

SOCIAL-SECURITY LEGISLATION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 197, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 197

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 7260, a bill to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and so forth. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 20 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY]. All I can say at this time is that this is a wide open rule, as open as any rule ever presented to the House. It permits amendment under the rules of the House. No rule was ever presented to the House that was more open.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and, if the Chair please, to the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONAGHAN. The point of order I wish to make is this. I read in the rules that the rights of the House must be safeguarded as to its integrity, safety, and efficiency, and this matter of social security is one of the most im-

portant subjects that will come before this House during this whole session of Congress.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana will please state his question of privilege.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am stating the point of order. It affects the dignity of this House to safeguard the rights of its Members to speak upon a matter in which they have vitally concerned themselves. That is a matter of paramount importance and constitutional importance, and the right cannot even be infringed by civil officers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not stating a question of personal privilege, or a matter involving the privilege of the House.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the question of the privilege of the House must be raised by resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. But that does not apply to the matter of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. A matter of the privilege of the House must be raised by resolution. The Chair understood the gentleman from Montana to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. MONAGHAN. And a matter of personal privilege. I said also the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I read from rule IX:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

Under the question of personal privilege I cite the integrity of the proceedings of the House. I cannot see that this rule adequately protects this House so far as giving it and the public adequate information as to the rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not stating a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. The gentleman will state the question of personal privilege.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair, if any has been made.

The SPEAKER. But the Chair has not made any ruling. The Chair is simply seeking to have the question of personal privilege stated by the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I have stated it.

The SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. MONAGHAN. This matter of social security is one in which I am vitally interested and have interested myself from my first session in Congress, and I have interested myself on this rule to the extent of circularizing every Member of the House. I am not permitted to speak upon it. It is my constitutional right that my constituents may be heard here. That is denied.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not stating a question of personal privilege, and I move that his remarks be stricken from the Record.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to rule.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue, if I shall not be interrupted.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman cannot make an argument at this time. He must succinctly state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I will state it.

The SPEAKER. Without accompanying it with an argument at this time.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Am I not permitted to argue the point of order?

The SPEAKER. It is necessary for the gentleman first to state his question of personal privilege as a basis for any

argument that he may desire to submit. The Chair has no desire other than to see that the gentleman and every Member of the House is protected under the rules. The rules provide that a gentleman who raises a question of personal privilege must first state his question before he proceeds to argue with reference to it.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I have asked for time from the minority and the majority—

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman is not stating a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MONAGHAN. How could I state my question of personal privilege if I do not state the right that has been denied me? I maintain that the right of any Member should be safeguarded to speak upon any question in which he is vitally interested himself at every session of the Congress. By reason of the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] will not assign me time, and I am not assigned time by the minority, and my unanimous-consent request is denied, my personal privilege—

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Montana, under the guise of raising a question of personal privilege, is making a speech to his constituents in behalf of the Townsend plan.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has no right to make that statement.

The SPEAKER. The rules provide that a Member may rise to a question of personal privilege where his rights, reputation, and conduct individually, in his representative capacity, is assailed or reflected upon. The Chair fails to see where the gentleman has presented a question of personal privilege which will bring himself within that rule. The rules provide for the conduct of the business of the House—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The rules are necessary—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask that the improper words of the gentleman from New York referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Montana as "a demagogic speech" be taken down—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in the midst of a ruling. The Chair hopes the gentleman will respect the Chair until he finishes with his statement.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask that the gentleman's improper words be taken down, and do not want to lose that right—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in the midst of a ruling. The Chair trusts the gentleman from Texas will refrain from interruption until the Chair has concluded.

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to state to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN] that these rules have been adopted for the proper conduct of the business of the House. They provide the method of procedure. If this rule is adopted the gentleman may, of course, appeal to those who have charge of the time for time, but there are 435 Members of the House, and the gentleman must appreciate, as the Chair does, that it is impossible for those gentlemen to yield to everyone. However, the Chair is very sure that opportunity will be afforded the gentleman sometime during the discussion of the bill to express his views.

The Chair fails to see where the gentleman has been denied any right that has not been denied to every Member of this House. The gentleman has his right of appeal to get time, as the Chair stated, if this rule is adopted. If the rule is not adopted and the bill is taken up, then the gentleman may proceed under the rules of the House. The Chair fails to see where the gentleman has raised a question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, unless the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] withdraws the word "demagogic", that the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN] was making "a demagogic

speech" is out of order. It attributes improper motives to the gentleman from Montana, who, I think, is earnest and sincere, and I ask that those words, "a demagogic speech", be taken down, as used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], unless the gentleman sees fit to withdraw them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, I did not pronounce it just that way, but I have no intention of withdrawing it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words embracing "demagogic" be taken down, because while he and I do not agree on this bill, I think the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN] is sincere and in earnest in his declaration. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman requests that the words of the gentleman from New York be taken down.

The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the request to take down the gentleman's words does not come too late?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; it does not. I made it in due order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time and to get down to the business of the House, and without relinquishing any of my private opinions, I withdraw the word I used.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I therefore withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for what is commonly known as a "wide open" rule for the consideration of the so-called "social security bill." The rule provides for 20 hours of general debate to be confined to the bill and is wide open for all amendments that are germane that any Member may wish to offer. We think the importance of this legislation calls for a rule of this liberality.

I want to congratulate the Ways and Means Committee on the presentation of this bill after many days of consideration. It is a great and wonderful step in advance providing for the security of old age, for the security of motherhood and of childhood. We have learned many lessons from the depression, among them that in a land of surpluses, in a land of plenty, where we raise a surplus of foodstuffs, thousands if not millions are hungry; that in a land where we produce a surplus of wool, cotton, and other material for clothing, many are unclothed; that in a land where we produce a surplus of fuel, coal, oil, and electric power, many are cold and homes are unheated. From this depression we have learned that there must be new formulas for the security of humanity. After all, the supreme purpose of government is the protection of its citizens and the protection of humanity.

This legislation is a wonderful step in advance along the line of security. It may not go as far as some would like, but certainly it is a movement in the right direction as an initial step.

The rule provides that anyone who has an amendment they believe will improve the details of this legislation may offer it and will have ample opportunity and time in which to discuss it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. COX. The effect of the proposed rule is to give a privileged status to the bill and to make possible its consideration at this time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is all.

Mr. COX. And in that it provides for 20 hours' general debate it enlarges the privileges of the Members rather than restricts them.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is true. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is one of the most liberal rules I have ever seen.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. How long will we be permitted to discuss the rule before the previous question will be ordered on the rule?

Mr. GREENWOOD. The rules of the House provide for 1 hour of debate on the rule.

Mr. McFARLANE. I do not so read it in the rule.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is the rule of the House touching this matter, as I understand it.

Mr. McFARLANE. Another question, if the gentleman will permit. The Parliamentarian has had some 19 or 20 amendments submitted to him but he has not passed upon them. If this rule is adopted, can the gentleman state whether or not the different measures that have been discussed before the country would be germane to the bill?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Why, certainly the gentleman cannot state that; that is the province of the Speaker and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when the amendment is offered and after he knows what it is.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. In its ultimate finality it is within the control of the House, because even though the Speaker rules, the House can pass on all rulings. Is not that true?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. TRUAX. If this rule is adopted, may the so-called "Townsend plan" be offered as a substitute?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I have no reason to believe it would not be germane.

