
SUPPLEMENT TO
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC SECURITY

TABLES

[Table 1 printed in Report proper]

A. UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF:

2. Families and persons receiving emergency relief, continental United States.
3. Cases receiving emergency relief, direct work, special programs.
4. Obligations incurred for emergency relief from all public funds, by source of funds, January 1933 through November 1934, by months and by quarters.

B. UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LAWS:

5. Estimate of unemployment in employments which could be covered by unemployment-insurance plans.
6. States arrayed by average percentage of nonagricultural unemployment April 1930; 1933 average; and 1930-33 average.
7. Countries in which compulsory unemployment insurance laws have been enacted and number of workers covered in each.
8. Countries in which voluntary unemployment insurance laws have been enacted and number of workers covered in each.
9. General provisions of compulsory unemployment insurance laws.
10. General provisions of voluntary subsidized unemployment insurance laws.

C. AGE DISTRIBUTION AND OLD-AGE PENSION LAWS:

11. Number of older persons gainfully occupied by age and occupation for United States, 1930.
12. Age distribution of United States population by urban and rural for 1920 and 1930.
13. Actual and estimated number of persons aged 65 and over compared to total population, 1860 to 2000.
14. Operation of old-age pension laws of the United States, 1934.
15. Principal features of the old-age pension laws of the United States.
16. Old-age insurance and pension legislation in foreign countries through 1933.
17. Principal provisions of foreign noncontributory old-age pension laws through 1933.

D. SECURITY FOR CHILDREN:

18. Estimated number of families and children receiving mothers' aid and estimated expenditures for this purpose.
19. Funds for State maternal and child health work.

E. MISCELLANEOUS:

20. General economic statistics.

TABLE 2.—Families and persons receiving emergency relief, continental United States

Months	Resident families and persons receiving relief under the general relief and special programs					Number of transients receiving relief ²
	Families	Single persons	Total families and single persons	Total persons	Percent of total population ¹	
1933						
January.....	³ 3,850,000	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
February.....	³ 4,140,000	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
March.....	³ 4,560,000	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
April.....	4,475,322	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
May.....	4,252,443	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
June.....	3,789,026	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
July.....	3,451,874	³ 455,000	3,906,874	³ 15,282,000		12 (4)
August.....	3,351,810	³ 412,000	3,763,810	³ 15,077,000		12 (4)
September.....	2,984,975	³ 403,000	3,387,975	³ 13,333,000		11 (4)
October.....	3,010,516	³ 436,000	3,446,516	³ 13,613,000		11 (4)
November.....	3,365,114	461,315	3,826,429	15,080,465		12 (4)
December.....	2,631,020	433,431	3,069,451	11,664,860		10 (4)
1934						
January.....	2,486,274	456,469	2,942,743	11,086,598	9	(4)
February.....	2,599,975	532,036	3,132,011	11,627,415	9	126,873
March.....	3,070,855	563,138	3,633,993	13,494,282	11	145,119
April.....	3,847,235	590,007	4,437,242	16,840,389	14	164,244
May.....	3,815,926	617,735	4,433,661	17,228,458	14	174,138
June.....	3,757,971	559,502	4,317,473	16,833,294	14	187,282
July.....	3,867,047	512,362	4,409,409	17,301,734	14	195,051
August.....	4,059,605	569,877	4,629,482	18,187,193	15	206,173
September.....	4,096,725	656,215	4,752,940	18,410,334	15	221,734
October.....	⁵ 4,106,681	720,853	⁵ 4,827,534	⁸ 18,450,567	15	235,758
November ⁶	4,225,000	750,000	4,975,000	18,900,000	15	266,000

¹ Based on 1930 Census of Population.² Middle of month figures, excluding local homeless which are included under general relief program.³ Partially estimated.⁴ Not available.⁵ Partially estimated to cover the rural rehabilitation program on which reports are not yet complete.⁶ Preliminary.

Source: Division of Research, Statistics, and Finance, Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

TABLE 3.—Cases ¹ receiving emergency relief—direct, work, special programs

1934	Grand total	General relief			Special programs ²
		Total	Work programs	Direct relief only	
April.....	4,437,242	4,437,242	1,176,818	3,260,424	(3)
May.....	4,433,661	4,320,187	1,343,214	2,976,973	113,474
June.....	4,317,473	4,237,425	1,477,753	2,759,672	80,048
July.....	4,409,409	4,368,195	1,723,295	2,644,900	41,214
August.....	4,629,482	4,582,434	1,922,020	2,660,405	47,048
September.....	4,752,940	4,619,496	1,950,728	2,668,768	133,444
October.....	4,827,534	4,654,402	1,998,167	2,656,235	173,132
November ⁴	4,975,000	4,785,000	2,150,000	2,635,000	190,000

¹ Cases include each family or single person on relief, not counting transient single persons.² Rural rehabilitation program, emergency education program, student aid; excludes transients.³ Cases aided under special programs in April were included in the general relief program.⁴ Preliminary.

Source: Division of Research, Statistics, and Finance, Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

TABLE 4.—Obligations incurred for emergency relief from all public funds by source of funds, January 1933 through November 1934, by months and by quarters¹

	Obligations incurred for emergency relief						
	Total	Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent
1933							
January.....	\$60,827,160.00	\$31,175,001.46	51.3	\$8,898,288.71	14.6	\$20,753,870.69	34.1
February.....	67,375,423.32	39,850,235.88	59.1	5,921,376.42	8.8	21,603,811.02	32.1
March.....	81,205,631.61	51,355,220.07	63.2	5,212,394.33	6.4	24,638,017.21	30.4
First quarter.....	209,408,215.70	122,380,457.41	58.4	20,032,059.46	9.6	66,995,698.92	32.0
April.....	73,010,800.68	45,373,968.80	62.1	8,182,877.70	11.2	19,453,954.18	26.7
May.....	70,806,338.08	48,803,456.80	68.9	5,017,248.11	7.1	16,935,633.17	24.0
June.....	66,339,206.68	42,523,714.87	64.1	8,038,872.89	12.1	15,776,618.92	23.8
Second quarter.....	210,156,345.44	136,701,140.47	65.0	21,238,998.70	10.1	52,216,206.27	24.9
July.....	60,155,873.87	37,482,328.17	62.3	7,576,554.71	12.6	15,098,990.99	25.1
August.....	61,470,496.37	39,781,831.27	64.7	8,726,266.40	14.2	12,962,398.70	21.1
September.....	59,346,333.14	36,289,188.33	61.1	11,093,954.69	18.7	11,963,195.12	20.2
Third quarter.....	180,972,708.38	113,553,347.77	62.8	27,396,775.80	15.1	40,022,584.81	22.1
October.....	64,888,913.42	40,415,353.15	62.3	10,186,795.50	15.7	14,286,764.77	22.0
November.....	70,810,514.27	39,796,429.13	56.2	18,633,706.17	26.3	12,380,318.97	17.5
December.....	56,526,330.37	27,755,055.43	49.1	18,768,833.14	33.2	10,002,441.80	17.7
Fourth quarter.....	192,225,758.06	107,966,837.71	56.2	47,589,394.81	24.7	36,669,525.54	19.1
Total, 1933.....	792,763,027.67	480,601,783.36	60.6	116,257,228.77	14.7	195,904,015.54	24.7
1934							
January.....	53,880,834.01	29,065,736.51	54.0	16,124,460.00	29.9	8,690,637.50	16.1
February.....	57,668,212.60	26,462,858.11	45.9	21,832,729.56	37.9	9,372,624.93	16.2
March.....	69,794,802.92	32,522,395.84	46.6	25,615,747.44	36.7	11,656,659.64	16.7
First quarter.....	181,343,849.53	88,050,990.46	48.5	63,572,937.00	35.1	29,719,922.07	16.4
April.....	113,134,286.74	82,299,551.45	72.7	17,642,023.89	15.6	13,192,711.40	11.7
May.....	129,222,770.62	96,741,145.12	74.9	12,647,639.02	9.8	19,833,986.48	15.3
June.....	125,198,649.88	92,084,137.06	73.6	11,777,402.31	9.4	21,337,110.51	17.0
Second quarter.....	367,555,707.24	271,124,833.63	73.8	42,067,065.22	11.4	54,363,808.39	14.8
July.....	130,953,215.11	95,146,288.68	72.6	13,061,941.23	10.0	22,744,985.20	17.4
August.....	149,424,555.07	113,308,571.80	75.8	12,226,882.75	8.2	23,889,100.52	16.0
September.....	143,227,846.44	108,550,186.27	75.8	11,406,614.12	8.0	23,262,046.05	16.2
Third quarter.....	423,605,616.62	317,014,046.75	74.8	36,695,438.10	8.7	69,896,181.77	16.5
October.....	156,747,867.63	121,949,841.00	77.8	13,950,560.23	8.9	20,847,406.40	13.3
November.....	172,750,000.00	139,430,000.00	80.7	10,670,000.00	6.2	22,650,000.00	13.1
Total, 1934.....	1,302,063,041.02	937,569,711.84	72.0	166,956,000.55	12.8	197,477,328.63	15.2
Total, 23 months.....	2,094,766,068.69	1,418,171,495.20	67.7	283,213,229.32	13.5	393,381,344.17	18.8

¹ Includes obligations incurred for relief extended under the general relief program, under all special programs, and for administration; beginning April 1934 these figures also include purchases of materials, supplies, and equipment, rentals of equipment (such as team and truck hire), earnings of nonrelief persons employed, and other expense incident to the work program. Does not include about \$900,000,000 expended for the C. W. A., of which \$840,000,000 was derived from Federal funds and \$150,000,000 from State and local funds.

² Break-down partially estimated.

³ Preliminary.

Source: Division of Research, Statistics, and Finance, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Jan. 7, 1935. Table based on reports from State and local relief administrations.

TABLE 5.—*Estimate of unemployment in employments which are customarily covered by unemployment-insurance plans*

Year:	Estimated percent of unemployment	Year—Continued.	Estimated percent of unemployment
1922.....	13.1	1928.....	8.5
1923.....	7.3	1929.....	6.1
1924.....	9.4	1930.....	15.3
1925.....	7.8	1931.....	26.6
1926.....	7.4	1932.....	39.0
1927.....	8.3	1933.....	39.2

Source: Estimates of the Committee on Economic Security. It should be noted that these unemployment rates are indicative only of the unemployment occurring in the group of gainful workers which are customarily covered by unemployment-insurance plans, and that they do not represent the unemployment for the entire working population. These rates are higher than those for all gainful workers, because the incidence of unemployment borne by the group covered is greater than for the working population as a whole.

TABLE 6.—States arrayed by average percentage of nonagricultural unemployment—April 1930; 1933 average; and 1930-33 average

April 1930			1933 average			1930-33 average		
State	Percent of gainful workers unemployed	Ratio to average of all States	State	Percent of gainful workers unemployed	Ratio to average of all States	State	Percent of gainful workers unemployed	Ratio to average of all States
		Percent 100.0			Percent 100.0			Percent 100.0
All States.....	8.5		All States.....	33.2		All States.....	25.8	
1. Michigan.....	13.9	163.5	Michigan.....	45.9	138.3	Michigan.....	34.3	132.9
2. Rhode Island.....	11.2	131.8	Pennsylvania.....	40.2	121.1	Rhode Island.....	29.6	114.7
3. Montana.....	10.7	125.9	Arkansas.....	39.2	118.1	New Jersey.....	28.8	111.6
4. Illinois.....	10.3	121.2	New Jersey.....	38.8	116.9	Montana.....	28.4	110.1
5. Oregon.....	10.1	118.8	Arizona.....	38.6	116.3	Pennsylvania.....	28.3	109.7
6. Nevada.....	9.8	115.3	New Mexico.....	38.3	115.4	Illinois.....	28.0	108.5
7. Ohio.....	9.5	111.8	New York.....	38.1	114.8	New York.....	27.8	107.9
8. Massachusetts.....	9.4	110.6	Rhode Island.....	36.6	110.2	Nevada.....	27.8	107.9
9. Pennsylvania.....	9.0	105.9	Florida.....	36.6	110.2	Arizona.....	27.7	107.4
10. Colorado.....	8.9	104.7	Montana.....	36.4	109.6	Florida.....	27.1	105.0
11. New Jersey.....	8.9	104.7	Illinois.....	35.7	107.5	Massachusetts.....	27.0	104.7
12. California.....	8.8	103.5	Nevada.....	35.4	106.6	Ohio.....	26.9	104.3
13. New York.....	8.7	102.4	Colorado.....	35.3	106.3	Indiana.....	26.6	103.1
14. Indiana.....	8.6	101.2	Massachusetts.....	34.8	104.8	Connecticut.....	26.4	102.3
15. Washington.....	8.6	101.2	Utah.....	34.3	103.3	New Mexico.....	26.2	101.6
16. Utah.....	8.5	100.0	Wyoming.....	33.9	102.1	Utah.....	25.7	99.6
17. Florida.....	8.5	100.0	Indiana.....	33.4	100.6	Arkansas.....	25.6	99.2
18. Oklahoma.....	8.4	98.8	Ohio.....	32.2	97.0	Colorado.....	25.1	97.3
19. Maine.....	8.2	96.5	Connecticut.....	31.7	95.5	Washington.....	24.4	94.6
20. Minnesota.....	8.2	96.5	Texas.....	31.6	95.2	Wyoming.....	24.2	93.8
21. Vermont.....	8.0	94.1	Missouri.....	31.5	94.9	Missouri.....	24.2	93.8
22. North Carolina.....	7.9	92.9	Iowa.....	31.0	93.4	Oklahoma.....	24.2	93.8
23. New Hampshire.....	7.9	92.9	Vermont.....	30.9	93.1	Louisiana.....	24.1	93.4
24. Kentucky.....	7.8	91.8	Washington.....	30.7	92.5	Vermont.....	24.1	93.4
25. Connecticut.....	7.8	91.8	Louisiana.....	30.6	92.2	California.....	24.0	93.0

TABLE 6.—States arrayed by average percentage of nonagricultural unemployment—April 1930; 1933 average; and 1930-33 average—Contd.

