

Analysis of reproductive data, according to religious affiliations

	Protestant		Jewish		Catholic		Total ¹	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
Total number of patients	1,090	54.5	330	16.5	573	28.7	2,000	100.0
Pregnancies came to term	3,336	78.6	869	70.8	2,347	82.6	6,563	78.6
Living children	2,985	70.3	809	65.8	2,104	74.0	5,909	70.9
Dead children,	301	7.1	39	3.3	224	7.5	554	6.6
Still-born.....	50	1.2	21	1.7	29	1.1	100	1.2
Pregnancies terminated prematurely..	906	21.4	359	29.2	495	17.4	1,177	21.4
Spontaneous.....	376	8.9	80	6.5	264	9.3	724	8.5
Therapeutic.....	47	1.1	25	1.9	13	.5	85	1.1
Physician---	167	3.9	145	11.9	59	2.1	384	4.6
Midwife-.....	73	1.7	16	1.3	32	1.1	121	1.5
Self-induced.....	243	5.8	93	7.6	127	4.4	463	5.6
Total.....	4,242	100.0	1,228	100.0	2,842	100.0	8,340	100.0

¹ The total also includes 11 children, 4 spontaneous abortions and 13 abortions performed by physicians among the women of no religious affiliations, or whose affiliation was not recorded.

² The difference between this figure and the total number of pregnancies is due to 26 twin births.

**STATEMENT OF THOMAS KENNEDY, INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER,
UNITED-MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA**

I have carefully examined the so-called "economic security bill" introduced by Senator Wagner and Representative Lewis. I am in complete accord with the stated purposes of the bill, namely, to provide, among other things, for a system of unemployment insurance and old-age protection for American workers. I believe, however, that the bill as it now stands must be amended in several vital particulars before it can hope to secure the desired objectives in any worthy way. To enact a law which, while purporting to provide economic security for the workers, fails to do so in any large measure, would, in my opinion, be a social catastrophe. I am aware that the argument is made that an imperfect law is at least a beginning, and that improvements can be made later. This is true in many legislative matters. But in the present case, there is the grave danger that a law which is palpably imperfect will result in discrediting the whole idea of economic security legislation, and that vast numbers of workers, whom the law is supposed to benefit, will find themselves unprotected and will feel themselves deceived.

Therefore! it seems to me to be imperative that the proposed law be made as excellent as it can be made at the very start, and that, at the least, certain evident imperfections be corrected.

The most evident imperfection is the failure of the present bill to deal with unemployment insurance as a national problem. At the National Conference on Economic Security, on November 14, last, I expressed my views on this point in some detail. These views were, briefly, that any unemployment insurance to be effective must be national in scope and operation, and that it must be organized and operated under the auspices of the Federal Government. An unemployment insurance system has to deal with industrial problems, and industry is organized primarily on a national basis. All of our basic industries—iron and steel manufacturing, coal mining, textile manufacturing, transportation, etc.—are national in scope and operation. Bituminous coal mining, for example, extends in to more than 30 States; competition is interstate; wage agreements are made entirely without regard to State laws. To attempt to impose upon such an industry a series of unemployment insurance systems, based on State boundaries, would be harmful to operators as well as to mine workers. For the operators, it would make fair competitive practices still more difficult; for the workers, it would mean that employees in one State might be well protected in the matter of unemployment insurance, while those in an adjacent State might have little or no protection, and workers moving from one State to another would be absolutely unprotected.

The above is the gist of my remarks on this subject at the national conference last November, some 2 months before the present bill was drafted. My views'

remain unchanged. They have, indeed, been strengthened by further thought upon the matter, and I am more than ever convinced that an unemployment insurance system must be established in all industries and in all States, and that the basic standards as to benefit payments, waiting period, etc., must be everywhere the same. The present bill does not even assure that all States will adopt an unemployment insurance system; and it equally fails to assure any real measure of uniformity regarding standards.

These essential objectives can only be accomplished by substituting the subsidy plan for the tax-remission plan. The tax-remission plan will result neither in universal adoption of an insurance system nor in uniformity of standards. The subsidy plan will permit, the law itself to set the standards, and will assure universal adoption. Moreover, the subsidy plan is far less complicated from the standpoint of administration and is, I believe, more easily defensible on grounds of constitutionality.

As regards the financing of the unemployment insurance system, I would strongly favor the raising of the necessary funds by increased taxes in the higher income brackets. A pay-roll tax will, in most cases, simply be added to prices, and the workers will thus ultimately pay the bill in the form of higher cost of living.

As regards the old-age protection features of the present bill, two very important changes should be made. First, the amount of the old-age pension should be raised from \$30 to not less than \$50 a month. With our present cost of living, which is constantly increasing, and our American standards of living, an income of \$30 per month represents no more than a pauper's pittance. It is just a little bit better than the poorhouse. A monthly income of \$50 is certainly the least which a wealthy country like ours should even think of offering its unfortunate aged citizens.

The second change should be to reduce the qualifying age for the receipt of an old-age pension to 60 years. Old age, in the physiological sense, may not begin until 65 or even 70. But economic old age, in this era of mechanical conveyors, begins at a much earlier period. Everyone knows that 45 years is now the deadline in hiring new employees almost everywhere, and, even then, the man of 45 has little chance. This is one of the most deplorable features of our modern industrial life, but the situation exists, and a law which seeks to protect the older workers must deal with realities.

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE L. GOURLEY, WASHINGTON, D. C., REPRESENTING
THE AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION

My name is Lawrence L. Gourley. My address is the Mills Building, Washington, D. C. I appear on behalf of the American Osteopathic Association, at the request of its committee on public relations, for which I am counsel. I am not a physician.

There are approximately 9,000 osteopathic physicians and surgeons licensed and practicing in the United States, about 50 percent of whom are active members of this association. There are also 6 accredited colleges, and something over 193 hospitals and clinics. The American Osteopathic Association, 430 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., is representative of the osteopathic profession and of allied institutions.

The association was established to promote the interest of the science of osteopathy and of the osteopathic profession by stimulating research, elevating the standards of osteopathic education, and advancing osteopathic knowledge. Members of the association are required to be graduates of recognized colleges of osteopathy and licensed practitioners. It is organized along democratic lines as a federation of divisional societies established within the States. The house of delegates, comprised of representatives elected by the various federated societies, meets annually as the constituted legislative body of the association. Among the publications of the association are a code of ethics, a yearbook, a journal, a forum, and a magazine.

The attitude of the American Osteopathic Association toward the legislation now before this committee may be characterized as an admixture of commendation and apprehension. Any rational plan which has for its objective an increase in the availability of medical services to needy families and the improvement and further extension of measures of preventive medicine would have the unqualified and active support and the cooperation of the osteopathic profession and its institutions. This bill embodies a plan directed to those objectives, but the