Mr. TRUAX. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GREENWOOD. But I am not the Speaker of the House, nor am I the Parliamentarian. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio knows as much about it as I do.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. A few moments ago the Speaker of the House in ruling on a point of order stated that he felt sure the gentleman from Montana would be able to get time in the discussion of this bill. The Rules Committee brings out a rule dividing the time equally between the minority and the majority.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is always customary, and there is nothing unusual about that.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Has the Rules Committee ever thought of the injustice of that, in this respect: There are three times as many Democratic Members in the House as Republicans, yet Republicans are given an equal amount of time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The time has always been divided between the majority and the minority not with the idea of politics, but that has been the custom of the House ever since I have been a Member of the House. This rule is no different from every other rule in that respect.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When mention was made of the Townsend plan being germane under this rule, did the gentleman mean the plan by which \$200 a month was to be paid people over a certain age on the condition that they spend it during the month, that foolish, ridiculous, obnoxious bill?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I do not know what the gentleman may mean or what any man may have in the back of his head, but when the appropriate time comes, the gentleman can propound the parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker.

Also in connection with the purposes of this legislation I am sure we all appreciate that we live in a machine age, an age of great invention; and unless we are going to correct this position, under the laws of invention, the monopoly that is granted and the principal profits that come from an invention are going to accrue to the management of industry and not be divided as an appanage to those who work with their hands. The invention of machinery crowds out hundreds and thousands of men and women who labor with their hands. We know that the future holds in store much unemployment and its attendant distress, especially unemployment in old age, and we may as well make this step now looking forward to that future date so that the advantages that accrue from the machine and this age of discovery in which we live shall take care of the people displaced. All our people must be taken care of under legislation of this character, and I say that the bill is a wonderful step in advance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Speaking of the machine age, if the 48 States of the Union would shorten hours of labor we could meet the threat of the machine age, and that is the only way in which we can meet it.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I will agree with the gentleman from New York that the shortening of hours of labor would be very beneficial, but nevertheless there will always be that distress of old age; there will always be the necessity for assistance to be rendered to motherhood and childhood. I believe it is our duty as a nation of great wealth and of great surpluses to provide a scheme of government that through the years will build up the necessary reserves to provide for security in old age, of motherhood, and of childhood. This bill, in my opinion, is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Ways and Means Committee for the care with which this bill has been prepared and for the work they have performed. I trust that the House will sustain the Committee by voting favorably on this rule in order that we may have full consideration and full opportunity for amendment of this bill.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I make the suggestion that if the membership will read the report of the committee, they will find it is most instructive and explanatory of the measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to myself.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has given an open rule to the security bill, giving the House an opportunity to amend the bill when it comes before this body.

The bill provides that the Federal Government pay one-half of the cost of State old-age pensions, with a Federal limit of \$15 per month to one person. You will admit that this is by no means a princely sum and there is grave doubt as to the constitutionality of part of the bill; the Government, in the minds of many, has not the power to enforce social insurance under the guise of a tax. Again, no credit is allowed for the private pension funds set up by individual employers. The bill is, to say the least, loosely drawn and will probably reach the courts. I, however, propose to vote for the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, although this bill, the administration's old-age pension bill, comes into the House under an ostensibly open rule, yet insofar as that rule permits the administration bill to be amended in the way that many Members of the House would like to see it amended, this rule is not an open rule at all. It is to all practical intents and purposes virtually a gag rule, and I desire to try to show you, in the short time allotted for discussion on the rule, just why it is a gag rule.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I have only 5 minutes on the rule, and I would appreciate it if the gentleman would allow me to finish my statement.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman in favor of liberalizing the rules of the House?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield. I am sorry, but the gentleman must realize that my time is too limited to yield at this point for questions if I am to conclude my own statement within the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally conceded, and I have consulted several of the best parliamentarians in the House on the point, that under a general open rule of the House no such old-age pension plan as that embraced in the Lundeen bill or in the revised McGroarty bill may be offered by way of amendment as a substitute to section 1 of the pending bill, which is the old-age-pension feature of the President's economic-security bill, which bill we are now about to consider under this rule.

Now, let me say frankly at the outset that the only part of the President's economic-security bill that I am very greatly interested in for the moment, or that many Members are very greatly interested in, is section 1 of that bill, which contains the old-age-pensions provisions. I dare say not 2 percent of the people of the United States either know or care a great deal about any part of this administration bill, except the old-age-pension part of it, but, on the other hand, I venture to say that 90 percent of the people of the United States do know and do care about the old-age-pension features of it and that they are very much interested in knowing whether or not we intend at this session of Congress to give to them an adequate old-age-pension bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I intend to confine my remarks at this stage to the rule itself, and not to the bill reported in under the rule, I desire to say in this connection that the old-age pension provided in the administration bill is not an adequate old-age pension and that most of the membership of the House freely admit that it is not adequate. I doubt very much whether there will be any serious contention in the debate which is to follow the disposition of this rule that the pension here proposed is an adequate old-age pension. Furthermore, few people outside of the Congress believe this to be an adequate pension. Since the convening of the present Congress I have replied to more than 9,000 letters inquiring about and commenting upon the old-age-pension provision of the administration bill, but I have yet to receive a single letter in which the writer expressed the opinion that the pension here proposed is adequate.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not for the purpose of the debate on the rule criticizing the bill itself. What criticism I may have for it I shall reserve for debate upon the bill. But I am telling you what the people you yourselves represent think about it, for the purpose of urging upon you the liberalization of the rule, so that what your constituents have asked for in the way of an old-age pension may at least be considered and debated under the rule.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of people in this country who in good faith have petitioned the Congress to consider and discuss and to decide upon the merits of certain old-age-pension plans which they believe to be solutions to the old-age-pension problem. It is said that 20,000,000 people have signed petitions asking Congress to consider the so-called "Townsend plan", which is now before the Congress in the shape of a new bill known as the revised McGroarty bill. It is reported also that more than a million people have by the similar orderly method of petition prayed Congress to consider the Lundeen bill, which has been favorably reported to the House by the Committee on Labor. Is this body, the duly constituted representatives of the people and the law-making authority of the people, going to deny completely these petitions of the people?

The Constitution of the United States guarantees to its people the right of petition to the proper authority, which in

this case is the Congress of the United States, and that right presupposes and carries with it the right to have their orderly petitions properly considered and passed upon by the Congress in an orderly manner. I am not contending that you must grant those petitions by enacting their proposals into law, because to say that would be to deny to Congress the right to legislate as the representatives of the whole people. But I do say to you that you have no right to refuse to allow the legislation prayed for in those petitions to be considered on the floor of this House. I do say that you have no right, figuratively speaking, to throw those petitions in the waste basket. And finally I say that although you may have the legal right you have no moral right to adopt any rule today which will render it impossible for the House to consider and act upon either the revised McGroarty bill, the Lundeen bill, or any other old-age-pension bill now before Congress which proposes a different old-age-pension plan than that proposed in the President's bill. And that, Mr. Speaker, is precisely what the majority of this House will do if it adopts this rule.