April 1930			1933 average			1930-33 average		
State	Percent of gainful workers unemployed	Ratio to average of all States	State	Percent of gainful workers unemployed	Ratio to average of all States	State	Percent of gainful workers unemployed	Ratio to average of all States
		<i>Percent</i>			<i>Percent</i>			<i>Percent</i>
26. Wisconsin.....	7.8	91.8	Minnesota.....	30.3	91.3	Texas.....	23.9	92.6
27. Missouri.....	7.7	90.6	Nebraska.....	30.2	91.0	Wisconsin.....	23.8	92.2
28. Louisiana.....	7.7	90.6	West Virginia.....	29.4	88.6	Minnesota.....	23.4	90.7
29. Idaho.....	7.6	89.4	Maryland.....	29.4	88.6	Maryland.....	23.4	90.7
30. West Virginia.....	7.4	87.1	California.....	29.2	88.0	West Virginia.....	23.2	89.9
31. New Mexico.....	7.4	87.1	Oklahoma.....	29.2	88.0	Alabama.....	23.2	89.9
32. Arizona.....	7.4	87.1	Alabama.....	29.1	87.7	Maine.....	21.8	84.5
33. Wyoming.....	7.1	83.5	Wisconsin.....	28.8	86.7	Iowa.....	21.8	84.5
34. Texas.....	6.7	78.8	Idaho.....	28.5	85.8	Idaho.....	21.8	84.5
35. Arkansas.....	6.5	76.5	North Dakota.....	27.3	82.2	New Hampshire.....	21.8	84.5
36. Kansas.....	6.2	72.9	Kansas.....	26.9	81.0	Oregon.....	21.7	81.1
37. North Dakota.....	6.1	71.8	Virginia.....	25.6	77.1	Nebraska.....	21.5	83.3
38. Virginia.....	5.9	69.4	Mississippi.....	25.1	75.6	North Carolina.....	21.3	82.6
39. Nebraska.....	5.9	69.4	Kentucky.....	22.7	68.4	Virginia.....	21.1	81.8
40. Georgia.....	5.9	69.4	South Dakota.....	22.7	68.4	Kansas.....	21.0	81.4
41. Maryland.....	5.8	68.2	Tennessee.....	22.6	68.1	Kentucky.....	20.8	80.6
42. Alabama.....	5.6	65.9	Oregon.....	21.3	64.2	Tennessee.....	20.4	79.1
43. Iowa.....	5.6	63.5	New Hampshire.....	21.3	64.2	Mississippi.....	19.4	75.2
44. Tennessee.....	5.3	62.4	District of Columbia.....	21.0	63.3	North Dakota.....	18.9	73.3
45. South Carolina.....	5.2	61.2	Maine.....	20.3	61.1	District of Columbia.....	18.3	70.9
46. Delaware.....	5.2	61.2	North Carolina.....	18.4	55.4	Delaware.....	18.3	70.9
47. District of Columbia.....	4.9	57.6	Delaware.....	16.7	50.3	South Dakota.....	17.5	67.8
48. Mississippi.....	4.6	54.1	South Carolina.....	12.9	38.9	South Carolina.....	17.2	66.7
49. South Dakota.....	3.9	45.9	Georgia.....	12.6	38.0	Georgia.....	17.0	65.9

Source: Estimates derived from population and employment data reported by the U. S. Bureau of the Census, the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 7.—Countries in which compulsory unemployment-insurance laws have been enacted and number of workers covered in each

Country ¹	Date of law ²	Number insured ³
Australia (Queensland).....	Oct. 18, 1922	175,000
Austria.....	Mar. 24, 1920	969,000
Bulgaria.....	Apr. 12, 1925	280,000
Germany.....	July 16, 1927	⁴ 17,920,000
Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	Dec. 16, 1911	12,960,000
Irish Free State.....	Aug. 9, 1920	359,000
Italy.....	Oct. 19, 1919	4,000,000
Poland.....	July 18, 1924	954,000
Switzerland (13 cantons).....	(⁵)	⁶ 325,000
United States (Wisconsin).....	Jan. 29, 1932	330,000
Total number insured.....		38,272,000

¹ A compulsory law was passed in Russia in 1922, but benefit payments were suspended in 1930.

² These are the dates upon which the laws were enacted, not the dates upon which they went into effect.

³ These are the most recent figures available.

⁴ This figure represents the number covered previous to the beginning of the depression in 1929. The official figure is much smaller (12,503,000 at end of August 1933); the difference is due not to any limitation of coverage but to the fact that those unemployed workers who had exhausted their right to insurance benefits and had thus come within the scope of the communal relief were not included in the figures for the members covered by unemployment insurance.

⁵ The first of the cantonal measures was passed in 1925.

⁶ This figure includes persons compulsorily insured in certain communes in cantons having voluntary insurance.

Source: Compiled by the Committee on Economic Security.

TABLE 8.—Countries in which voluntary unemployment insurance laws have been enacted and number of workers covered in each

Country	Date of law ¹	Number insured ²
Belgium.....	Dec. 30, 1920	1,038,000
Czechoslovakia.....	July 19, 1921 ³	1,500,000
Denmark.....	Apr. 9, 1907	337,000
Finland.....	Nov. 2, 1917	15,000
France.....	Sept. 9, 1905	192,000
Netherlands.....	Dec. 2, 1916	502,000
Norway.....	Aug. 6, 1915	47,000
Spain.....	May 25, 1931	⁴ 50,000
Sweden.....	Jan. 1, 1935	(⁵)
Switzerland (11 cantons) ⁶	Oct. 17, 1924 ⁷	195,000
Total number insured.....		3,876,000

¹ These are the dates for the enactment of the national laws, not the dates upon which they took effect.

² These are the most recent figures available.

³ This act came into effect on Apr. 1, 1925.

⁴ The number of persons belonging to funds which may be subject to the insurance law is 50,000. It is not definitely known whether all these persons come under the law but it is probable that the majority of them do.

⁵ It is estimated that 23 unions with 320,000 members have funds which may be used for the insurance provided in the law. The law became effective Jan. 1, 1935. It is likely that 320,000 can be taken as a rough estimate of the number who will come under the law in its early stages.

⁶ 7 of these cantons specify that communes may enforce compulsory insurance within their borders; the population of communes that have compulsory insurance is given in table 1.

⁷ This is the date of the national measure. The first of the cantonal acts was passed in 1925.

Source: Compiled by the Committee on Economic Security.

TABLE 9.—General provisions of compulsory unemployment insurance laws

Country and year of original law ¹	Regular weekly contributions	Qualifying period (contributions)	Waiting period (days)	Amount of benefit	Normal duration of benefits
Australia (Queensland), 1922	Workers, employers, State, each 6d.	26 weeks	14	Varies with locality, marital status, and number of dependents.	13 weeks.
Austria, 1920	One-half workers, one-half employers, as percentage of basic wage classes.	20 weeks	8	Varies with wage classes, marital status, and number of dependents.	12 to 20 weeks.
Bulgaria, 1925	Workers, employers, State, each 1 leva.	52 weeks in 2 years.	8	16 leva daily for head of family; 10 leva all others.	12 weeks.
Germany, 1927	Workers, employers, each 3¼ percent of basic wage classes.	do	Varies, 3 to 14 with number of dependents.	Varies with wage classes, locality, and number of dependents.	14 weeks (means test required after 6 weeks).
Great Britain, 1911	Workers, employers, State, each one-third, as flat rate varying with age and sex.	30 weeks in 2 years.	6	Varies with age, sex, and number of dependents.	26 weeks.
Irish Free State, 1911	Workers and employers contribute varying amounts; State two-sevenths of aggregate.	12 weeks	6	do	1 day's benefit for each weekly contribution.
Italy, 1919	One-half workers, one-half employers, as percentage of basic wage classes.	48 weeks in 2 years.	7	Varies with wage classes.	90 to 120 days.
Poland, 1924 ²	Wage earners ½ percent of wages; employers, 1½ percent, State 1 percent.	26 weeks	10	Varies with marital status and number of dependents.	13 weeks.
Switzerland (13 cantons)	Varies with the type of insurance fund, occupation, risks involved, and laws of Canton.	180-day minimum.	3 minimum	Maximum benefit 50 percent wages, plus 10 percent for members with dependents.	90-day maximum.

¹ A compulsory law was passed in Russia in 1922, but benefits were suspended in 1930, owing to an absence of unemployment.

² Poland also has a system of unemployment insurance for salaried workers to which only employers and employees contribute.

Source: Compiled mainly from the *Monthly Labor Review*, August and September 1934, "Operation of Unemployment Insurance Systems in the United States and Foreign Countries."

TABLE 10.—General provisions of voluntary subsidized unemployment insurance laws

Country and year of original law	Subsidies	Qualifying period	Waiting period	Maximum amount of benefits	Normal duration of benefits
Belgium, 1920.....	State pays two-thirds of contributions by members.	1 year.....	1 day each month plus 3 days each 6 months.	Three-fourths usual wages.	30 days each 6 months.
Czechoslovakia, 1921.....	State pays 2 to 3 times union benefits.	Varies with fund; 3-month minimum.	7 days.....	Two-thirds last wage.....	26 weeks.
Denmark, 1917.....	State, 15 to 90 percent contributions; local governments pay one-third of State subsidy.	12 months.....	6-day minimum; 15 maximum. Varies with fund.	Two-thirds average earnings.	Varies; 70 to 120 days.
Finland, 1917.....	State, one-third to two-thirds of benefits paid by funds.	6 months.....	6-day minimum; 18 maximum; varies.	Two-thirds average wage.....	120 days.
France, 1905.....	State, 60 to 90 percent of benefits.	do.....	Varies with funds.....	One-half normal wages.....	180 days.
Netherlands, 1916.....	Federal, one-half workers contributions; local, one-half also.	Varies; 26 weeks in general.	Varies; 6 days in general.....	70 percent average daily wage.	Varies; 36 to 90 days.
Norway, 1915.....	State one-half and more of benefits paid; local governments pay two-thirds of State subsidy.	26 weeks.....	Varies with fund; 3 to 14 days.	One-half daily earnings.....	13 weeks.
Spain, 1931.....	State pays varying percentage of benefits.	6 months.....	6 days.....	Three-fifths normal wages.	60 days.
Sweden, 1934 ¹	State pays percentage of benefits.	52 weeks in 2 years.....	6-day minimum; 3-month maximum.	Four-fifths usual wages.....	90-day minimum; 120-day maximum.
Switzerland, 1924.....	Federal subsidy, 38 to 43 percent of benefits plus cantonal and communal subsidies.	180-day minimum.....	3-day minimum.....	Three-fifths normal wages.	90-day maximum.

¹ Sweden's law became effective Jan. 1, 1935.

Source: Compiled mainly from the *Monthly Labor Review*, August and September 1934, "Operation of Unemployment Insurance Systems in the United States and Foreign Countries."

TABLE 11.—*Number of older persons gainfully occupied by age and occupation for United States, 1930*¹

	45 and over	50 and over	55 and over	60 and over	65 and over	70 and over	75 and over
Total population.....	28,048,786	21,006,507	15,030,703	10,385,026	6,633,805	3,863,200	1,913,196
Total gainfully occupied....	14,626,620	10,350,550	6,795,459	4,155,395	2,204,967	977,925	335,023
Agriculture.....	3,891,109	2,979,047	2,115,609	1,407,129	829,825	417,734	159,809
Forestry and fishing.....	84,013	58,250	36,865	21,627	11,100	4,678	1,493
Extraction of minerals.....	286,039	181,594	104,957	54,796	24,553	8,572	2,347
Manufacturing and mechanical industries.....	4,165,502	2,837,582	1,794,848	1,047,104	518,525	205,130	61,048
Transportation and communication.....	994,996	656,832	400,231	222,808	100,297	33,141	9,073
Trade.....	1,889,026	1,307,044	831,557	488,493	247,726	105,367	33,616
Public service.....	351,075	270,775	192,679	126,097	69,441	29,701	8,891
Professional service.....	852,491	596,732	380,186	223,031	113,284	51,190	18,496
Domestic and personal service.....	1,566,011	1,107,365	723,292	443,768	232,989	99,963	33,500
Clerical occupations.....	546,358	355,329	215,235	120,542	57,227	22,449	6,750

¹ Less unknown.Source: Fifteenth Census of the U. S., 1930, vol. II, *Population*, table 3, p. 567, and vol. IV, *Occupations*, table 21, p. 42.

