

cleansing), for the prevention of infantile paralysis and other diseases, and to investigate this method as a cure of infantile paralysis to the end that the disease be controlled and cured.

That an appropriation for the purchase of said Townsend-Davis clystertory method be made by the United States Government, the sum to be \$1,000,000. That said method be disseminated by bulletins of instruction and personal demonstration to the people of the United States and possessions for the prevention of infantile paralysis and other preventable and curable diseases, cancer, appendicitis, high blood pressure, and the common cold. The common cold alone causes the loss of billions of dollars to the American people every year.

The duty of this division shall be to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of human sanitation and the use of said method in ridding the human intestines and blood of the waste material. The retention of material similar to pus and mucus in the small intestines and stomach is the cause of infantile paralysis and other diseases, and the Townsend-Davis clystertory method removes this cause.

This division shall be known as the "Bureau of Instruction in Hygiene for the Prevention of Disease", and shall be a clearing house for all methods of hygiene, nonmedical, not already recognized, for the conquering of loathsome diseases by instruction in the care of the body. A nominal sum to be charged for said instruction will maintain the bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that complete your statement?

Miss DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you for your appearance.

Miss DAVIS. I thank you. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman—I ask that that be attached to this section of the bill that you have before you, 803. If that is amended on that section, I think it will be appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Miss DAVIS. And I ask you to consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Mr. I. Amter.

#### STATEMENT OF I. AMTER, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. AMTER. Not having adequate time, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to present a real picture of the unemployed situation of the country, I have condensed it into a statement, and I hope that later I will be able to enter something into the records of the meeting of this committee.

First, I want to say that I represent the only Nation-wide unemployed organization in the United States, having close to 500,000 organized unemployed in our organization in 42 States of the country; and in the name of this organization and the 16,000,000 unemployed in the United States, I wish to state categorically that the unemployed reject the Wagner-Lewis bill, since they do not come within the provisions of the bill. For that reason the unemployed support the workers' bill, H. R. 2827. This bill has also been endorsed by more than 2,500 locals of the American Federation of Labor, 5 internationals, 6 State federations of labor, and upward of 50 central labor bodies. To this must be added a large number of fraternal, farm, youth, Negro, veteran, church, and professional organizations, and so forth. Seventy municipal councils, including such cities as St. Louis, Minneapolis, Buffalo, Milwaukee, and, since our national congress, Youngstown and Lynn, Mass., have endorsed the workers' bill. In other words, 4 to 5 million people are rallying behind the workers' bill.

On June 8 Mr. Roosevelt stated in his message to Congress, "Among our objectives I place security of the men, women, and

children of the Nation first." No one can question but that the unemployed are the most insecure.

The question was asked of a previous speaker as to the number of unemployed in the United States. Nobody knows, not even the United States Government. We will have correct figures only when there is instituted a system of unemployment insurance embracing every worker in the country. The national committee on economic security speaks of 10,000,000 unemployed. William Green says there are 11,500,000 unemployed. We declare there are 16,000,000 unemployed, and the number is growing. The unemployed are not only the manual workers but include hundreds of thousands of white-collar workers, professionals, farmers, and so forth. Among the unemployed are 5,000,000 of the youth of the country who have graduated from schools and colleges and have never obtained work.

I want to interpolate a word. The United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Zook, issued a statement, I think it was last October, to the effect that in the 5 years of the crisis, 7,000,000 boys and girls have graduated from high schools and colleges in the United States. At the beginning of the human-needs campaign that was inaugurated in New York City I think about 2 months ago, Newton D. Baker had an article in the New York Times. Commenting on the statement of Dr. Zook, he said:

Of this number, no more than one-third have ever obtained work, and they have only worked part time at very low wages.

I need not say a word about the situation of the children, which is well known, in that the Department of Labor has already stated that 25 percent of the children of the United States are under-nourished.

The Federal Government recently announced a program for the unemployed. One million five hundred thousand are to be thrown on the mercy of the States, municipalities, and private charity. The nature of their relief can be gathered from the F. E. R. A. report of September, which I have here. This report shows that in Kentucky families on relief receive an average of \$8.21 a month. North Carolina, Virginia, and Arkansas ranged at only slightly higher, whole families being compelled to subsist upon that amount of money during the period of a whole month.

The Government's further program is to put 3,500,000 on public works, for which an appropriation of \$4,800,000,000 is sought. As for the remaining unemployed no provision is made whatever. The report of October of the United States Department of Labor shows that 1,950,000 on relief jobs received an average of \$26.16 a month, about \$6 per week. The \$4,000,000,000 appropriation cannot afford what Mr. Roosevelt promised, namely, \$50 a month for a period of more than 2 years, for which the appropriation runs, but only \$24.39 a month. This is nothing but forced labor. Can one therefore have the hardihood to call this "security"? We demand union wages and conditions on all jobs and an adequate number of hours per week.