The other bills to which I have referred are tax bills, and that is the reason why they cannot be offered as amendments or substitutes for section 1 of the pending bill, under the supposedly open rule which you are now proposing to adopt. Under this rule all tax bills must be held to be not germane to section 1 because section 1 contains no tax provision. The revised McGroarty bill is a tax bill providing, among other things, for a 2-percent transaction tax for the purpose of financing the pension provided for in the bill. The Lundeen bill is also a tax bill. All the other old-age-pension bills now pending before Congress are tax bills, and this rule will shut them all out from any consideration whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the point I make is clear to everyone—that under the general rules of the House and under this particular rule—no one will be allowed to offer any other old-age plan as a substitute to section 1 of the administration bill which, of course, is the only bill before the House for consideration under the rule. I have no right to say to Members how they shall vote for any of these other bills if they are offered, but I think I have a right to insist that the Rules Committee ought to give the Membership of the House an opportunity to consider those other plans and to debate them, and, if they are satisfied with one of the other plans they ought to have the right to substitute it for the old-age-pension provision of this administration bill.

The only way that that can be done, and the only way that this House will have any opportunity whatever of considering any other old-age-pension plan except the particular plan specified in the pending bill, is to vote down the previous question on the rule and then amend the rule so as to provide that any other old-age-pension plan, together with any other system or scheme of raising revenue to finance it, may be offered by way of amendment to section 1 of this bill. Gentlemen will have an opportunity to do this by simply voting down the previous question and amending the rule, or by voting down the rule itself and requiring the Rules Committee to bring in a new rule. If you refuse to do that, then by your vote you will declare to your colleagues and to the country that you have prevented and forbidden consideration and debate in this House upon any other kind or type of old-age-pension bill except the specific plan provided in the pending bill, which, in the opinion of the majority of the Members here, is altogether inadequate and with which the country as a whole is not satisfied. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Montana rise?

Mr. MONAGHAN. For the purpose of submitting a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Is not the statement that was made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Morr] correct, that if this

rule passes, then only one particular plan, the plan that we now have under discussion, may be passed upon by the Congress?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not in position to answer that parliamentary inquiry. That is a matter which will come up subsequently under the rules of the House. The Chair would not seek to anticipate what the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may rule or what the Committee itself may do. The Chair feels very certain that the Chairman of the Committee will be governed, as all chairmen of committees are, by the rules and precedents of the House. Certainly the Chair would not anticipate his ruling; and in addition to this, the Chair cannot pass upon any particular amendment until it has been presented in all its phases.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BILL

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this legislation should have been accompanied by a special rule—

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman please, I have only 5 minutes.

Bringing in this bill under a special rule is a reflection upon you Democrats.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I always yield to my chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We were advised by what we considered good parliamentary authority that this is the only way by which the bill could be considered. We were advised that it is not privileged and could only come in under a rule. Apparently, the gentleman would not want it considered at all.

Mr. KNUTSON. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows there are 319 Democrats in the House, 103 Republicans, 7 Progressives, and 3 Farmer-Laborites. In other words, you have three times as many Members as the three other parties combined [applause], but you cannot be trusted to pass upon a measure of this kind without a gag rule. [Laughter.] Now, applaud that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONAGHAN and Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNUTSON. To my good friend from Montana, who started the fireworks.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Does not the gentleman feel that my rights in this House have been infringed when I have been refused the right to express myself on this, the most important part of the whole program, the rule under which the bill will be considered?

Mr. KNUTSON. Technically, no; morally, yes. [Laughter and applause.]

When we were in control we very rarely brought legislation in under a gag rule. [Laughter.] That is all right, but the RECORD will bear me out. I notice that the proponents of this rule are going to some pains to explain to you that this is an open rule.

Now, do not deceive yourselves. If you adopt this rule, you vote to tie your hands so that you cannot substitute any provisions for section 1 that provides for raising the money through taxation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman is complaining because this measure is brought in under a rule. Will he please say how in the world it could be considered without a rule? To show you how absolutely absurd—

Mr. KNUTSON. I cannot yield for a speech. If the gentleman wants to propound a question, all right.

Mr. WARREN. I want to propound a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think you are taking too much of my time, and I refuse to yield further.

Mr. WARREN. It could only come up, otherwise, on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield for a statement.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KNUTSON. For a question, yes; but not a statement.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Could we not adopt the same procedure we followed when we considered the bonus bill? You then brought in a special rule for the Patman bill and the Andrews bill, so that we could amend the Vinson bill by substituting those two bills. Why do you not do the same thing here?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wish to inquire as to the gentleman's opinion of whether we could, under this rule, substitute H. R. 2827, or the McGroarty bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is H. R. 2827 the gentleman's bill?

Mr. LUNDEEN. H. R. 2827 is the Lundeen bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; you cannot.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If we did not have a rule there would be just 1 hour of debate under the rules of the House, whereas under the rule there is 20 hours of debate.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why could you not bring in a rule to give us 20 hours of debate and let it go at that?

As I look into your faces on this side you appear to me like intelligent people. You look as though you can be trusted, but evidently your leaders feel that you cannot be trusted, and perhaps they know you better than I do. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, just to show how absolutely ridiculous and fallacious the argument made by the gentleman from Minnesota is I call attention of the House to this fact: He is complaining of the wide-open rule brought out on this occasion. Had there been no rule this bill would have been considered on some Calendar Wednesday, and there would have been only 1 hour of general debate on each side on the whole subject. The gentleman from Minnesota knows that, and that shows how entirely ridiculous his argument is. His reason for opposing this rule is absurd on its face.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I wonder how the length of debate would give us a better bill.

Mr. WARREN. The same rules of germaneness would apply then as now.

Mr. MONAGHAN. How about the bonus bill?

Mr. WARREN. That was brought in under a rule.

Mr. MONAGHAN. But a very much more liberal rule than this.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the press of the Nation has heralded this rule as wide open. I agree that it is a wide-open rule technically, but from a practical standpoint it is a rule which accomplishes the same purpose of a stringent gag rule. It prevents this House from discussing and passing on genuine social-security plans.

The argument has been raised here that legislation on social security is just as important, if not more important, than that of the soldiers' bonus. I agree with that statement. The rule on the soldiers' bonus provided that the House could vote for either the Vinson plan, the Patman plan, or the Andrews plan. The Rules Committee brought in a special rule giving the Membership the right to offer any of these plans as amendments in the Committee of the Whole or in the House with two motions to recommit.

Why should not a special rule be adopted, providing the same procedure for this legislation, which is the most important long-range legislation presented before this House in 25 years?

Nobody can deny that the Lundeen bill may be ruled out on a point of order on the ground that it is not germane under this trick rule. Nobody can deny that it will also be argued that the Townsend old-age plan is not germane. As far as the Townsend plan is concerned it may be ruled out because it provides for taxation. It may be held not to be germane because it provides for revenue raising, and the Doughton bill before us has no revenue-raising provisions for Federal old-age provisions. The Townsend plan may be ruled out on a further point according to the Mapes precedent in that it raises revenue by a different method than that in the bill. Why not adopt a special rule making both these plans in order.