TABLE 12.—Age distribution of United States population by urban and rural for 1920 and 1930

Age group	Total population			Urban population			Rural population		
	1920	1930		1920	1930		1920	1930	
	Number	Number	Accumulated percentage ¹	Number	Number	Accumulated percentage ¹	Number	Number	Accumulated percentage ¹
Under 5.....	11,573,230	11,444,390	-----	5,275,751	5,628,360	-----	6,297,479	5,818,030	-----
5 to 9.....	11,398,075	12,607,639	90.6	5,050,276	6,211,141	91.7	6,347,799	6,396,468	89.1
10 to 14.....	10,641,137	12,004,877	80.3	4,661,312	5,949,603	82.7	5,976,825	6,055,184	77.3
15 to 19.....	9,430,556	11,552,115	70.5	4,445,963	6,015,411	74.1	4,984,593	5,536,704	66.0
20 to 24.....	9,277,021	10,870,378	61.1	5,102,099	6,420,303	65.4	4,174,922	4,450,070	55.7
25 to 29.....	9,086,491	9,833,698	52.2	5,319,058	6,171,951	56.1	3,767,433	3,661,657	47.4
30 to 34.....	8,071,193	9,120,421	44.2	4,726,556	5,773,476	47.1	3,344,637	3,346,945	40.6
35 to 39.....	7,775,281	9,208,645	36.8	4,453,437	5,773,764	38.8	3,321,844	3,434,881	34.4
40 to 44.....	6,345,557	7,990,195	29.3	3,602,119	4,932,386	30.4	2,743,438	3,057,809	28.0
45 to 49.....	5,763,620	7,042,279	22.8	3,190,639	4,222,829	23.2	2,572,981	2,819,450	22.4
50 to 54.....	4,734,873	5,975,804	17.1	2,613,070	3,491,257	17.1	2,121,803	2,484,547	17.1
55 to 59.....	3,549,124	4,645,677	12.2	1,895,847	2,656,416	12.0	1,653,277	1,989,261	12.5
60 to 64.....	2,982,548	3,751,221	8.5	1,528,090	2,120,260	8.2	1,454,458	1,630,961	8.8
65 to 69.....	2,068,475	2,770,605	5.4	1,000,986	1,527,724	5.1	1,067,489	1,242,881	5.8
70 to 74.....	1,395,036	1,950,004	3.1	660,731	1,031,232	2.9	734,305	918,772	3.5
75 to 79.....	856,560	1,106,390	1.6	398,637	563,217	1.4	457,923	543,173	1.8
80 to 84.....	402,779	534,676	.7	185,455	267,715	.6	217,324	266,961	.8
85 to 89.....	156,539	205,469	.2	69,012	102,133	.2	87,527	103,336	.3
90 to 94.....	39,980	51,664	.1	17,626	25,147	(3)	22,354	26,517	.1
95 to 99.....	9,579	11,633	(3)	4,223	5,007	(3)	5,356	6,026	(3)
100 and over.....	4,267	3,964	(3)	1,851	1,360	(2)	2,386	2,604	(3)
Unknown.....	148,699	94,022	.1	98,835	66,036	.1	49,864	27,986	.1
Total population.....	105,710,620	122,775,016	100.0	54,304,603	68,954,823	100.0	51,406,017	53,820,223	100.0

¹ Accumulated percentage based on all over first age mentioned in each age group.

² Estimated.

³ Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

Source: Fifteenth Census of the U. S., 1930, vol. II, *Population*, tables 7 and 16, pp. 576, 587-89.

TABLE 13.—Actual and estimated number of persons aged 65 and over compared to total population, 1860 to 2000

Year	Number aged 65 and over	Total population	Percent aged 65 and over	Year	Number aged 65 and over	Total population	Percent aged 65 and over
1860.....	849,000	31,443,000	2.7	1940.....	8,311,000	132,000,000	6.3
1870.....	1,154,000	38,558,000	3.0	1950.....	10,863,000	141,000,000	7.7
1880.....	1,723,000	50,156,000	3.4	1960.....	13,590,000	146,000,000	9.3
1890.....	2,424,000	62,622,000	3.9	1970.....	15,066,000	149,000,000	10.1
1900.....	3,089,000	75,995,000	4.1	1980.....	17,001,000	150,000,000	11.3
1910.....	3,958,000	91,972,000	4.3	1990.....	19,102,000	151,000,000	12.6
1920.....	4,940,000	105,711,000	4.7	2000.....	19,338,000	151,000,000	12.7
1930.....	6,634,000	122,775,000	5.4				

Source: Data for years 1860 to 1930 from the U. S. Censuses. Estimates for subsequent years by the actuarial staff of the Committee on Economic Security. These forecasts are made on the assumption of a net immigration of 100,000 annually in years 1935-39, and 200,000 annually in 1940 and thereafter.

TABLE 14.—Operation of old-age pension laws of the United States, 1934

State	Type of law	Number of pensioners ¹	Number of eligible age ²	Percentage of pensioners to number of eligible age	Average pension ¹	Yearly cost ³
Alaska.....	Mandatory.	⁴ 446	3,437	Percent 11.1	\$20.82	\$95,705
Arizona.....	do.....	⁵ 1,974	9,118	21.6	9.01	200,927
California.....	do.....	⁶ 19,300	210,379	9.2	21.16	3,502,000
Colorado.....	do.....	8,705	61,787	14.1	8.59	172,481
Delaware.....	do.....	⁸ 1,610	16,678	9.7	9.79	188,740
Hawaii.....	Optional.....	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)
Idaho.....	Mandatory.	1,275	22,310	5.7	8.85	114,521
Indiana.....	do.....	⁷ 23,418	138,426	16.9	⁷ 6.13	⁸ 1,254,169
Iowa.....	do.....	⁴ 3,000	184,239	1.6	⁴ 13.50	⁴ 475,500
Kentucky.....	Optional.....	(¹⁰)	(¹⁰)	(¹⁰)	(¹⁰)	(¹⁰)
Maine.....	Mandatory.	(¹¹)	(¹¹)	(¹¹)	(¹¹)	(¹¹)
Maryland.....	Optional.....	¹² 141	92,972	.2	29.90	50,217
Massachusetts.....	Mandatory.	¹³ 20,823	156,590	12.8	24.35	5,411,723
Michigan.....	do.....	¹² 2,660	148,853	1.8	¹² 9.59	¹³ 306,096
Minnesota.....	Optional.....	2,655	94,401	2.8	13.20	420,536
Montana.....	do.....	1,781	14,377	12.4	7.28	155,525
Nebraska.....	Mandatory.	(¹⁴)	(¹⁴)	(¹⁴)	(¹⁴)	(¹⁴)
Nevada.....	Optional.....	23	4,814	.5	15.00	3,320
New Hampshire.....	Mandatory.	⁴ 1,423	25,714	5.5	¹⁵ 19.06	¹² 298,722
New Jersey.....	do.....	¹⁵ 10,560	112,594	9.4	12.72	1,375,693
New York.....	do.....	51,228	373,878	13.7	22.16	13,592,080
North Dakota.....	do.....	(¹⁶)	(¹⁶)	(¹⁶)	(¹⁶)	(¹⁶)
Ohio.....	do.....	¹² 24,000	414,836	5.8	¹ 13.99	¹³ 3,090,000
Oregon.....	do.....	(¹⁷)	(¹⁷)	(¹⁷)	(¹⁷)	(¹⁷)
Oregon.....	do.....	(¹⁸)	(¹⁸)	(¹⁸)	(¹⁸)	(¹⁸)
Pennsylvania.....	do.....	930	22,665	4.1	8.56	95,599
Washington.....	do.....	⁷ 2,239	101,503	2.2	(⁹)	(⁹)
West Virginia.....	Optional.....	(¹⁴)	(¹⁴)	(¹⁶)	(¹⁶)	(¹⁶)
Wisconsin.....	do.....	1,969	112,112	1.8	16.75	395,707
Wyoming.....	Mandatory.	643	8,707	7.4	10.79	83,231
Total.....		180,003				31,192,492

¹ Where no special reference is given, the figures are as of Dec. 31, 1933.

² 1930 Census figures.

³ Where no special reference is given, the figures represent actual cost for the year 1933.

⁴ As of December 1934.

⁵ As of Oct. 1, 1934.

⁶ No information available or not computed.

⁷ As of August 1934.

⁸ Appropriation for 1934.

⁹ Estimated from expenditures of April through November 1934, \$317,000.

¹⁰ No pensions being paid.

¹¹ Not yet in effect.

¹² As of November 1934.

¹³ Estimated from monthly figures.

¹⁴ Not much being done due to lack of funds.

¹⁵ As of September 1934.

¹⁶ No pensions being paid now.

¹⁷ Administered by counties; no information available for State.

¹⁸ Law just being put into effect.

Source: Data collected by the Committee on Economic Security.

TABLE 16.—*Old-age insurance and pension legislation in foreign countries through 1933*

A. COMPULSORY CONTRIBUTORY OLD-AGE INSURANCE LAWS OF GENERAL COVERAGE

Country	Year when passed	Coverage
Austria ^{1 2}	1927	Workers in industry and commerce, including domestic workers, except casual domestics. Special schemes for agricultural workers, salaried employees, and miners.
Belgium ²	1924	All wage earners, including agricultural workers and domestics (except casual domestics); and independent workers with incomes below 18,000 francs a year. Special schemes for salaried employees and miners.
Bulgaria ^{1 2}	1924	Employed persons, including agricultural workers and domestics. Special scheme for public officials.
Chile ¹	1924	Wage earners under 65 earning less than 8,000 pesos a year; independent workers with annual incomes below 8,000 pesos a year.
Czechoslovakia ^{1 2}	1924	Employed workers over school age and under 60, including agricultural, domestic, and home workers. Special schemes for salaried employees, miners, state employees, employees of statutory corporations, such as railways. Special act for independent workers, passed in 1925, not yet enforced.
France ^{1 2} (see also sec. C).	1910	All employed persons under 60 whose annual earnings do not exceed 18,000 francs a year in cities with over 200,000 inhabitants or industrial areas, 15,000 francs elsewhere. (Income limit raised by 2,000 francs in respect of each child.) Persons employed in agriculture subject to insurance against old age and death only. Special scheme for miners.
Germany ^{1 2}	1889	All workers, including agricultural, domestic, and home workers. Special scheme for salaried employees with annual earnings below 8,400 reichsmarks. Special scheme for miners.
Great Britain ^{1 2} (see also section C).	1925	All workers, including agricultural workers and domestics; salaried employees with incomes below £250 a year.
Greece ^{1 2}	1922	All persons employed in industry and commerce.
Hungary ^{1 2}	1928	All persons employed in specified employments. Employments may be added by Minister's order. Salaried employees with incomes below 6,000 pengo a year. Special scheme for miners.
Italy ¹	1919	All employed persons, including agricultural and domestic workers. Salaried employees with incomes below 800 lire a month.
Luxemburg ^{1 2}	1911	Workers in industry and commerce. Special scheme for salaried employees in industry and commerce.
Netherlands ^{1 2}	1913	All employed persons, including agricultural and domestic workers, whose annual remuneration does not exceed 2,000 florins. Insured persons whose remuneration rises above 2,000 florins remain liable to insurance. If their remuneration has been above 3,000 florins for some time, they are exempted at their request. Special schemes for railway workers and miners.
Poland ^{1 2}	1933	All workers in commerce and industry. Insurable wage limit.
Portugal ¹	1919	All employed persons over 15 years earning less than 900 escudos annually.
Rumania ¹	1912	All persons employed in industry and commerce, and craftsmen. Special scheme for miners in Ardeal, which includes survivors' insurance.
Spain.....	1919	All employed persons whose annual earnings do not exceed 4,000 pesetas. Domestic servants excluded.
Sweden ¹	1913	All citizens between 16 and 66 years unless already guaranteed pension under army, navy, etc.
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. ^{1 2}	1922	All manual workers; engineers and skilled technical workers; navigating staff in civil aviation; various categories of salaried employees.
Yugoslavia ^{1 2}	1922	All wage earners except household casuals, farm labor, and sea fishermen. (Not yet enforced.)
	1924	All workers and other persons employed under mining act.
	1907	Salaried employees in Slovenia and Dalmatia who have reached age 18 and whose annual earnings are not less than 150 dinars.

¹ Old-age insurance combined with invalidity insurance.² Old-age insurance combined with survivors' insurance.

Source: Compiled from *Compulsory Pension Insurance*, International Labour Office, Studies and Reports, Series M, No. 10, Geneva, 1933; *Noncontributory Pensions*, International Labour Office, Studies and Reports, Series M, No. 9, Geneva, 1933; *Insuring the Essentials*, Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong, 1932.

TABLE 16.—*Old-age insurance and pension legislation in foreign countries through 1933—Continued*

B. COMPULSORY CONTRIBUTORY OLD-AGE INSURANCE LAWS OF LIMITED COVERAGE

Country	Year when passed	Coverage
Argentina ^{1 2}	1921	Public utility employees.
	1924	Bank staffs.
Brazil ^{1 2}	1923	Railway workers.
	1926	Dock workers.
	1931	Staffs of public utility undertakings.
Cuba ^{1 2}	1927	Seamen and harbor workers.
Ecuador ¹	1928	Staffs of banks.
Switzerland:		
Canton Glarus ¹	1916	Legal residents between ages 17 and 50.
Appenzell.....	1925	All legal residents between ages 18 and 64.
Basle Town ²	1931	All persons between ages 20 and 65 who have been resident in the Canton for 2 years.
Uruguay ^{1 2} (see also section C).....	1919	Staffs of public utility undertakings.
	1925	Staffs of banks and stock exchange.