Into this situation was catapulted the Wagner-Lewis bill. This bill makes absolutely no provision for the unemployed, nor even for workers who, after the bill goes into operation, are supposed to receive unemployment compensation if they are laid off. It merely

states that a 3-percent pay-roll tax shall be imposed on the employers, to be reduced to 2 or 1 percent depending on the business index. This tax will be handed on to the worker in the price of the product. Out of the report of the National Committee on Economic Security we gather that the compensation would amount to 50 percent of the worker's wage with a maximum of \$15 a week. No minimum is established. I would like to interpolate another word. The Federal Government recently established a minimum wage scale for the pecan-shelling industry, a very unimportant industry, it is true, an industry that involves only 15,000 workers in this country, but the minimum wage was established at the outrageously low figure of \$6 per week for 35 or 40 hours of work. I want to state that the whole N. R. A. legislation has shown consistently that where Negro workers are involved, there the wages are low, and the pecan-shelling industry is almost completely made up of Negro workers. With no minimum established, the worker in the pecan-shelling industry would receive \$3 a week as compensation if he should be discharged.

The worker may receive compensation for 15 weeks and under particular conditions for 25 weeks after a 4-week waiting period. Then he joins the workers on relief. This is supposed to be "security."

As for the old-age pensions, aid for dependent children, child welfare, and so forth, we can only say that the Government is making a shamefully inadequate provision. It would appropriate for all ordinary items enumerated a total of \$93,500,000 a year. Quite naturally the bankers and manufacturers do not object to this program for it does not cost them a cent.

As against this program, we put the workers' bill, which provides for the unemployed and all workers for the full period of disability at Government expense, based on taxes and income above \$5,000, inheritances, and so forth.

Furthermore, we lay down a basic principle in connection with social and unemployment insurance. That is, the worker has the right to live. In order to live, he must earn his living. In order to earn his living he must have a job. When he is denied the opportunity to earn his living, because he has no job, because the employer cannot make any profit out of him, this worker shall be compensated to the full extent of his potential earnings, no matter what it may cost. That worker has that right, and that is our contention.

Now, if I may conclude, we might ask why there was such haste in introducing the Wagner-Lewis bill in the last session of Congress, namely 3 days after the introduction of the workers' bill—on February 5, the Wagner-Lewis bill; the workers' bill on February 2—and now again is being put through the Ways and Means Committee with all urgency. This is due to the fact that the campaign for the workers' bill is growing tremendously, because the workers recognize that it is the only bill representing their interest. We urge the Ways and Means Committee to endorse the workers' bill and to report it favorably; but we state finally, we assure you that we will not stop fighting until the workers' bill is enacted into law by the United States Congress.

I wish that, as I stated in the beginning, I might be able to give you a more adequate picture of the situation of the unemployed in the United States.

Mr. REED. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. Who is the author of the workers' bill?

Mr. AMTER. The original writer of the workers' bill was the Communist Party, and it was then popularized among the masses of this country, through 4 years of struggle by the National Unemployment Council.

Mr. REED. You say it is introduced now in Congress?

Mr. AMTER. It was introduced into Congress. I have a copy here that I will leave with you.

Mr. REED. Who is the author of the bill? Who introduced it?

Mr. AMTER. Congressman Lundeen.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Mr. AMTER. I might state further that the bill has already been introduced into the State Legislatures of California, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and is about to be introduced in 5 or 6 more States.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is your organization communistic?

Mr. AMTER. Our organization is not communistic, though I am a Communist. Our organization is made up of all workers, political connections or affiliations making no difference whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you.

Mr. AMTER. I would just like to say a word.

The CHAIRMAN. Your time is up, but go ahead for one word.

Mr. AMTER. I would like to have introduced, as I said before, a more complete statement of this situation, because I believe it is in the interests of the Ways and Means Committee and also of the Government as a whole, to have an expression of opinion from the followers of the Wagner-Lewis bill, but the incident yesterday made it perfectly clear that when Mr. Benjamin, of the National Joint Action Committee, was ejected from the hall, it would be impossible for me to make a statement such as is necessary in a situation of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. He was offered an opportunity to extend his remarks, and he was given the same consideration that every other witness has been given.

Mr. AMTER. I know he was ejected.

The CHAIRMAN. He asked for 5 minutes. We gave him 10 minutes. Mr. Henry Ellenbogen, Representative from Pennsylvania, will be heard at this time. Mr. Ellenbogen, you may proceed for 5 minutes, with the privilege of extending your remarks.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY ELLENBOGEN, REPRESENTATIVE THIRTY-THIRD DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I thoroughly agree with the principles of this bill. It marks a great forward step in social legislation, and we are all very happy about it.

I should like to call attention to just a few details in order to be able to complete within a short time. As regards old-age security, the bill is divided into three parts; an old-age-pension system for those who are now aged, a compulsory Federal old-age-insurance system for those who are under 60 years of age, and a voluntary system of