Throughout the Nation millions of people are in favor of the McGroarty-Townsend plan, millions of people are in favor of the Lundeen workers' plan. Although I am for H. R. 2827, the Lundeen bill, known as the "workers' bill", and although I am opposed to the Townsend plan because it would impose a sales tax, which is just as bad as the payroll tax imposed under the Doughton bill. I do not care to discuss the merits of any of the plans at this time. I shall do so under general debate. However I do say that the House of Representatives should have an opportunity to vote on these plans and to deliberate on matters which are being discussed by millions of our citizens. We should vote these plans up or down and assume our responsibilities like real Representatives of the people and not dodge issues which millions of Americans have raised throughout the Nation. Their causes should be given a trial before this House and this House should be given an opportunity to pass judgment. We should not hide behind a trick rule. We should face issues squarely. That is our duty and that is why we are here. This rule, in all likelihood will preclude this House from voting on any of these plans. So when you say you are giving us a wide-open rule, you are giving us a wide-open bag; you have got this thing in the bag and you are getting away with it. [Laughter and applause.]

I propose that the only method by which we can amend this rule so as to make the Townsend plan germane and the Lundeen plan germane is to vote down the previous question and then amend this trick rule. We cannot amend this trick rule unless we vote down the previous question. If the previous question is voted down, then I shall propose the following amendment:

On page 1, line 11, after the word "rule", insert "In the consideration of the bill it shall be in order to consider as amendments the provisions of H. R. 2827 (the Lundeen) plan and of H. R. 7154 (the Townsend) plan, notwithstanding any rule of the House."

This will give a real hearing to a great portion of the American people.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The Lundeen bill is a bill that has been reported by a committee of this House?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Exactly. The Labor Committee reported the Lundeen bill favorably. Why should not this House be given an opportunity to discuss and pass on this plan?

Mr. Speaker, you may call this "social security", you may call this a "new deal", you may call it what you please, but it is simply the same old stacked deck of cards that were sent to the laundry 2 years ago to be powdered and polished and

are now being dealt out in the same old manner. You can call it "social security"; you can call it "the new deal." I say to you this is not social security, not a new deal, but it is just a new delusion. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained, this bill did not enjoy privilege. The effect of the rule is to give it a privileged status, thereby making possible consideration at this time. The rule reported and now offered to the House deprives no Member of any privilege or right which he enjoys under the general rules of the House. As a matter of fact, in providing 20 hours' general debate, it enlarges the privileges of the Membership.

It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, most unreasonable for anyone to complain of the action of the Rules Committee in reporting this rule, especially in view of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee, asking for a rule, simply requested such rule as the Rules Committee in its judgment might see fit to grant. That committee reported a rule which preserves to the Members all rights that they enjoy under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Not now. It could not in reason be expected that the Rules Committee would have gone out of its way to the extent of seeking to liberalize the general rules of the House in order to make possible the consideration of some extreme and impossible a measure as is the Townsend plan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], well stated, that the House should have an opportunity to pass on these two measures supported by millions of people in these United States. For instance, H. R. 2827, considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, and reported out, 6 to 1, by that subcommittee, should be included. I have the hearings on that bill before me in which the constitutionality of the workers' unemployment, old-age, and social-security bill is clearly upheld.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sure the gentleman does not want to misstate the facts. The committee reported the bill 7 to 6. Mr. LUNDEEN. I was speaking of the subcommittee when I said the vote was 6 to 1.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, let us get it straight.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Well, my statement is correct; the subcommittee of the Labor Committee favorably reported H. R. 2827 and the full Labor Committee reported the bill out by a majority of one.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. This bill was passed upon favorably by the Committee on Labor, and I put in for a resolution with the Rules Committee and we received no action on it.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the gentleman; and I wish to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that the subcommittee reported the bill out 6 to 1, as I have already stated. The main Committee on Labor passed the bill by a majority of one, which is the vote to which the gentleman from Georgia referred.

These hearings are quite complete. There are 800 pages of testimony of economists and leaders of thought along the line of social security from all over the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say his bill had been reported out by the Committee on Labor?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KNUTSON. It would be an act of discourtesy to the Committee on Labor if we refused to consider it during the consideration of this measure.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I think the gentleman is correct. I think the Committee on Labor is one of the finest committees in this House, and it has as its chairman one of the ablest and finest leaders that American labor has ever had. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Certainly.

Mr. CONNERY. I will say that we are used to the discourtesy to which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] referred.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Since this rule will not permit a vote either upon the Lundeen measure or the McGroarty bill, and since it has 20 hours of debate, is it not a rule that provides for "all bull" and no real bill?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will leave that to the gentleman's own judgment. I wish to say that the thing to do, in my opinion, when the previous question is voted upon, is to vote down the previous question and throw open this rule to amendment. [Applause.] That is what we should do in this House, so that we can vote on the Townsend plan and vote it up or down, as the Members think best, and vote on this Lundeen plan—H. R. 2827—as the House thinks best, either one way or the other.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Is H. R. 2827, known as the "Lundeen bill", an old-age-pension bill?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Unemployment, old-age, and social-security bill.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. But is it distinctly an old-age-pension bill, or does it pension all unemployed.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It covers the unemployed and old-age pensions.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Let us get this straight. It is not strictly an old-age-pension bill.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It is an unemployment, old-age, and social-insurance bill.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes.

Mr. TRUAX. If we vote for this rule then we preclude the consideration of the Lundeen workers' bill and the Townsend old-age bill. We shut the door against those two bills.

Mr. LUNDEEN. In my opinion we do, and that is based on the judgment of the best parliamentarians of the House of Representatives. I hope we can persuade the leaders of the majority to permit a vote on the Lundeen bill (H. R. 2827) and the Townsend bill (H. R. 7154), introduced by Representative MCGROARTY. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN].

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] and say that I have the profoundest respect for him. His action in granting these 3 minutes is proof to me of what I have always thought—that he is one of the most sportsmanlike, as well as one of the most brilliant, men in the House. [Applause.]

The reason that I rise in opposition to this rule is quite simple. It is regarded generally by those who know that, even while opportunity is presented here for amendment, the amendments desired to be offered will be ruled out, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has so well stated, as not being germane to the bill under consideration. It is further true that there is a right to a motion to recommit, but that right goes by proper rule to the minority side of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, with the power in their hands to offer an innocuous

and harmless motion and thereby defeat any bill such as the Lundeen bill or the McGroarty bill, or any other type of social-security bill.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGHAN. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. And may I suggest that even if the minority should offer on a motion to recommit the revised McGroarty bill, it would be held not germane, the same as it would be if it were offered as an amendment to the bill, so that the right to recommit gives the people no right whatever so far as putting in a substitute for the administration bill is concerned.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGHAN. Yes; always, to my good friend from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. A motion to recommit is subject to amendment. I looked that up the other day. One can offer an amendment to a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman begins, will he yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In view of statements that have been made to the effect of a vote for the rule having the same effect as a vote against the so-called "Lundeen and McGroarty bills", what has the gentleman to say?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot interpret that. That is a parliamentary question which should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I thought the gentleman was a good parliamentarian.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of excitement about this rule. It has been stated many times that it is a wide-open rule and that is what it is, and no one by talking from now until doomsday can convince anybody with reason that it is not. No more wide-open rule could be devised. It is just a form. The committee clerk draws it when told to bring out an open rule and that is all it is. The Ways and Means Committee, different from the time when we had up for consideration the bonus bill, left the matter entirely to the Committee on Rules. So far as the bonus bill is concerned, I might say that the Committee on Ways and Means requested the Rules Committee to make the Patman bill in order.