C. NONCONTRIBUTORY OLD-AGE PENSION LAWS

Australia ¹	1908	All citizens with insufficient income, resident 20 years.
Canada.....	1927	All citizens with insufficient income; resident in Canada 20 years, in Province 5 years.
Denmark.....	1891	Citizens with insufficient means, resident 5 years.
France ¹ (see also section A).	1905	All citizens with insufficient means.
Great Britain (see also section A).	1903	Citizens with insufficient means; 12 years' residence since age 50 for natural-born citizens; 20 years' residence in all for naturalized subjects.
Greenland.....	1926	All Greenlanders without subsistence income.
Iceland.....	1909	Citizens with insufficient means.
Irish Free State.....	1903	Citizens with insufficient means, resident 30 years.
Newfoundland.....	1911	All citizens with insufficient means.
New Zealand.....	1898	Citizens with insufficient means and 25 years' continuous residence.
Norway (will not go into effect until announced by Royal decree).	1923	All citizens with insufficient income.
South Africa.....	1923	All citizens (of 5 years' standing) with 15 years' residence out of preceding 20 years; other persons with 25 years' residence out of preceding 30 years; insufficient income.
Uruguay ¹ (see also section B.)	1919	All persons with insufficient means. (For naturalized subjects or aliens 15 years' residence is required.)

¹ Old-age pension legislation combined with invalidity pension legislation.² Old-age insurance combined with survivors' insurance.

TABLE 18.—Estimated number of families and children receiving mothers' aid and estimated expenditures for this purpose

[Based on figures available Nov. 15, 1934]

State	Number of families receiving mothers' aid	Number of children benefiting from mothers' aid	Estimated present annual expenditures for mothers' aid, local and State		
			Total	Local	State
Total.....	109,036	230,565	\$37,487,479	\$31,621,957	\$5,865,522
Alabama ¹					
Arizona.....	106	379	20,940		20,940
Arkansas ²					
California.....	7,056	17,642	2,133,909	224,252	1,909,747
Colorado.....	553	1,435	149,688	149,688	
Connecticut.....	1,271	3,276	734,627	489,752	244,875
Delaware.....	348	855	93,000	46,500	46,500
District of Columbia.....	209	720	143,997	143,997	
Florida.....	2,564	6,164	222,286	222,286	
Georgia ²					
Idaho ³	230	619	36,315	36,315	
Illinois.....	6,217	14,802	1,837,012	1,533,217	303,795
Indiana.....	1,332	3,856	352,224	352,224	
Iowa.....	3,527	9,170	719,772	719,772	
Kansas.....	768	1,997	75,721	75,721	
Kentucky.....	137	356	62,889	62,889	
Louisiana.....	88	229	9,312	9,312	
Maine.....	817	2,124	310,000	155,000	155,000
Maryland.....	207	694	117,459	117,459	
Massachusetts.....	3,939	11,817	2,450,000	1,400,000	1,050,000
Michigan.....	6,933	18,039	2,448,962	2,448,962	
Minnesota.....	3,597	9,152	1,138,176	1,138,176	
Mississippi ³					
Missouri.....	336	874	93,440	93,440	
Montana ⁴	839	1,969	213,623	213,623	
Nebraska.....	1,654	4,300	272,036	272,036	
Nevada ⁵	200	520	44,035	44,035	
New Hampshire.....	280	761	\$82,440		82,440
New Jersey.....	7,711	18,789	2,445,564	\$2,445,564	
New Mexico ⁶					
New York.....	23,493	56,524	11,731,176	11,731,176	
North Carolina.....	314	947	58,706	29,353	29,353
North Dakota ³	978	2,644	238,314	238,314	
Ohio.....	8,923	24,470	2,116,908	2,116,908	
Oklahoma ⁵	1,896	5,166	123,314	123,314	
Oregon.....	1,040	2,259	247,140	247,140	
Pennsylvania.....	7,700	22,587	3,197,640	1,598,320	1,598,320
Rhode Island.....	513	1,666	267,252	133,626	133,626
South Carolina ²					
South Dakota ⁵	1,290	3,324	285,986	285,986	
Tennessee.....	241	627	71,328	71,328	
Texas.....	332	863	43,987	43,987	
Utah.....	622	1,617	78,651	78,651	
Vermont.....	206	461	46,976	23,488	23,488
Virginia.....	136	545	33,876	16,938	16,938
Washington ⁵	3,013	7,834	519,538	519,538	
West Virginia.....	108	281	16,086	16,086	
Wisconsin.....	7,173	17,932	2,180,790	1,930,790	250,000
Wyoming ⁶	95	279	22,294	22,294	

¹ Includes revised figures for Illinois.² No mothers' aid law.³ Mothers' aid discontinued.⁴ Estimated on basis of 2.6 children per family, the average rate for 20 States reporting in December, 1933.⁵ Estimated on basis of trends in comparable States from which reports have been received.⁶ Law not in operation.

Source: The U. S. Children's Bureau.

TABLE 19.—Funds for State maternal and child-health work

State	1928			1934	Percent increase 1934 over 1928	Percent decrease 1934 under 1928
	Total funds	Federal	State			
Delaware.....	\$18,008.02	\$11,504.01	\$5,504.01	\$33,000.00	83.3	
Pennsylvania.....	132,621.98	68,816.99	63,810.99	197,539.00	48.9	
Maine.....	25,000.00	15,000.00	10,000.00	26,300.00	5.2	
Massachusetts.....	78,275.00		78,275.00	80,850.00	3.3	
New Hampshire.....	20,976.62	12,988.31	7,988.31	21,620.50	3.1	
Rhode Island.....	24,276.28	14,076.28	10,200.00	24,065.00		0.9
Illinois.....	70,000.00		70,000.00	69,070.00		1.3
Connecticut.....	32,760.00		32,760.00	29,392.00		10.3
New Jersey.....	118,163.55	31,284.55	86,879.00	103,872.52		12.1
Wisconsin.....	50,752.00	27,751.62	23,000.38	43,350.00		14.6
Maryland.....	33,554.00	19,277.00	14,277.00	26,844.00		20.6
Minnesota.....	47,000.00	26,099.55	20,900.35	36,000.00		23.4
South Dakota.....	7,500.00	7,500.00		5,000.00		33.3
Arizona.....	19,507.42	12,253.71	7,253.71	12,890.00		33.9
New York.....	210,041.78	80,041.78	130,000.00	134,500.00		36.0
Virginia.....	75,574.00	25,574.00	50,000.00	40,372.00		46.6
Kentucky.....	47,597.48	20,298.64	21,298.84	25,200.00		47.1
Michigan.....	64,741.11	34,741.11	30,000.00	31,940.00		50.7
Missouri.....	49,186.81	24,186.81	25,000.00	23,799.00		51.6
Texas.....	77,902.52	41,450.52	36,452.00	34,840.00		55.3
Montana.....	24,400.00	13,700.00	10,700.00	10,500.00		57.0
Georgia.....	64,438.89	35,451.10	28,987.79	26,000.00		59.7
North Dakota.....	8,000.00	6,500.00	1,500.00	3,056.00		61.8
North Carolina.....	49,519.66	27,259.56	22,260.00	18,500.00		62.6
Washington.....	8,387.00	5,000.00	3,387.00	3,000.00		64.2
Mississippi.....	49,076.53	22,076.58	27,000.00	15,150.00		69.1
Wyoming.....	10,000.00	7,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00		75.0
Louisiana.....	30,042.00	7,521.00	22,521.00	7,000.00		76.7
Kansas.....	35,000.00	20,000.00	15,000.00	8,000.00		77.1
West Virginia.....	40,443.48	19,871.74	20,871.74	9,140.00		77.4
Hawaii.....	18,451.92	11,725.96	6,725.96	4,100.00		77.8
California.....	57,530.00	31,290.00	26,290.00	12,225.00		78.8
Florida.....	37,906.00	16,531.72	21,374.28	7,330.00		80.7
Ohio.....	53,334.00	23,585.57	29,748.43	10,048.00		81.2
Oregon.....	27,533.46	15,283.46	12,250.00	4,701.00		82.9
Iowa.....	42,298.91	21,085.31	21,213.60	6,600.00		84.4
Idaho.....	12,500.00	7,500.00	5,000.00	1,430.00		88.6
South Carolina.....	37,711.30	21,355.65	16,355.65	2,046.00		94.6
Tennessee.....	55,767.00	25,767.00	30,000.00	2,912.00		94.8
Alabama.....	64,173.90	25,836.95	38,336.95	2,520.00		96.1
Arkansas.....	38,635.02	21,817.51	16,817.51			
Colorado.....	15,000.00	10,000.00	5,000.00			
Indiana.....	53,897.00	31,927.00	21,970.00			
Nebraska.....	17,000.00	11,000.00	6,000.00			
Nevada.....	16,044.00	10,522.00	5,522.00			
New Mexico.....	19,860.66	12,430.33	7,430.33			
Oklahoma.....	42,358.96	23,679.48	18,679.48			
Utah.....	20,500.00	12,500.00	8,000.00			
Vermont.....	5,000.00	5,000.00				

¹ For four States (California, Connecticut, Michigan, and Wyoming), 1929 figures are given.
Source: The U. S. Children's Bureau.

TABLE 20.—General economic statistics

INDICES OF BUSINESS CONDITIONS*

[1923-25=100]

	1929	1932	1934 (first 10 months)
1. Index of industrial production ¹	119	64	80
2. Index of factory pay rolls ²	108	45	62
3. Index of factory employment ³	101	62	79
4. Index of freight car-loadings ²	106	56	63
5. Index of department store sales (value) ²	111	69	68
6. Index of construction contracts awarded (value) ³	117	28	33
7. Index of exports (value) ²	115	35	48
8. Index of bank debits outside New York City.....	140	65	69

*Survey of Current Business, February 1934, p. 3, and December 1934, p. 3.

¹ Unadjusted for seasonal variation; adjusted for number of working days.

² Unadjusted for seasonal variation.

³ Adjusted for seasonal variation.

TABLE 20.—General economic statistics—Continued

OTHER ECONOMIC DATA		
9. Number of gainful workers, September.....	1934.....	50,277,000
Estimate of Committee on Economic Security.		
10. Per capita full-time income, wage, and salaried employees.....	1929.....	\$1,475
	1932.....	\$1,199
<i>National Income, 1929-32</i> , Letter from Acting Secretary of Commerce, S. Doc. 124, 73d Cong., 2d sess., p. 19.		
11. Average weekly factory earnings per wage earner.....	1929.....	\$28.54
	1932.....	\$17.10
	1934.....	\$20.08
<i>Survey Current Business</i> , February 1934, p. 7, and December 1934, p. 7. Data for 1934 for first 10 months.		
12. Index of cost of living (1913=100).....	December 1929.....	171
	December 1932.....	132
	June 1934.....	136
<i>Monthly Labor Review</i> , August 1934, p. 526.		
OLD-AGE DATA		
13. Population, 1930.....	60 years of age and over..	19,385,028
	65 years of age and over..	6,633,805
	70 years of age and over..	3,863,200
Fifteenth Census of the U. S., 1930, vol. II, <i>Population</i> , p. 576.		
14. Number of old-age pensioners.....	1931.....	76,339
	1934.....	180,003
Data for 1931 from <i>Monthly Labor Review</i> , June 1932, p. 1261. Data for 1934 compiled by Committee on Economic Security from latest available information.		
15. Amount paid in old-age pensions.....	1931.....	\$16,173,207
	1934.....	31,192,492
Data for 1931 from <i>Monthly Labor Review</i> , June 1932, p. 1261. Data for 1934 compiled by Committee on Economic Security from latest available information.		
NATIONAL INCOME STATISTICS		
16. National income paid out.....	1929.....	\$82,300,000,000
	1933.....	46,800,000,000
<i>The National Income, 1933</i> , release Jan. 14, 1935, p. 6, Department of Commerce.		
17. National income paid out.....	1933.....	\$46,800,000,000
Wages and salaries.....		29,300,000,000
Dividends and interest.....		7,300,000,000
Net rents and royalties.....		2,300,000,000
Entrepreneurial withdrawals.....		7,900,000,000
<i>The National Income, 1933</i> , release Jan. 14, 1935, p. 6, Department of Commerce.		
18. National income paid out.....	1932.....	\$48,894,000,000
Business savings or losses.....		9,529,000,000
Income produced.....		39,365,000,000
<i>National Income, 1929-32</i> , letter from Acting Secretary of Commerce, S. Doc. 124, 73d Cong., 2d sess., p. 10.		
WHOLESALE, RETAIL, AND MANUFACTURING SALES		
19. Net wholesale sales.....	1929.....	\$68,950,108,000
	1933.....	32,030,504,000
<i>Final United States Summary of Wholesale Trade in 1933</i> , Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, p. 7. The 1929 figures have been revised.		
20. Net retail sales.....	1929.....	\$49,114,653,000
	1933.....	25,037,225,000
<i>United States Summary of the Retail Census for 1933</i> , Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, p. 3.		
21. Gross value of manufactured products.....	1929.....	\$69,960,909,712
	1933.....	31,353,840,392
<i>Census of Manufactures: 1933</i> , Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, p. 1. The 1929 figures have been revised.		
LIFE-INSURANCE STATISTICS		
22. Aggregate life insurance in force.....	1933.....	\$97,985,043,747
Ordinary.....		71,918,829,182
Industrial.....		17,154,472,848
Group.....		8,911,741,717
Spectator Co., <i>Year-Book—Life Insurance</i> , 1934.		
23. Average size of life-insurance policy in force, 1933:		
Ordinary.....		\$2,252
Industrial.....		210
Computed from Spectator Co. <i>Year-Book—Life Insurance</i> , 1934.		
24. Surrendered policies and loans, life insurance.....	1933.....	\$4,394,948,987
Spectator Co., <i>Year-Book—Life Insurance</i> , 1934. Also letter from Spectator Co.		