Why a rule? As has been said, you would never consider this legislation during this session of Congress without a rule. The bill has no privileged status. While it has partial revenue features in it, it does not come within clause 45 of rule XI which makes bills raising revenue in order. So a rule is necessary.

There has been a lot of talk here for weeks and weeks about gag rules on this measure. I am disclosing no confidence when I say that many of us, including the Speaker and myself, have stood against any gag rule for the consideration of this measure, and let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] that this is a pension bill in a great measure. I do not know whether the distinguished orator from Minnesota was ever on a pensions committee, but I have an idea that at one time he was chairman of a pensions committee. In the whole history of Congress no pension bill was ever brought in otherwise than under suspension of the rules, with 40 minutes of debate, no amendments permitted, no motion to recommit, with every rule of the House suspended. That is the way it was always brought in under Republican administration.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman said the Ways and Means Committee requested that the Patman bill be made germane to the Vinson bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. The Committee on Labor asked a rule from the Committee on Rules after favorably reporting the Lundeen bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let me say right there that we hear a lot of criticism of the Rules Committee in the House here and we are supposed to take it. My information as to the Lundeen bill is that in the gentleman's committee a vote was taken to table the measure and that vote was 7 to 7.

Mr. CONNERY. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Seven to seven to table it. That did not carry and one member who voted to table the measure left the room and the bill was reported out on a vote of 7 to 6. Further, I do not recall that the gentleman has ever asked me or approached the Rules Committee to give even a hearing on the Lundeen bill.

Mr. CONNERY. Does not the gentleman want me to state the situation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not the time to go into that now.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman referred to me.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If I am not correct, I stand corrected.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman want me to mention private conversations we have had about the Lundeen bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I must be mistaken. The gentleman must be correct when he states he did mention the subject to me.

Mr. CONNERY. I have mentioned it to the gentleman three or four times. I am not going to say what the gentleman said, except there was no chance for the Lundeen bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am perfectly willing that the Lundeen bill be made in order on this bill. I hope it is in order and I hope the Townsend plan is in order on this bill.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. I know the gentleman is a good parliamentarian. I ask the gentleman to tell the House whether or not he thinks the Lundeen bill or the Townsend plan bill, either, is germane to this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is now asking me to go into a matter which I have not gone into. Nobody is entitled to stand on the floor of the House and say that either the Townsend plan or the Lundeen plan is not germane to this bill. The Parliamentarian has a stack of bills yet to examine. Some Member will preside as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and will pass upon these questions as they rise. Off-hand, I will say now that I think the Townsend plan is germane, although I attach little importance to my opinion because I have not sufficiently studied the bill. I hope it is, so I can vote against it. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is always possible to appeal from a decision of the Chair? I would call the gentleman's attention to this additional fact also, that in the matter of the bonus question we had but one bill and not, as in the present instance, a bill with several parts. The two situations are entirely different. My own personal opinion is in complete harmony with that of the distinguished gentleman from New York, that this being a bill of several parts, not one particular bill, but several bills in one, either one of those bills is in order as an additional part of this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope they are.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not time, I am sorry.

There is no man in the House for whom I hold more affection than the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN]. It must be remembered, however, that the tactics here today of voting down a rule, and the tactics of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN] yesterday in objection to my request to have until midnight to file a rule, were against this bill. If these tactics succeed, no Townsendite, no Lundeenite, no lift-the-burden-off-the-Federal-Governmentite would ever get a chance to consider this bill.

I did not know that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN] was the leader of the Townsendites. I thought my beloved friend the poet laureate of California, JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY, had introduced the bill and led his valiant fight for the Townsend plan. I did not know until yesterday that Dr. Townsend, who is now presiding in all his dignity over this House, had selected the young admiral from Montana [laughter] to lead his forces in this battle.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Briefly.

Mr. MONAGHAN. The gentleman does know, however, that my interest in old-age pensions antedates the Townsend plan or any other plan.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did not know that.

Mr. MONAGHAN. And that it dates back to the time when the railroad retirement bill had to be fought through Congress against the united and combined opposition of the leadership of both House and Senate.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Something has been said about an innocuous motion to recommit. Wait until you see it. The motion to recommit will be to strike out the heart of this bill. It will not be any perfunctory motion, and that motion is in the hands of the minority.

What would you have us do? Would you have us hold the N. R. A. bill, the banking bill, and other bills are germane to this bill? Would you tear up Jefferson's Manual just to suit those who have sent all this propaganda throughout the country?

Mr. MONAGHAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would not.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Under one plan only 6,000,000 people would be eligible for old-age pensions instead of 22,000,000 and we would have the spectacle of sons and daughters giving up supporting their parents and wanting the Federal Government to support them. We of the great State of New York take care of our deserving aged people, but we do not deceive and delude them. There is going to be a day of reckoning for the people who are advocating this Townsend plan when our poor, distressed, desperate people wake up to the situation and find the snare and the delusion they have been drawn into. [Applause.]

Mr. MONAGHAN. May I say to the gentleman—

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

Mr. MONAGHAN. There will be a day of reckoning for those advocating the delusion plan suggested.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the rules provide that a Member desiring to interrogate the Member who has the floor must first address himself to the Chair and obtain consent of the gentleman addressing the House. [Applause.] It is highly improper, although indulged in practically all the time, for a Member to rise and interrupt the Member addressing the House without first addressing the Chair and obtaining consent of the gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. For a brief question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. When it comes to the question of despair, does not the gentleman from New York believe that the imposition of a pay-roll tax which eventually will fall on the employees will bring greater despair than the despair the gentleman describes?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That I do not know. The gentleman from New York knows that the great Empire State has never neglected its aged and its children; and we do not have to depend upon the Federal Government to take care of our people.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is only so far as the State of New York goes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, we have been struggling with this problem for at least 10 days. We have done what we thought was the very best thing to do.

I have seen statements in the paper that the administration was in favor of a gag rule. That is not the fact. The

administration does not intrude into the province of this House and tell it how to conduct its business.

Mr. Speaker, we allotted 20 hours of general debate. I hope the members of the Ways and Means Committee will stay on the floor. I hope the membership as a whole will stay here and give attention to the consideration of this bill. This bill probably should be perfected. There may be mistakes, errors, and fallacies in it, so we appeal to the membership to stay here during its consideration. We hope every opportunity for debate will be granted. We hope that every amendment may be offered, in spite of what has been said here today. Whoever presides in that chair as Chairman must rule in accordance with the precedents of the House, and if I am the only man left alive I am going to stand against the day when you take the Manual of that beloved Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, and tear it into shreds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNERY. On the previous question, would a vote of "no" leave the rule open for amendment?