TABLE 20.-General economic statistics-Continued

SAVINGS ESTIMATES

25. Annual savings through life insurance	1933--	\$2,950,465.899
New premium payments		234,954.196
Renewal premium payments		2,715,511.703
Spectator Co., <i>Year-Book-Life Insurance</i> , 1934.		
26. Savings and other time deposits	1929--	23,218,000,000
	1932--	24,281,000,000
Data for all reporting banks in United States.		
<i>Statistical Abstract of the United States</i> , 1933, p. 242, table 252.		

Mr. WITTE. I want to call attention in there, Senator, to table 13, which illustrates a very important point in connection with this old-age problem, that the number of the aged has been increasing rapidly and will continue to increase very rapidly in the years that are ahead of us.

For instance, in 1860, 2.7 percent of the population of the country were 65 years of age and over. Since then each census has shown a larger percentage of the people of this country in the older age groups. In 1920 it was 4.7 percent; in 1930, 5.4 percent. Population statisticians forecast that that percentage will increase to 6.3 percent in 1940, and will continue to increase until by 1980 you will have 11.3 percent of the population over 65, and by the year 2,000, 12.7 percent. At the present time there are 7,000,000 people over 65; by 1960, 13,500,000; by the year 1980, 17,000,000; by the year 2,000, 19,000,000

Senator GORE. Nineteen million over what age?

Mr. WITTE. Over 65.

Senator CONNALLY. Is that based upon the theory that our other population will also increase, or is it based on longevity?

Mr. WITTE. This is a result of the fact that we are approaching what, in terms of the statisticians, is called a "stable population."

Senator GORE. Where the births and deaths will nearly balance?

Mr. WITTE. All this is based on the assumption that there will be no improvement in longevity; that the present mortality rates will continue. If there is an improvement in mortality rates, the number of the aged will probably be greater, and the percentage will be greater.

Here are some facts which I think will illustrate that, while the estimates of the statisticians may not be exactly correct, they are probably on the right trail. In 1930, the census disclosed fewer children under 5 years of age than there were in 1920. We are rapidly approaching the same sort of a condition that the European countries have reached, the distribution of population as between the younger and the older age groups forecast for this country in 30 years is the distribution of the population in England today; it is the population distribution in France, and in nearly all other western European countries. They have reached earlier than we have this condition of stable population.

We know how many people there are now, let us say, between 20 and 30. Applying the usual mortality tables, we know that 30 years or 40 years from now, when those people will be between 60 and 70, there will be more than twice the number of people between 60 and 70 than are now between 60 and 70. This is due to the changing age composition of our people. Our birth rates have declined, and on the other hand the length of life, the average length of life, has been increasing. Without any further improvement in the mor-

tality rates, we can expect and must look forward to a time which is not very distant—a period distant no longer than 20 or 30 years—when we will have nearly twice as many people in these older age groups than we have now.

Senator GORE. The cost and burden of this old-age pension will be a constantly increasing factor?

Mr. WITTE. The cost of old-age pensions will be higher with the years, and whether you enact a pension law or not, there will be a cost of supporting the aged, because the aged of any generation have to be supported by the other people of that generation except insofar as the aged have made provisions for their own support. To the extent that the aged have not made provisions for their own support, whether any pension legislation is enacted or not, there will be a cost on future generations which will be much greater than the present cost of supporting the aged.

Senator GORE. It will be shifted from the children to the taxpayers under this legislation?

Senator COSTIGAN. Has the experience of other countries, such as Germany, confirmed what you are now saying about the increasing cost of old-age pensions?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir. These countries have undergone in the years that have passed, the same thing that faces this country in the next 20 or 30 years—an increasing number of the aged.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask you—I am just curious to know—how many people there are, say, of 80 years. Are we to expect that people are going to live longer over a certain period?

Mr. WITTE. No; this does not assume that they will live any longer. This assumes no improvement in longevity. This assumes the present mortality rates.

Senator CONNALLY. It does assume that the proportion of old people will increase out of proportion to the increase in the population.

Mr. WITTE. That is due to the fact that the number of young people is no longer increasing.

Senator CONNALLY. That situation cannot go on forever.

Senator GORE. I can see how that would affect the percentage, but I do not see how it would affect the total

Mr. WITTE. We know now there are so many more people in the age groups between 30 and 40, let us say, than there were in the age group of 30 to 40 thirty years ago. The people that are now between 60 and 70 thirty years ago were 30 to 40. We know now how many people we have in this age group of 30 to 40 who in 30 years will be 60 to 70; and that is twice as many as are now in the 60 to 70 age group.

Senator CONNALLY. If they will all live.

Mr. WITTE. With the same mortality rates we now have, there will be twice as many in this group as now.

That is an important point that must be considered in connection with this problem, that no matter what is done there will be an increasing number of aged, and there is bound to be an increasing cost for the support of the aged.

Also I would like to call attention to this further fact, that the cost of supporting the aged, is necessarily very great. That results from the fact that old age is a long period of time. The present experience tables indicate that a man who reaches the age of 65 on the average

has an expectancy of 11 to 12 years. He can look ahead, if he has average life, to 11 to 12 years more. Women can look ahead to 15 years; that is the average expectancy for a woman who reaches the age of 65. Eleven to 12 years or 15 years is a long period of time for people who do not have any means.

To provide an income of \$25 a month—the very low income of \$25 a month—to a person after the age of 65, taking interest at 3 percent, he must have laid aside \$3,300 by the time he reaches the age of 65, to give him an income of \$25 a month for the balance of his life—the 11 or 12 years that the average man has ahead of him—and a woman will have to have laid aside \$3,600. It is a large sum.

Senator CONNALLY. Have the processes by which man's life has been extended made any improvement in his capacity for work after he reaches 65 or any other age?

Mr. WITTE. I think that the end, Senator, of the working period of life is a little longer than it was in earlier generations, but there are also countervailing tendencies, as you well know, the tendency in certain lines of work to refuse to employ people who are past middle age; but, unquestionably, a person at the present time—the average worker—has a somewhat longer period of working life than he had in 1860.

Senator CONNALLY. It may be that we are working to no real purpose just to extend life if it is to be useless, unless it is to make some valuable contribution to society. What is the value of simply extending it in order to complicate our problems?

Mr. WITTE. That is of course a question of the value of life, and I think you cannot measure it—I am sure you have not that thought—simply in terms of dollars and cents and production.

Senator GORE. This will facilitate the distribution of wealth.

Mr. WITTE. Coming down to this question of how many of the aged are dependent; or did you have another question, Senator?

Senator CONNALLY. No; go right ahead.

Mr. WITTE. Coming to this question of the number of the aged who are dependent: In our report there is a statement which some newspapers completely misinterpreted because they did not look at the very next sentence. The sentence is that conservatively one-half of the people now over 65 need support, are dependent on someone else for support. That does not mean that they are dependent on the public. As we state in our report, the largest number of people who are dependent are supported by their children, and under this legislation they will continue to be supported by their children and should be so supported. The ones who are dependent upon the public for support are a much smaller number.

At this point permit me to give you the approximate number of the aged who are now in receipt of some sort of pension and the number of the aged who are in receipt of public relief. Some of the pensions are earned pensions, in the sense that they are built up by contributions, and some of them not.

There are about 100,000 old people in public almshouses at the present time. Most of those people need not only financial help, most of them also need physical care. There is a somewhat larger number than that in private homes for the aged. Many of these old people in the private homes for the aged are paying their own way or their children are paying their way. Some are charity cases.

There are about 140,000 pensioners under industrial pension plans in this country. Industrial pension plans cover at the present time something like four or five million workers-plans that companies have voluntarily set up-some of which are contributory and some of which are non-contributory. There are about 15,000 pensioners under trade-union plans.

Senator GORE. Fifteen thousand?

Mr. WITTE. Fifteen thousand. About 45,000 people pensioned under the United States Employees Retirement Act, perhaps 5,000 under State retirement acts, 25,000 under teachers' pension laws, and probably an equal number under policemen and firemen pension systems that exist in municipalities.

Of course, a much larger number of people than these age groups-no definite figures-who are in receipt of veterans' pensions.

Senator HASTINGS. Isn't that police group much larger than 25,000?

Mr. WITTE. Actual pensions?

Senator HASTINGS. That are taken care of.

Mr. WITTE. I am citing the figures of those that are actually on pensions. This is not an attempt to state how many people are included within these systems, but this is the number of the pensioners. This is an account of the old people.

There are at the present time under State old-age pension laws, general State old-age pension laws in operation in 28 States. In October of last year, there were 180,000 pensioners under State old-age pension laws.

The number on relief lists is not absolutely known, but based on samples throughout the country, the estimate is arrived at that there are approximately 700,000 people over 65 years of age on relief lists, toward which the Federal Government makes a contribution. In some parts of the country there are a considerable number of the aged who are provided for on local relief without receiving any Federal assistance. That is generally the situation in New England, for instance. In New England most of the old people that are on relief are not on Federal emergency relief, and there are certain other places in the country where the same situation exists. Most of the old people that are on relief are included among those 700,000, but there is an indefinite number beyond that, but probably not in excess of 100,000 or 150,000.

Senator GORE. Have you figured out at all the cost of carrying those 700,000 on relief rolls?

Mr. WITTE. It is difficult to figure it. The average family receives \$23 a month on direct cash relief.

Senator GORE. That is the family?

Mr. WITTE. That is the family, and generally for these old people it means that the grandfather or the grandmother is being taken care of as a member of the family group, although in some cases it means an old couple is itself a family group. As a member of the family group, with an average of \$23 per family, the actual allowances are probably not in excess of \$5 additional for the grandfather or the grandmother per month.

Senator GORE. Five dollars a month. This proposes to make it \$30 as against \$23 for the entire family.

Mr. WITTE. Under relief.

Senator CONNALLY. A moment ago you said there were a definite number of old people now being supported by children, and that they would be continued to be so supported. Is it not a fact and do you not think if we adopt a plan like this, that a great many of those that are now being supported, or similar cases, by the children, will be supported on this roll? That they will be anxious to get them on this roll?

Mr. WITTE. This bill provides that they shall be given support if they have no other means of support. I think that is true, Senator, that in the course of time there might be a tendency toward the increase of some weakening of the willingness of children to support their parents. And this is not merely a matter of willingness. I want to call attention to the terrific havoc that has been created by the present depression. Not only have old people's savings been wiped out, but also in many cases the savings of people who are well along in years. Many of those people have lost their jobs. It is very doubtful whether they can in the remaining years of their life make an adequate provision for old age.

Senator GORE. In not only old age but youth and middle age as well.

Mr. WITTE. Youth has, we hope, a longer period ahead to build in. A man who is now 50, who has been completely wiped out and who has lost his job, unless conditions improve very materially, will have a hard time to make enough of a provision to take care of himself. This affects also the children, Senator.

Senator GORE. On that point, what about superimposing upon them the burden proposed in this legislation? It is a pitiful situation. People have a hard time to feed themselves, and industry is prostrate, organized industry and individual industry, and everybody else, and if you are going to pass on to the people that are already prostrate this additional burden, I was wondering whether it would speed general recovery or not.

Senator HASTINGS. Before you leave this particular point, if you do not mind my interrupting you, because I am anxious to find out as nearly as we can, this number. The statement that you say has been misconstrued by the newspapers in the report, I suppose, is this statement which I quote:

At this time a conservative estimate is that at least one-half of the approximately seven and a half million people over 65 years now living are dependent

And the next paragraph:

Children, friends, and relatives have borne and still carry the major part of the cost of supporting the aged. Several of the State surveys have disclosed that from 30 to 50 percent of the people over 65 years of age were being supported in this way.

That is from the report. If you take that 30 to 50 percent and figure it at 40 percent of 3,750,000, you will have 1,500,000 of this aged group that are being taken care of by the children.

Mr. WITTE. May I interrupt, Senator? Excuse me.

Senator HASTINGS. Certainly.

Mr. WITTE. That 30 or 50 percent relates to the total number of the aged, not to those that are dependent; it includes those that are supported by their children.

Senator HASTINGS. You state here that a conservative estimate is that at least one-half of the approximately seven and a half million people over 65 years of age now living are dependent. And you state, "children, friends, and relatives have borne and still carry the major part of the cost of supporting the aged." Does that half refer to those that are being supported by the children, or doesn't it?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, it includes those who are being supported by their children.

Senator HASTINGS. What are we to understand is the situation? Do I take 40 percent of the 7;2 million, or 3 million, and deduct that from the 3;2 million and leaving only one-half million?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, that is roughly the way you do it if you use those figures only, but we also quoted in the report the figure that approximately 700,000 aged over 65 are on Federal emergency relief lists at the present time, also that there are a considerable number of people on local relief lists that are not counted in that 700,000. How many nobody can tell for sure. We estimate between 100,000 and 150,000, which would indicate on relief, roughly, let us say, 850,000. One hundred and eighty thousand more are now in receipt of pensions under general State old-age pension laws which, all of them, are based on need; they are situated much like the people who are on relief. The combined total will give you the old people who have no means of support, whose children either cannot or do not support them—a total of approximately 1 million.

Senator HASTINGS. Do we add that 180,000 to this 850,000?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, Sir.

Senator HASTINGS. Do we understand that the best estimate of the committee is that there are a million people over 65 years of age that need help, and not 3,750,000?

Mr. WITTE. That is correct, Senator.

Senator HASTINGS. That is correct?

Mr. WITTE. Yes.

Senator HASTINGS. I am glad to get that information.

Mr. WITTE. Now, I want to say something about State old-age-pension laws if you have no further questions on this matter of dependent aged.