The SPEAKER. And debate, of course.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Thirty-six Members have risen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 188, noes 54.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 177, noes 50.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-three Members have risen; a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 288, nays 103, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]
YEAS—288

Adair	Cole, Md.	Eckert	Hess
Allen	Cole, N. Y.	Edmiston	Higgins, Conn.
Arnold	Colmer	Elcher	Higgins, Mass.
Ashbrook	Cooley	Ellenbogen	Hill, Ala.
Barden	Cooper, Tenn.	Evans	Hill, Samuel B.
Beam	Corning	Faddis	Hobbs
Belter	Cox	Farley	Hoffman
Berlin	Cravens	Fenerty	Holmes
Biermann	Crosby	Ferguson	Hope
Blackney	Cross, Tex.	Fernandez	Huddleston
Bland	Crowe	Fiesinger	Igoe
Blanton	Crowther	Fitzpatrick	Imhoff
Bloom	Cullen	Fletcher	Jacobsen
Boehne	Cummings	Focht	Jenkins, Ohio
Bolleau	Daly	Ford, Calif.	Johnson, Okla.
Boland	Darden	Ford, Miss.	Johnson, Tex.
Bolton	Darrow	Frey	Johnson, W. Va.
Boylan	Dear	Fuller	Jones
Brennan	Deen	Fulmer	Kee
Brooks	Delaney	Gasque	Keller
Brown, Ga.	Dempsey	Gassaway	Kelly
Brunner	Dickstein	Gavagan	Kenney
Buchanan	Dies	Gillette	Kerr
Buck	Dietrich	Gingery	Kimball
Bulwinkle	Dingell	Goodwin	Kinzer
Burch	Disney	Granfield	Kleberg
Caldwell	Ditter	Gray, Ind.	Kloeb
Cannon, Mo.	Dobbins	Green	Kniffin
Carden	Dondero	Greenwood	Kocialkowski
Carmichael	Dorsey	Greever	Kopplemann
Cartwright	Doughton	Gregory	Lambertson
Cary	Doxey	Guyer	Lambeth
Casey	Drewry	Haines	Lanham
Castellow	Driscoll	Halleck	Larrabee
Celler	Driver	Hamlin	Lea, Calif.
Chandler	Duffey, Ohio	Hancock, N. Y.	Lee, Okla.
Citron	Duffy, N. Y.	Harlan	Lehlbach
Claiborne	Duncan	Hart	Lewis, Colo.
Clark, N. C.	Dunn, Miss.	Harter	Lloyd
Cochran	Eagle	Healy	Lord
Coffee	Eaton	Hennings	Lucas

Lucky	O'Day	Robinson, Utah	Taylor, Tenn.
McAndrews	O'Leary	Robison, Ky.	Terry
McClellan	Oliver	Rogers, N. H.	Thom
McCormack	O'Neal	Rogers, Okla.	Thomason
McGehee	Owen	Romulus	Thompson
McKeough	Palmisano	Rudd	Tinkham
McLaughlin	Parks	Sabath	Tonry
McLeod	Parsons	Sanders, La.	Treadway
McReynolds	Patman	Sanders, Tex.	Turner
McSwain	Patton	Sandlin	Turnip
Mahon	Pearson	Schaefer	Turpin
Maloney	Peterson, Fla.	Schuets	Umstead
Mansfield	Peterson, Ga.	Schuets	Utterback
Mapes	Pfelfer	Sears	Vinson, Ga.
Marshall	Pierce	Shanley	Vinson, Ky.
Mason	Plumley	Sisson	Wadsworth
May	Polk	Smith, Conn.	Walter
Mead	Quinn	Smith, Va.	Warren
Merritt, N. Y.	Rabaut	Smith, W. Va.	Wearin
Millard	Ramsay	Snell	Weaver
Miller	Ramspeck	Snyder	Whelchel
Mitchell, Ill.	Randolph	Somers, N. Y.	Whittington
Mitchell, Tenn.	Rankin	South	Wilcox
Montague	Ransley	Spence	Williams
Montet	Reece	Stack	Wilson, La.
Moran	Reed, N. Y.	Starnes	Wilson, Pa.
Nelson	Reilly	Sullivan	Wolcott
Nichols	Rich	Sumners, Tex.	Wood
O'Brien	Richards	Tarver	Woodruff
O'Connell	Richardson	Taylor, Colo.	Woodrum
O'Connor	Robertson	Taylor, S. C.	Young
			Zimmerman

NAYS—103

Amle	Culkin	Lemke	Sadowski
Andresen	Dirksen	Ludlow	Sauthoff
Andrews, N. Y.	Dockweller	Lundeen	Schneider
Arends	Doutrich	McFarlane	Scott
Ayers	Dunn, Pa.	McGrath	Scrugham
Bacon	Ekwall	McGroarty	Secrest
Binderup	Engel	Maas	Short
Brewster	Englebright	Marcantonio	Sirovich
Buckbee	Gearhart	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Wash.
Buckler, Minn.	Cehrmann	Martin, Mass.	Stefan
Burdick	Gifford	Massingale	Stubbs
Burnham	Gilchrist	Maverick	Sutphin
Carlson	Gildea	Merritt, Conn.	Taber
Carpenter	Gray, Pa.	Michener	Thurston
Carter	Greenway	Monaghan	Tobey
Cavicchia	Gwynne	Moritz	Tolan
Christianson	Hildebrandt	Mott	Truax
Church	Hill, Knute	Murdock	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Hoepfel	O'Malley	Welch
Colden	Hollister	Patterson	Werner
Collins	Hook	Perkins	White
Connery	Houston	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Cooper, Ohio	Hull	Powers	Withrow
Costello	Kahn	Reed, Ill.	Wolverton
Crawford	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.	Zioncheck
Crosser, Ohio	Kramer	Ryan	

NOT VOTING—40

Andrew, Mass.	Flannagan	Lamneck	Russell
Bacharach	Gambrill	Lesinski	Seger
Bankhead	Goldsborough	Lewis, Md.	Shannon
Bell	Griswold	McLean	Steagall
Brown, Mich.	Hancock, N. C.	McMillan	Stewart
Buckley, N. Y.	Hartley	Meeks	Sweeney
Cannon, Wis.	Jerckes, Ind.	Norton	Thomas
Chapman	Kennedy, Md.	Pettengill	Underwood
DeRouen	Kennedy, N. Y.	Peyster	West
Fish	Kvale	Rayburn	Wolfenden

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Bacharach.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Stewart.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Thomas.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. McLean.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Wolfenden.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Kvale.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. West.
 Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Meeks with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Underwood with Mrs. Jenckes of Indiana.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Russell.
 Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Shannon with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Peyster.

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ARENDS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M'GROARTY BILL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as one in favor of the McGroarty bill, I desire that the Record show at this point that I voted against the previous question on the rule to consider the security bill.

April 11, 1935

state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7260) to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a social-security board; to raise revenue; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7260, with Mr. McREYNOLDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, as this is one of the most important measures coming before the Congress for consideration at this session and, perhaps, as important as any measure that the Congress in recent years has been called upon to consider, I prefer not to be interrupted until I have finished my statement. However, I shall not decline to yield. It is my purpose, so far as I may be able to do so, to explain the purposes and the provisions of this bill and I desire to do so in as consecutive a manner as I am capable of doing.

The social-security bill (H. R. 7260), which has been favorably reported by the Ways and Means Committee, is based upon the recommendations of the President in his message to both Houses of Congress on January 17 of this year, and the detailed report and recommendations of his Committee on Economic Security, which was transmitted at that time.

Nearly a year ago, on June 8, the President transmitted a message to Congress advocating social-security legislation, and shortly thereafter he created, by Executive order, a committee consisting of the Secretary of Labor as chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, instructing his committee to make a comprehensive study of the many factors in our industrial life which lead to dependency and destitution, and to recommend appropriate measures which would provide protection against these causes of insecurity.

The Ways and Means Committee, to whom these recommendations for legislation were referred, held hearings on the subject for 3 weeks, at which time all persons desiring to be heard were given an opportunity to express their opinions. The record of the public hearings fills a volume of over 1,100 pages. Practically every person appearing before the committee was in favor of the broad purposes of the economic-security program, and their criticisms were directed to particular features of it rather than to its fundamental purposes. These criticisms have been taken into account in the thorough revision made by the committee. Following the hearings, the Ways and Means Committee worked over this legislation in executive session for more than a month, and carefully considered every part and phase of the broad problem of social security. The proposed bill has been entirely rewritten, and important modifications have been made at many points. The fundamental recommendations of the President and his Committee on Economic Security, however, are embodied in the new bill reported to you by the Ways and Means Committee.

I do not believe since I have been a Member of this body any bill that has been considered by the Congress has been given more thorough, more careful, or more painstaking consideration, or where broader latitude has been afforded to everyone desiring to be heard and express his view than has been the case in the consideration of this legislation.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

The proposed bill has been entirely rewritten and many important modifications made, as I believe will be testified to by each member of the committee.

The proposed bill presents a broad plan for social security, embracing measures for (1) protection against destitution and dependency in old age, (2) unemployment compensation, (3) security for children, and (4) increased public health protection. These measures of protection against the principle causes of destitution and dependency, taken together, in conjunction with the immediate program of public works, and with the cooperation of the States, will provide a coordinated plan for social security. It is of great importance that the many overlapping phases of insecurity should be approached in this manner, rather than through separate piecemeal proposals.

The social-security bill is one of the most important measures ever placed before Congress for its consideration. While it is designed to enhance very greatly the security of the American worker and to provide a larger measure of social justice, it does so within the scope of our existing economic order. In no way does it resemble the many panaceas and nostrums which propose that we legislate ourselves into prosperity by lifting ourselves by our bootstraps, and which would upset our established economic and political institutions. The fact that several of these proposals have attracted a wide-spread following implies a threat to our existing institutions which should not be regarded lightly.

We do not claim the bill under consideration to be a perfect measure, nor one that will not require amendment from time to time, in the light of experience, but, in view of the present very great lack of economic security of the American worker, it represents a long step forward and a step which we cannot wisely postpone.

The social-security program of the administration is an attempt to mitigate and to prevent the distress and suffering which so frequently arise from our industrial economy. So long as the country was largely agricultural, and industry was conducted on a small scale, there was relatively little need for such measures of protection as the social-security bill will provide. The insecurity of the worker arising from unemployment and dependency in old age was much less than at present. The industrialization of society, the development of large corporations, the increasing use of machinery, the great number of unemployed, as well as the increasing number of persons dependent in old age, make it necessary that we take measures which will restore to the American worker and his family the degree of social security which he formerly enjoyed.

Today we see frightful evidence of insecurity on every hand. The fact that more than 15,000,000 persons are receiving unemployment relief is perhaps our most striking evidence of insecurity. Nearly a million of these persons are over 65 years of age. A much larger number are over 50 years of age, and have little prospect of ever again becoming employed. Nine million of the persons on relief are children under 16 years of age, many of whom have never known what it is to have a regular wage earner in the family. It is estimated that at present 10,000,000 wage earners are unemployed, although only about half of these are receiving unemployment relief.

As long as this large number are unemployed and dependent on public charity for their sustenance, the great mass of American families, those in which there are employed wage earners, can feel no real security.

The existence of such a large relief problem, the presence of insecurity on such a vast scale, is a serious threat to our economic order. We must certainly deplore the extent to which large masses of our people are weighed down by privation and suffering, and we cannot overlook the grave social danger implied in the deterioration and pauperization of a large section of our population. We cannot afford to delay further the legislation which is necessary to protect our American workers against the many hazards of our industrial order which lead to huge relief rolls and threaten the foundations of our society.

The social-security program of the administration grew out of a determination to find a better way of dealing with the causes which have brought about the present acute situation. It should not be regarded as a substitute for relief, for there will always be the necessity for some public charity. It will not benefit immediately all of those now on relief, but other protection is provided for them. What the bill will do is this: Relieve much of the present distress and greatly lessen the incidence of destitution and dependency in future years.

The essential feature of the social-security bill is that of social insurance against the principal hazards or risks which have caused American families to become dependent upon relief. These causes are well known: (1) Unemployment, (2) old age, (3) lack of a breadwinner in families with young children, and (4) sickness. The bill includes comprehensive measures against all but the last of these. Measures proposed to furnish protection against the risks arising out of old age and unemployment are usually called social insurance. Social insurance protects the worker and his family against dependency by enabling them, with the help of their employers, to build up reserves which may be used during periods of unemployment and in old age. Protection for the family with young children under 16 lacking a wage earner, is provided through Government funds rather than through social insurance.

The principle of insurance is familiar to all of us. No country in the world is more insurance-minded than we are, as evidenced by the statistics upon the amount of insurance in effect in this country. Certainly everyone will recognize that the greatest economic risk facing the average American family today is that of unemployment. There should be no argument as to the social desirability for applying the principle of insurance against this risk. Let no one say that insurance against these serious social dangers is contrary to our institutions, or that it will undermine the integrity of the American citizen.

The advantages of social insurance over public relief are many. It does not carry with it the stigma of charity with its devastating effect on the morale of our population and its loss of self-respect. The protection afforded by social insurance comes to the worker as a matter of right. It is contingent upon the previous employment and contributions of the worker himself and does not involve the social investigation and the means test which is inevitable in any system of public relief. Contrary to the mistaken impression of many persons, social insurance does not place a premium upon idleness. Quite the contrary. The worker's right to benefits is conditioned upon his previous employment, and social insurance will do nothing to break down the sacred American tradition of self-reliance and initiative.

Social insurance quite justifiably places on industry itself a part of the burden of unemployment. Under suitable legislation, industry can and will be encouraged to go far toward stabilization and regularization of employment. Social insurance will be beneficial to society as well as to the worker himself. It upholds the purchasing power of the great mass of wage earners upon which the welfare of our industrial order is so greatly dependent. It counteracts deflationary tendencies particularly at the outset of a depression and does much to allay its most disastrous effects. In providing individuals with a real sense of security, it has a social effect of the utmost significance.