There are at 'this time 28 States, as well as Alaska and Hawaii, which have State old-age pension laws, general laws, that provide for the payment of pensions to old people who lack the means of support. These laws vary considerably. We have in the statistical data I have submitted, an analysis of these laws for your information. Eight of the laws are optional. They are mostly the older laws. They are optional in this sense, that the counties may or may not, as they see fit, grant old-age pensions, and in all of those 28 States, only some of the counties actually are paying old-age pensions. The other 15 States and the 2 Territories have laws that are statewide in their operation.

Senator GORE. Can you give the States and the age limit?

Mr. WITTE. I will give you that in a minute. Four of the laws are not in operation at this time, and a fifth is, for all practical purposes, not in operation. These are all laws that were enacted in 1933. In 1933 nine State legislatures adopted laws and in 1934 another one was added to this list. The great majority of the old-age-pension laws are of recent origin. There has been quite an increase in the number

of pensioners, despite the financial stringency of the States and counties. A survey made by the American Association for Social Security, which has promoted old-age-pension legislation in this country more than any other organization

Senator COSTIGAN (interpolating). Is that the organization with which Mr. Epstein is associated?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir; in 1933 there were 115,000 pensioners under the State old-age pension laws. A questionnaire which we sent out covering October 1934, 9 months later, disclosed 180,000.

Senator GORE. How much later?

Mr. WITTE. Nine months.

Senator GORE. Due to that tendency, do you not think that you might reasonably assume that the States will take care of this problem themselves?

Mr. WITTE. I think not, Senator, because the situation is that the States, or so many of the States, and the localities are financially unable to carry the load. While the number of pensioners has been increasing during this period, the number of old people on relief has grown probably even more rapidly.

Senator GORE. My point is, the Federal Government is not going to get money except from people who live in these various States.

Mr. WITTE. That, of course, goes to the question of finances; that is a little apart from the question I am taking up right now, if I may be excused.

Senator GORE. I do not want to thrust that into this situation.

Mr. WITTE. In most of the State laws, the counties either have to pay all of the expense or most of the expense. Some laws provide for the State paying all of the expense. That is one reason, Senator, why just leaving the situation the way it is is not likely to prove adequate. So many of the counties are utterly unable to meet that burden at the present time.

On this question of the age that you asked about, 14 States have a 70-year age limit, 1 State has an age limit of 68 and the balance 65. So you have just about half of the group at 70 and half of the group at 65.

Senator GORE. Are there any under 65?

Mr. WITTE. None under 65, except the Territory of Alaska, which has an age limit for women of 60, and 65 for the men.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it in California?

Mr. WITTE. California, I think, has a 70-year limit-yes; it has a 70-year limit.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they paying in California?

Mr. WITTE. The maximum pension in California is \$1 a day.

Senator COSTIGAN. How long a residence is required in California?

Mr. WITTE. Fifteen years.

Senator GORE. There is no way of calculating expectancies and how long it will be if this law is passed, that the age limit will be reduced to 60 from 65.

Mr. WITTE. That will depend on the action of the Congress, I presume.

Senator BLACK. There is no way of figuring either, how many more will be thrown out of employment under 65 or over 65 under the system we have.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Doctor.

Mr. WITTE. The residence requirements-coming to that-are generally 10 or 15 years, and 15 years is more common than 10.

The CHAIRMAN. In this bill you have put it at 10 years

Mr. WITTE (interrupting). Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Five, five within the last ten before application.

The CHAIRMAN. It must be 5 years of the 10 years. It does not sa~ ~it shall be 5 continuous years?

Mr. WITTE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that the bill ought to be changed in some respects in reference to that?

Mr. WITTE. Of course, that is a matter for your decision. The 5-year residence requirement is still quite a long residence requirement.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the bill, if one has lived 5 years in a State, of the 10 years, he could get the pension. Suppose that he had lived there, lived 4% years in the State but moved back just before this law went into effect, but had prior to that time lived there 5 years, he could come under the provisions?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir.

Senator CAPPER. What did you say was the largest amount paid in any State?

Mr. WITTE. The largest amount paid under any State law--I am coming to that in a minute--the largest amount and the most usual amount is \$30 a month, or \$1 a day. There are quite a few States with lower amounts.

Senator CAPPER. That includes both the local payment and the State?

Mr. WITTE. The total payment, Senator.

Senator CAPPER. The total payment?

Mr. WITTE. Yes. The residence requirements are 10 or 15 years, usually. The State of Delaware has a 5-year residence requirement; that is the lowest. In the State of Arizona, 35 years. It has ranged from 5 to 35, with 15 the most common.

The CHAIRMAN. Have many of these States because of the depression, failed to pay these pensions?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir. The situation in this depression has been that of an enormous increase in the number of aged who are dependent, who cannot be provided for by their children because their children have lost employment or have lost their savings. This also has been true: There has been a great temptation for the local officials to place the old people on relief rather than to grant them a pension, because on relief the Federal Government has paid the larger part of the cost. On old-age pensions the Federal Government has thus far not paid one cent. This has meant that for every old person or old couple that has been granted an old-age pension, the States and counties have paid the entire expense, whereas in most parts of this country if the couple or the old person has been put on relief, the Federal Government has paid most of the bill. Obviously, the temptation has been to put them on relief.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you putting into the record at this point each State that pays a pension for old age?

Mr. WITTE. We have this in one of the tables which you have permitted me to include as a supplement, this gives a detailed analysis of all existing laws, as well as the latest information on the operation of these laws.

The maximum pension payable is most commonly \$30 a month; some lower. North Dakota, for instance, has a maximum yearly pension of \$150-that is the lowest. There are none higher at this time than \$30 a month.

Senator HASTINGS. A dollar a day?

Mr. WITTE. Yes. It would figure a few dollars more by the day. I am using that as being the same as \$30 per month.

Senator HASTINGS. Yes; because there are still 365 days in a year.

Mr. WITTE. Certainly.

The pensions actually granted vary with the needs of the applicant, and any system of pensions based on need must provide for varying pensions.

The CHAIRMAN. Do not all of these States put it upon the question of need?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir; every one of them. The term "old-age pensions" implies need-it implies a person who does not have the means of support, who must be provided for in some fashion. The actual pension will vary with the need.

Senator GORE. Do you know whether there is a tendency or not to divest themselves of their property by such persons in order to qualify?

Mr. WITTE. All State laws make it an offense to do that, and I think, to date, at least, there is very little evidence that people have done that.

Senator GORE. In the home owners loan law that was passed, it tempted a great many to put themselves in a position so that they could qualify as being in distress.

Senator HASTINGS. I did not get your answer to Senator Gore's question. What is your answer? Do they require them to divest themselves of their property?

Mr. WITTE. No. There are property qualifications in all of the laws to start with. The property qualification usually is, not more than \$3,000 of property, but there is a provision in the law-in all of the laws-making it an offense for old people to divest themselves of property in order to qualify for a pension. Likewise, there are provisions in nearly all of the laws under which the States may require assignments of property as a condition of granting a pension, and a provision further that the pensions granted shall be a lien against the estate. That is applied in cases where it develops upon the death of the pensioner that he had undisclosed property. In the case of a person not playing the game squarely or who has not played the game squarely-if it develops that he has undisclosed property-there is a lien for the amount of the pensions paid against the property.

An assignment of the property is required in certain instances. An old couple may have building and loan stock, let us say, which at this time, in many places, is not worth much, but may later have value. They cannot live from the building and loan stock, but that may be taken as security for the pension, so far as it is any security.

Senator GORE. There is nothing in this bill which provides that after the death of the party if they leave an estate it can be applied to the reimbursement of the Government for the pension paid.

Mr. WITTE. Yes, there is a clause in here. There is a section that the State law must require that the amount contributed toward the pension by the Federal Government shall be a lien against the estate of the decedent.

Senator GORE. I knew that was in Senator Capper's bill at the last Congress.

Mr. WITTE. It is in this bill, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any discrimination in the States between the sexes?

Mr. WITTE. No, not in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. That applies both to the ladies and the gentlemen?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir, and I believe it has never been charged that there is any actual discrimination.

Senator GORE. Suppose an old couple, a husband and wife, would they both be beneficiaries?

Mr. WITTE. They could be. It is a matter of need and their other income.

Senator HASTINGS. Before we leave that question of the assignment of the property that they may own, do these State laws require that they assign that property?

Mr. WITTE. That the administrator may require such assignment.

Senator HASTINGS. That contribution which the State makes is a lien against their estate at the time of their death?

Mr. WITTE. That is substantially true of all of the laws. Without examining that closely, I could not tell you absolutely surely if that is the provision in all of the laws. It is in substantially all of the laws, at least.

Senator CAPPER. Can you express an opinion as to which of these States has passed the most workable old-age pension laws, in the light of the experience that has been had up to this time.

Mr. WITTE. The newer laws are the more liberal laws. Generally I would say the laws of the States of New York and Massachusetts are the two most liberal. They are the laws under which the largest pensions have been paid, and in which the conditions, not with reference to age, the age limits are higher, are the most liberal. With reference to residence qualifications, Delaware has the best law, as well as in many other respects.

Senator GORE. You say the later laws are the most liberal laws?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir; the later laws are the most liberal. The older laws were optional county laws. They left it to the counties and the State itself contributed nothing.

Senator GORE. That has been the tendency in the past, to liberalize the laws.

Mr. WITTE. Yes, sir.

Senator GORE. Through experience?

Mr. WITTE. I presume so. The actual amounts of pension paid vary. I want to make that clear. They will vary with the need of the old people. An old couple that live in a rural district and own their own home, as so many old couples do, maybe they own even a little piece of ground, all they will need is something for their groceries and a small allowance for clothing, but after all a much smaller amount than for an old couple that resides in an urban center where they have no home, where rent must be furnished for them, and where fuel must be furnished. It always depends upon the concrete situation. Under all laws the entire income is taken into consideration. They may have a few dollars of income.

Senator GORE. That is under this bill?

Mr. WITTE. This bill provides that the pension shall be an amount which when added to the income of the pensioner shall be sufficient to provide "a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health." That is the language of the New York and the Massachusetts laws, and that will vary with the circumstances.

Senator GORE. Farmers are not to be as well treated as the city people?

Mr. WITTE. Oh, yes, they are. As a matter of fact, all statistics indicate that there is a larger proportion of the aged in rural territory, in proportion to the population, than in urban territory.

Senator GORE. Do you mean there are more voters in the country than in the towns?

Mr. WITTE. No; I meant the old people. There is a larger percentage of the old people in the rural territory, in towns and in small villages, than in the urban centers.

Senator CONNALLY. You mean just of the ones that are in want or of the total?

Mr. WITTE. All of them. Under either criteria.

Senator CONNALLY. They live longer in the contry?

Mr. WITTE. That is probably true. And I presume old couples are not as much attracted by the bright lights of the cities as the other people. They are more contented to remain in the rural areas.

Senator CONNALLY. If they have remained in the rural areas until they are old, they have no business going to town then.

Mr. WITTE. No; they have not.

Senator HASTINGS. I understood from Senator Wagner's testimony yesterday that under this bill it was contemplated that the Federal Government would contribute \$15 per month, and all the States that participated in that Federal fund would also have to contribute at least \$15, but that it was left to the Administrator to say whether \$15 per month for that particular State contributed by the State was sufficient to keep that person in health and decency as required by this statute.

Mr. WITTE. This statute requires that the State law, in order to get credit, in order to be entitled to any Federal aid, must give the old couple or the old person a sufficient pension which, "when joined with the income of that person and the person's spouse," is adequate "to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health." That may be \$10 in certain circumstances and the total cost may be \$10, or it may be even less, because there may be other income sufficient except for a few dollars lacking to provide for that old couple. There is nothing in the bill that in all cases there must be \$15 contributed by the State, and it may be considerably more than \$30 total. In an urban center it is more than \$30 on the average.

Senator HASTINGS. I got the distinct impression that every State must contribute at least \$15 before they can participate in this Federal fund. You say that is not so.

Mr. WITTE. That is not true, I think. No.

Senator HASTINGS. Are you quite certain of that?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, Sir.

Senator HASTINGS. So that the administrator of this law may decide that one State shall contribute \$5. Does that mean that the Federal Treasury will contribute only \$5 or will it contribute \$15?

Mr. WITTE. The Federal Treasury contributes one-half of the amount contributed by the State up to \$15.

Senator HASTINGS. Up to \$15?

Mr. WITTE. Up to \$15. And, Senator, the provision is not that the State must pay a flat \$5 pension or any flat amount. This bill contemplates a supplement to the person's income sufficient to support him in decency and health. That will vary with different circumstances.

Senator HASTINGS. You mean in the same State?

Mr. WITTE. In the same State and in the same community.

Senator HASTINGS. So that the suggestion made by Senator Gore that you would not pay the man in the country perhaps as much as you paid the man in the city, is really a serious question.

Mr. WITTE. That would be the case, certainly. Where you have to provide rent, Senator, it is a different matter from than where you have to provide no rent.

Senator HASTINGS. You mean that under this bill the Federal administrator must ascertain for himself whether or not the various amounts paid to various people in a particular State comes within the definition of a decent living and whatever the language is.

Mr. WITTE. Not in each case, Senator. This contemplates that the State law must include a provision like this Federal standard. The State of New York and the State of Massachusetts now have this language. This is the language from the New York and Massachusetts laws. The State of California, my own State, Wisconsin, have laws which say \$30 a month. That sort of a law probably will not comply with this requirement. We expect that the States that now have definite limits will substitute a standard that is flexible—a statute which says that the old person should receive an allowance which with his own income and that of his spouse will be sufficient "to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health". The Federal Administrator will judge, generally, whether that is being complied with. There is no thought that they will check every case. That sort of a machinery is not contemplated.

Senator HASTINGS. How many of these States that now provide pensions provide for varying amounts?

Mr. WITTE. All of them.

Senator HASTINGS. All of them do?

Mr. WITTE. That is the concept of an old-age pension.

Senator HASTINGS. It is not uniform?

Mr. WITTE. No, it is not uniform.

Senator HASTINGS. And the amounts that you have mentioned have been maximum amounts?

Mr. WITTE. That is it. I have the actual amounts here. I want to come to that right now if I may.

Senator BYRD. Do you agree with Senator Wagner that the minimum of \$40 should be paid by the State and the Federal Government?

Mr. WITTE. In all cases?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

Mr. WITTE. That is contrary to the general concept and what old-age pension laws provide. Old-age pensions have been a supplement to other income in an amount sufficient to support old people in reasonable decency. That will vary with what income they themselves have. That will vary with the conditions under which they live.

Senator BYRD. Senator Wagner stated, as I understood him yesterday, that a minimum of \$40 should be paid to each old person provided they have no other income.

Mr. WITTE. That might be his opinion. This bill does not require it.

Senator BYRD. I ask you whether you agree with that from your investigation.

Mr. WITTE. That probably is a proper payment in many situations. In the city of New York the average pension has been \$40 a month or a little better, while in New York State as a whole the average has been \$22.16, because obviously it costs a great deal more for an old couple to live in New York City particularly if they do not own their own home, as most people in New York City do not. The public has to provide that if there is no other means of support.

Senator COSTIGAN. Do you regard a minimum of \$40 as excessive in any part of the United States?

Mr. WITTE. YOU mean with all other income taken into consideration?

Senator COSTIGAN. Taking that as the absolute income.

Mr. WITTE. You still would deduct, Senator, I take it, the income of the couple which they themselves might have?

Senator COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. WITTE. That would still vary the pension. The pension might be only a dollar.

Senator COSTIGAN. But do you regard a total minimum of \$40 as excessive?

Mr. WITTE. I do not think it is excessive; no.

Senator COSTIGAN. In any part of the United States?

Mr. WITTE. If you can afford it.

Senator GORE. What about \$200.

(Laughter.)

Senator HASTINGS. Doctor, before you leave this

Senator GORE (interposing). I want the gentleman's smile to go into the record.

Senator HASTINGS. With reference to what Senator Byrd said was Senator Wagner's statement, I would like to read this statement from Senator Wagner's testimony and see if there is any part of it that you disagree with. It take it that you do. I am quoting from page 13:

It is impossible to calculate the precise sums required for this task. Opinions will vary greatly as to what constitutes fair standards of health and decency. But if we accept \$40 per month per person as an immediate minimum goal, our 3,500,000 dependent old people need assistance to the extent of \$1,680,000,000 per year. And this need will mount with alarming rapidity.

I take it that in view of your testimony you do not agree with the number because you said that the number is approximately 1,000,000 persons.

Mr. WITTE. I do not think I differ with Senator Wagner. Senator Wagner does not say that this is to come from the public treasury. There are approximately 3,500,000 people who, from their own means, have not sufficient to live on, but most of them are being supported by their children and relatives and friends. The bulk of this cost is now being borne and will continue to be borne by the children and relatives.

Senator HASTINGS. So you do not think Senator Wagner intended to imply that it was necessary to appropriate from some public funds from the Federal and the State treasuries, \$1,680,000,000 a year.

Mr. WITTE. I am very certain the Senator could not have meant that.

Senator BYRD. Doctor, I would like to ask this question: To what extent is the ability of the children, the sons and the daughters, to support their families, considered when the sons and the daughters are not under the roof of the parents?

Mr. WITTE. If they are not under the roof of the parents, in most States it is a requirement of the State statutes-not of the old-age pension laws, but, I think, in all States, it is a requirement of the general laws of the State-a provision in the poor laws-that children must support their parents if they have the financial ability to do so.

Senator CONNALLY. Children that have been emancipated and over 21 years of age?

Mr. WITTE. Yes; that is the general requirement. And that requirement is legally enforceable in most States. It is in our State.

Senator GORE. I know an institution which I won't mention-it is a home for the aged, which includes men and women. Some of them, in addition to their support, get a little pension of about \$10 a month. When those checks are received, their children drive in, some of them as many as a hundred miles, to take these miserable little checks from the withered fingers of these old octogenarians.

Senator CONNALLY. That institution is not in my State, I may say.

Mr. WITTE. The children can be legally made to support them. The question that you raise, Senator, is what happens if there are children, for instance in another State, who won't support their parents, although they are able to? Obviously, the public cannot leave these old people to starve. It has to take care of them, and there are instances of children, unfortunately, who act as Senator Gore described, and in that instance, I think that we will all agree that, no matter how badly the children act, the public, if the old people have nothing to live on, must step in. It, however, is a right of the State to recover from the children in practically every State of the Union, if not in all of them.

Senator BYRD. What I want to be very clear in my own mind upon is this: If these old people applying for a pension have a son or daughter with enough property to support them or enough income, they will be denied a pension even though that son and daughter have left the home and have other obligations?

Mr. WITTE. They can enforce it.

Senator BYRD. Is it proposed to do so under this legislation that you have here?

Mr. WITTE. This legislation takes into account the actual situation and leaves it up to the State administration to take the proper steps to enforce the obligation of the children to support their parents. If, in fact, there are some old people who, although their children are able to support them, are living in dire want, I think any humane administrator will take care of them and then try to proceed to recover the money from the children. You would have to take care of them first; you cannot let the old people starve.

Senator BYRD. As a matter of fact, you have dictatorial power in this legislation over what the State is permitted to do. You can

deny the entire payment to the State, even though this money comes from the State originally and goes into the Federal Treasury, you can refuse to have it go back to a State unless the State does the things which your dictator under this bill sets up. Isn't that true?

Mr. WITTE. The pension must be an amount adequate to support the old couple in decency and health.

Senator BYRD. The administrator in Washington is to be the sole judge as to whether or not a State receives any of this appropriation from the Federal Government; isn't that correct?

Mr. WITTE. I presume so. It is the same clause, the same sort of standards you have for all kinds of aid. You have provisions, for instance, in your highway grants of aid to the States, that the State must comply with the prescribed standards, and as a matter of fact, I think, no instance has yet occurred where a State has been denied its allotments.

Senator BYRD. Yes; but I am answering the statement which you make, in which you state that the States have a right to establish the regulations. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government, through the administrator, establishes them, and you are coercing the States to do what the Federal Government desires, although the money originally comes from the States.

Mr. WITTE. We have very few standards. I think I can elaborate on those in a moment, when I reach those. There are relatively few standards.

Senator COSTIGAN. The great merit of such legislation is that it tends to bring about uniformity of standards in all the States.

Mr. WITTE. Certainly. I was at the point of the actual pensions paid. I think that is an important point. As the Senator stated here, these are maximum amounts. The actual pensions paid in 1933, as this survey of the American Association for Social Security indicated, were on the average slightly more than \$19 a month. That was the actual pension paid in all pension cases in the country. That average ranged from \$24.35 in Massachusetts, \$22.16 in New York, down to \$6.13 in Indiana.

The total cost at this time, based on our questionnaire—the total cost of the pensions paid to the 180,000 pensioners on the rolls in October 1934 was \$31,000,000, in round numbers. That is the amount that the State and local governments actually expended for old-age pensions. The average cost in October 1934 was slightly less than \$19. It has tended to go down rather than up, with the financial stringency of the States and counties.

That is an average. Individual cases run much higher. In New York City the average is \$40 a month, or a little more than \$40. In New York State as a whole it is \$22.16, but it is nearly double that amount in New York City where it costs more for old people to live.

Senator HASTINGS. What is the maximum in New York?

Mr. WITTE. The maximum in New York is this standard we have in the law.

Senator HASTINGS. Without naming an amount?

Mr. WITTE. Without naming any amount. "A reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health", is the language of the New York and Massachusetts laws, and it is the language of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. This would not take away from them the right to pay what they are paying now, but the Federal Government could go up and match it up to \$15?

Mr. WITTE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is possible for one getting \$40 in New York State now to get \$55?

Mr. WITTE. I think there are individual cases in which they will get as much as \$60, depending entirely on their circumstances. There are some old people that still have dependent upon them some young people. There are grandparents that are supporting young people where there is a family unit in which the head of the family is a grandfather who is supporting some grandchildren that are left by a daughter that has died, for instance. There are circumstances in which the total allowance to take care of that family must be considerably more than \$30. There are plenty of other cases where there is some other income, and the allowance can be a small amount to supplement such income.

Senator BYRD. do I understand, Doctor, that this Administrator has supreme power to deny a sovereign State of this Union any benefits of this pension system at all unless that State complies with the regulations that he makes and he thinks are proper.

Mr. WITTE. That is putting that in little stronger terms than I would.

Senator BYRD. Is that not the truth under this legislation if it is enacted as it now is?

Mr. WITTE. Perhaps, theoretically, so.

Senator BYRD. Not theoretically. You are writing a law.

Mr. WITTE. You have the same thing in other instances

Senator BYRD (interrupting): I want a simple answer to my question, whether or not the Administrator can refuse any part of this appropriation to a State if that State does not comply with regulations which he desires.

Mr. WITTE. Does not comply with the regulations prescribed in the statute; not the regulations he desires. The standards prescribed in this law.

Senator BYRD. The statutes do not go into details as to what is a standard of decent living. He can say what a standard of decent living is, as to how much each pensioner should obtain if the State does not provide that additional money, and then, as I understand it, the entire appropriation is denied to that particular State. Is that true?

Mr. WITTE. If a State law does not pay pensions adequate; but as I say, it is for the provision of a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health.

Senator BYRD. Who determines the standards of decency and health?

Mr. WITTE. In the first instance, the State administration. The general question whether a particular State meets these standards will be decided by the Federal Government and the representative of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not the proposition that you have certain rules and regulations laid down in the law?

Mr. WITTE. In the law itself.

The CHAIRMAN. As the State comes within the purview of the proposition, they must present their plan to the administrator and obtain his approval before the Federal aid goes to them, is that not the case?

Mr. WITTE. That is the case.

Senator BYRD. With all due respect to the distinguished chairman of this committee, as I understand the bill, it gives to the Federal administrator the right to set up certain standards of living, and if those standards of living are not complied with, then that particular State is denied any appropriation from this fund, and I would like to have the witness answer the question yes or no.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you say to that?

Mr. WITTE. I do not know that I can answer it yes or no, but if I answered it in those terms, I would say no, Senator. There is no authority here to the Administrator to set up rules and regulations saying what shall be deemed an adequate standard of health. There is no such authority in the bill.

Senator BIRD. But there is authority for the Administrator to deny a State an appropriation unless he thinks that what that State is doing is what he regards as right in that respect.

Mr. WITTE. This bill, Senator, contemplates this appropriation will take effect July 1, 1936. Your State of Virginia passes an old-age pension law. Let us say that the law is passed this winter. It submits that law to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1936. He takes a look at the law and determines whether the four standards of the law in here are in that act, and if it complies with that act he sets aside, he is required to, under this bill, set aside an allotment for that State. There is a clause in here under which the Administrator may stop a payment, may stop future payments if the State violates these standards.

Senator BYRD. In other words, the Administrator becomes the dictator of State legislation, by your own statement.

Mr. WITTE. The law requires standards. The standards are in the law.

Senator BYRD. A sovereign State must submit to the Federal Administrator a copy of the legislation before it is passed to ascertain whether or not lie approves it.

Mr. WITTE. That is the same provision you have in all other acts.

Senator HASTINGS. Let me see whether by reading this law it will not make perfectly clear what is contemplated. It is found in section 4 of the act. It says on page 3 [reading]:

A State plan for old-age assistance, offered by the State authority for approval, shall be approved by the Administrator only if such plan-

and the particular paragraph is paragraph E on line 18-

shall be approved by the Administrator only if such plan furnishes assistance at least great enough to provide, when added to the income of the aged recipient, a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health.

That is a part of it. And then it continues:

And whether or not it denies assistance to any aged persons, at least does not deny assistance to any person who has resided in the State for 5 years or more within the 10 years immediately preceding application for assistance.

And

Third: Has an income which when joined with the income of such person's spouse, is inadequate to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health and is over 65 years of age,

et cetera.

That is the provision which Senator Byrd is talking about.

Mr. WITTE. Yes.

Senator GORE. It seel_is to me the point in that is who is to define and interpret the phrase "decency and health", and then who is to decide whether the State lay is compatible with the standard so fixed.

Mr. WITTE. The State law, Senator, states, as do the Massachusetts and New York laws-it is obvious that the Administrator at the outset would have to say that New York and Massachusetts and any other State that writes that standard into its law is complying with the law. A situation might arise where a State subsequently-it is not likely to arise, but it might arise-in which a State despite this law paid pensions which obviously did not comply with its own act. The Administrator could conceivably refuse an allowance. What I mean is this: I want to illustrate that a little. In the State of Nebraska, because of the very bad conditions that have existed due to the drought, under a new law that was enacted in 1933 pensions had been paid of \$2 a month in many of the counties. I think in a situation like that there would be a question whether the Federal Government should match that \$2 by \$1, and there might be a question whether that was complying with the law. There is not any question that any Administrator could not refuse a State the credit because he thought \$24 on the average was inadequate.

Senator HASTINGS. He would have to, under this law. He would have to refuse to match it under this law.

Senator GORE. Why did you say Nebraska pays so low an amount as \$2 a month?

Mr. WITTE. It is a law that came into operation this year. It is supported by the counties only, and many of the counties are absolutely broke; Nebraska being in the condition it is in due to the drought.

Senator GORE. Is it your contention, then, that under this law that the National Administrator of this law ought to make those counties, whether they can or not, provide a larger amount than \$2?

Senator COSTIGAN. As a condition of advancing their proportion.

Senator GORE. You say that they cannot because they are broke. I do not know whether that would be regarded as a good excuse or not.

Senator HASTINGS. What is your understanding under this law? Could you say that the Federal Administrator would match it or could match it under those circumstances?

Mr. WITTE. I would like to start with the beginning. Start off with the very beginning of this act, July 1, 1935. If you will look at section 6, you have there a provision that the Administrator is to make an allotment at the beginning of the year to the State. There has not been any administration at the beginning of the year.. The State submits its law and this law contains this provision. The Administrator at that stage certainly cannot say, "I refuse to set up an allotment for this State that has this provision in the law." It could not say that the State of Virginia, for instance, having that provision, is not entitled to any allotment. The statute says that he shall set it up. The State draws monthly on that allotment, but there is this clause in the bill that the Administrator may withdraw-section 7-the only clause that could come into the picture:

The Administrator may withdraw his approval of a State plan, if after his approval thereof such plan fails to comply with the conditions specified in section 3 of this act.

And in section 3 of this act is the provision which says that they must provide a pension to people who are over 65 years of age and who are not inmates of institutions. That is the only condition.

Senator HASTINGS. Decency and health is in it, isn't it?

Mr. WITTE. Yes.

Senator BYRD. In the original instance, the approval must first be obtained from the Federal Administrator as to the details and as to the amount of money that the State will furnish?

Mr. WITTE. No; not as to the details and the amount of money. Matching the allotment that the Federal Government sets up is determined by the amount that the State has appropriated. The only question that will be before the Administrator at the beginning is: Does the law of the State of Virginia, or any other State, comply with the standards? Is that in the law? Is it there? He has nothing else to judge by. The State of Virginia has a law, let us assume, that as written, puts these standards into its law.

Senator BYRD. Let us say that Senator Wagner, who is the chief proponent of this legislation, is correct when he says that there should be a minimum payment from all sources of \$40 a month, which under this legislation requires \$15 from the Federal Government and \$25 from the State governments. If the Administrator agrees with Senator Wagner, is it not true then that he could deny a State any part of this appropriation unless that State contributed \$25, or unless the total income of the old-age pension amounted to \$40?

Mr. WITTE. He certainly could not at the outset. That is very obvious. The allotment must be set up. It will be drawn on monthly on the basis of the actual expenditures of the State. There is a clause that if the Administrator believes that the State is not complying with these conditions, the payments may be stopped.

Senator BYRD. Just answer this, please. I have not had an opportunity to read the legislation carefully and you have. Is it true that the Administrator can set up a standard of decent living if he so disposes, at \$40, or \$50, or \$60 a month?

Mr. WITTE. I think not. I see no authority in the bill that he can do so.

Senator BLACK. May I ask just this one question? I am not sure but I think we can clear this up. This bill specifically provides certain things. I do not know what you think it does provide. You are not a lawyer?

Mr. WITTE. No, sir.

Senator BLACK. This bill does specifically provide beyond the shadow of a doubt that the plans can be approved if they furnish assistance at least great enough to provide, when added to the income of the aged recipient, a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health, and it does undoubtedly provide that in case it fails to meet that requirement, the Administrator can notify the State authorities and shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold payments to such State. Undoubtedly the law as written, whatever may be intended, gives to the Federal Administrator the right if the State of Virginia, as suggested by the Senator, declines to pay \$40 and if the Administrator feels or believes that anything under that amount will not probably take care of the aged in line with his views that he can stop paying, and the question is, is that what, is intended by the

bill and is that what you understood? Do the committee on social security want a law which does give that authority to the Federal Administrator, because this one does.

Senator HASTINGS. That is Senator Wagner's interpretation of it, too.

Senator BLACK. Oh, yes. There is no question but what this one does.

Mr. WITTE. It is the same provision that you have in all kinds of aid laws. As a matter of fact, you have had a wealth of experience, and you Senators can judge much better than I whether this clause will mean that sort of interference or not.

Senator BLACK. Do you think it should mean that? That is the question?

Mr. WITTE. I think it should mean that if a State actually pays \$2, that the Federal Government should not attempt to match amounts of that sort, and if it pays any reasonable amount, the Federal Government, any Federal Administrator, I think, would not as a matter of fact interfere with the State's judgment in the matter.

Senator BLACK. Then you do favor—because it seems to me it is a question for the committee and the Senate to determine whether they want that—but you do favor giving such authority to the Federal Administrator, so that if a State fails to meet what the Federal Administrator feels to be necessary for decent subsistence, that he could decline to match it with Federal funds. That is the idea of the bill? That is your idea as to what the bill should contain?

Mr. WITTE. Certainly. Just as you do with highway aid and every other aid.

Senator BLACK. That is one of the standards that is set up, and it is recommended that the law provides that the Federal Administrator can determine whether or not the State is meeting that standard? That is what it does do? I do not think there is any question about that, just as stated by Senator Byrd.

Senator GORE. Does this mean that these broke counties in Nebraska, if they did not put up \$25 a month, that the Federal Administrator could withhold the \$15 under this?

Mr. WITTE. There is no \$15 or \$25 in this bill.

Senator HASTINGS. A maximum of \$15.

Mr. WITTE. A maximum of \$15 for the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that for the record, in order to clarify Senator Wagner's statement, I should read briefly from his testimony.

Senator HASTINGS. Senator Wagner, do I understand that if a State should find itself in a position where it could not raise more than \$15 a month which is admitted would not apply to the requirements here [redacted]

Senator WAGNER (interrupting). That is not admitted.

Senator HASTINGS. I got the distinct impression that it took \$40 a month to make a decent living within the definition of this bill.

Senator WAGNER. I think I said to Senator Couzens that there are different sections of the country in which the economic conditions are different, and undoubtedly in some localities \$30 would go further than \$40 would in other localities. So that I distinctly said that I think it is uniform to make a uniform and fixed rule as to that. If my own opinion were asked and I were to say, I would like to give \$40.

Senator HASTINGS. What page is that on?

The CHAIRMAN. Page 25.

Senator BYRD. What was the purpose in having the appointment of the Administrator and a social board chosen solely by the Executive without the consent and approval of the Senate?

Mr. WITTE. I do not get that, sir.

Senator BYRD. Should not the nomination to this important office be approved?

Mr. WITTE. This does not state how the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator shall be appointed.

Senator BYRD. You are going into a permanent proposition now that is going to last for generations to come. It seems to me he should be approved by the Senate just as the Cabinet officers are and the other important officers of the Government. I would like to know why it was done as it was.

Mr. WITTE. This is not a statute setting up the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Your act set it up previously, and this does provide that in the event that the Federal Relief Administration ceases to exist, then its functions under this bill may be transferred to some other governmental department.

Senator BYRD. You regard this as a permanent department of the Government for generations to come, do you not?

Mr. WITTE. Administration of the pensions is not work for one department. This will be one function of one department, Senator.

Senator BYRD. Under what department will it function?

Mr. WITTE. As this act stands now, under the Federal Relief Administration and its successors, whoever Congress may designate as its successors.

Senator GORE. That would be the successor of Mr. Hopkins in case he retired, probably.

Senator COSTIGAN. Senator Wagner said, continuing what the chairman read a moment ago:

How else can we work it? We have to put large responsibility somewhere. You have to trust somebody in these matters. We cannot sit here and pass upon each individual case as legislators.

Is that your own judgment?

Mr. WITTE. Yes; somebody must judge. That does not mean every case, but it does mean that in a situation where it is very evident that a State is not complying with the Federal standards—where, for instance, although it has a statute which says, "We will pay a pension to people under 70 years of age", nobody in the State ever receives a pension who is under 75—obviously in such a situation the administration would have a right to stop the allotments to that State. I think it is certainly questionable whether the Congress would want to appropriate those funds when a State, despite the fact that its law provided that a pension shall be paid to those over 70, actually did not pay any pension to those who were under 75.

Senator COSTIGAN. It is then your judgment that the section is desirable and of advantage to the State of Virginia rather than a disadvantage.

Mr. WITTE. That is my thought. It will secure a degree of uniformity, as similar provisions in other aid laws have secured. In actual practice I think that no Administrator will act unreasonably. I think you have to place reliance on your public officials to act within reason.

Senator BYRD. You are clear in your own mind now that this act does give the Administrator right in the first instance

Mr. WITTE (interrupting). Not the first time. The first time there is nothing that he can do except look at the law.

Senator BYRD. He can determine whether the State legislation sets up a decent standard of living. If it does not do that in his judgment, then he can deny the contribution of that State. You admitted that a little while ago in answer to a question from Senator Black, so I hope that your mind is still clear on that.

Mr. WITTE. If the State law provides, as does the State law of Massachusetts and of New York, the Administrator obviously would have to approve the law.

Senator BYRD. In other words, you start off with the first proposition that the legislation passed by the States must be approved by the Federal Administrator before that particular State can receive any benefits from this appropriation. There is no difference between us on that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt about that is there, Doctor Witte?

Mr. WITTE. Obviously somebody has to determine whether these States are

Senator BYRD (interrupting). You said a little while ago that that was not the case and I want to be certain that you and I agree on that, because to me that is a very important question.

Mr. WITTE. All you have to do is to write three lines in your Virginia law to meet that. If those lines are in there, you are all right.

Senator BLACK. That would mean if he writes the lines that you state, if he writes these words, then they have met it in the initial outset.

Mr. WITTE. Certainly.

Senator BLACK. If he simply puts in the law that the State shall pay a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health. That is correct as to the initial passage of the law?

Mr. WITTE. Certainly.

Senator BLACK. If after that the State of Virginia should conclude to pay only \$10 a month and the Federal Administrator concluded that that was not sufficient to give reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health, then the Federal Administrator could in his discretion cut off the payments from the Federal Government to the State of Virginia.

Mr. WITTE. Yes, Sir.

Senator BLACK. That is correct?

Mr. WITTE. Yes, Sir.

Senator BYRD. That is not what I understand. He will be forced to do that because the State has to contribute \$15.

Mr. WITTE. No; that is a mistake. That is not in the law.

Senator HASTINGS. Doctor, I would like to ask you this question

Senator BYRD (interrupting). Excuse me, Senator. Can I get this clear? Do I understand then that the Federal Government would contribute more than the State would contribute?

Mr. WITTE. No.

Senator BYRD. In other words, could the State contribute \$10?

Mr. WITTE. The State might contribute \$5 and the Federal Government might contribute \$5, and that might be adequate. It will, in many cases.

Senator BYRD. That is true, but it goes back to the other proposition that you could set the standard of living at \$40 or \$50 in the judgment and discretion of the Administrator. I am speaking as a matter of law and not what the Administrator will do. I am assuming that he is in sympathy with Senator Wagner who is the chief exponent and perhaps the greatest student of this legislation. But if the State administrator should fix it at \$40 he could deny Virginia a part of this under those conditions; is that true?

Mr. WITTE. It might be. But I say there is no authority in the Administrator to say that \$40 is the minimum. That is not it. He has to make a finding; he will have to determine that Virginia is not providing "a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health." That means a varying amount under varying conditions.

Senator BYRD. Still it gets down to the dollars and cents of what you regard as a standard of living and what creates that standard of living, and that is money; therefore you have to get down to the amount of money which is contributed by the State, which is a definite amount.

Senator HASTINGS. I would like to inquire, from the committee's point of view, what is the objection in the illustration that you have given where, because of the serious conditions Nebraska found itself able only to pay \$2 a month. What is the objection to the Federal Government contributing a like amount of \$2 a month when it is shown conclusively that that is all that the State could afford to pay? Is that not all the more reason why the Federal Government should contribute when the State has gotten to a position where it cannot pay more than a small sum like that?

Mr. WITTE. If you state it like that, that would be correct, if actually that was all that they could pay. We now know through experience with emergency relief—we have had the same situation with reference to emergency relief, the Administrator has discretion to require—in fact he has much wider discretion than he has under this bill—and under that bill we know that some communities have not done their fair share. If this is all they can actually do, that is one thing.

Senator HASTINGS. This law does not permit the Administrator, though, to contribute under circumstances like that.

Mr. WITTE. Yes, it does.

Senator HASTINGS. Well, no; it does not.

Mr. WITTE. He has to stop, you mean?

Senator HASTINGS. He has to stop.

Mr. WITTE. It is in his discretion.

Senator HASTINGS. Oh, no, not at all.

Mr. WITTE. Section 7, Senator.

Senator HASTINGS. Oh, yes. You mean it is in his discretion?

Mr. WITTE. The only case, as this discussion has brought out, is that after an allotment has been made, the Administrator may stop the allotment. The Administrator may withdraw his approval of the State plan if after his approval thereof such plan fails to comply with the conditions specified in section 3 of this act. In cases of such withdrawal, he shall notify the local authorities.

Senator HASTINGS. That is an additional power given him.

Mr. WITTE. That is the only power that he has to stop this allotment.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Witte, the committee will appreciate it if you can return in the morning. Miss Perkins has been before the House Ways and Means Committee, and it is rather late now, and we will hear Miss Perkins Friday morning. That will be more convenient to her, and Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, will be here in the morning also.

I would like for the committee to go into executive session for a few minutes. There is a matter of some importance which I want to take up with them. We will adjourn now until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a. m., an adjournment was taken until 10 a. m. of the following day, Thursday, Jan. 24, 1935.)