Social insurance is now in operation in most of the industrial countries of the world. Some of these countries have had social insurance for as long as 50 years; and the device has an even older history, going back for a hundred years or more in the private systems of European labor organizations. In this country labor organizations and individual employers have operated social-insurance systems on a limited scale for a number of years, but we are one of the latest of the industrial countries to consider social insurance on a broad governmental basis. Practically every other progressive country in the world has not merely one form of social insurance, but a fairly complete system, covering several types of risks not covered in the proposed legislation.

We may very profitably avail ourselves of European experience and avoid many of the mistakes which have been made there. The proposed social-security bill, while based upon careful study of the social-insurance systems of other countries, is not a copy of foreign institutions except in broad outlines. It is designed to fit our own conditions, and economic and political institutions. Our neighboring country to the north—Canada—is now considering very similar legislation proposed by the prime minister. Canada has had Dominion old-age-pension legislation for a number of years.

One of the major features of the social-security bill is protection against dependency and want in old age. This is covered by two titles of the bill. Title I provides for Federal aid to the States for old-age assistance, commonly called "old-age pensions." Title II provides for old-age benefits out of the Federal Treasury, based upon the employment of the wage earner during his lifetime of productive years of work. These represent two separate but complementary provisions for old-age security: The first making provision for persons who are already old and dependent and have passed their span of productive years; the second, for a form of old-age security whereby the employed person who is not yet old may in the future receive benefits which will support him in old age.

Title I, providing for Federal aid to the States for old-age pensions, authorizes an appropriation of \$49,750,000 for the next fiscal year, and as much thereafter as may be required. It is assumed that there will be a considerable lag before the State systems are fully operative, and the appropriation required for the first fiscal year is accordingly much smaller than will be required after a year or so when the States have their systems in full swing.

A number of factors combine to make old-age dependency one of our greatest social problems. The number of aged persons in our population has been increasing for several decades. In 1930 there were 6,500,000 persons in this country over 65 years of age. Within the next 35 years it is estimated that this number will more than double, reaching a total of 15 million persons. Not only is the number of aged persons rapidly increasing, but the percentage of persons over 65 years of age to the total population is also rapidly mounting. In 1860 only 2.7 percent of our population was over 65 years of age; by 1930 it had increased to 5.4, and it is estimated that by 1970 it will be over 10 percent. The old-age problem is not a numerical problem alone. The amount of dependency among aged persons is also rapidly increasing. The plight of the aged wage earner who has lost his job is only too well known. Industry demands younger workers, with the result that wage earners find it increasingly difficult to secure employment after the age of 40 or 50.

At the present time it is estimated that approximately half of the 6,500,000 persons over 65 years of age in this country are dependent upon others—approximately one million receiving public relief. The others are being cared for by relatives and friends or are without sufficient means but too proud to accept public assistance except as a last resort. It is extremely doubtful whether more than a few of this number will ever again be self-supporting. The number of persons now over 50 years of age receiving public relief is much larger. Of this group, many if not most will never be able to find suitable employment again. Those who do will be employed at a very great reduction in the wages formerly enjoyed. Even with the return of prosperity, we may be quite sure that the old-age problem will become more and more acute as time goes on. Millions of workers now middle-aged or approaching old age have seen their lifetime earnings swept away during the depression and now face old age with a degree of insecurity never known heretofore.

The problem calls for immediate action to relieve the suffering and distress of those who are already old and who have been the victims of our economic disorders; but it calls further for a wise long-time plan of action which will be practicable, which will be within our economic ability, and

which will provide in the future a maximum of security to the individual against old-age dependency.

There is a wide-spread demand throughout the country for a better and more humane and self-respecting method of caring for our dependent aged persons. The serious shortcomings of the care provided old persons in our poorhouses and the unhappy stigma attached to these institutions has rendered them unacceptable to public-minded persons for years. Twenty-nine States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii have provided for State old-age assistance, commonly called "old-age pensions", based on the policy that needy old persons should be maintained in their own homes rather than subjected to institutional treatment. It must be recognized that the aged person in need of public assistance is in a different class from the ordinary relief case. There is no question of returning him to society as a wage earner. His time of gainful employment has passed. There is a wide-spread sentiment that the assistance granted him should not carry the stigma of pauper's relief. There is a growing feeling also that society can afford to take care of its needy aged upon a more adequate and more respectable basis than heretofore and should retire these persons from competition with younger workers seeking employment.

Since the first State old-age-pension law was enacted in 1923, the movement has spread rapidly. Although, as has been said, 29 States and 2 Territories have such laws, many of them are inoperative for lack of funds or are limited to a few of the wealthier counties of the State.

The problem of dependency in old age is primarily a State and local responsibility, though we must not overlook its national or interstate aspect. Relatively few persons now reside within the same State throughout their lifetime. Old-age pensions supported exclusively by the State and local governments mean that only the wealthier States and the wealthier communities within those States will actually be able to provide such aid. In other communities old-age pensions can be provided only at the expense of the schools or other essential functions of government. The need for Federal aid is so obvious that it hardly requires statement.

Title I of the social-security bill provides Federal aid to State old-age-pension plans up to 50 percent of their expenditures for this purpose but not exceeding \$15 per month per person, and authorizes an appropriation of \$49,750,000 for the first year. With the anticipated lag in securing full operation of the State systems, it is estimated that the appropriation needed for the first year will be less than half of what will be needed thereafter. In fact, it is believed that the amount necessary will rise rapidly as the State systems become effective, and that within a few years the Federal Government will have to contribute several times this amount. The actuaries of the Committee on Economic Security have estimated that with the pensions as recommended, the total cost of old-age pensions will mount to \$800,000,000 within 10 years, half of which would be borne by the Federal Government. These estimates are probably high, but they indicate the very great financial burden of old-age assistance even upon a moderate scale. They show conclusively the need for Federal aid to the States to make old-age pensions possible.

The bill enumerates a certain number of minimum requirements with which the State old-age pension plans must conform in order to qualify for Federal aid. These provisions, which apply alike to Federal aid for old-age pensions and aid to dependent children, do not authorize the Federal agency to arbitrarily cut off the grants to any State. In fact, these provisions limit very strictly the supervisory powers of the Social Security Board over the States, and provide a maximum of State control in these matters. The Federal standards or conditions included in the law may, indeed, be regarded as minimum conditions, leaving to the States the determination of policies, the detailed administration, the amount of aid which shall be given, and questions of personnel. The proposed bill goes further in granting full discretion and authority to the States than any similar Federal-aid legislation within recent years. What the Federal Government is saying to the States in this legisla-

tion is, in effect, we will match your expenditures for these purposes.

The social-security bill also provides that the State old-age-pensions laws must permit the granting of pensions to persons 65 years of age or over, but permits the existing State laws which have a 70-year age minimum to remain in operation until 1940. States may not require more than 5 years' residence during the preceding 9 years and, under the terms of the bill, must not deny pensions to United States citizens who are otherwise qualified. These provisions are designed to liberalize the State laws. With the Federal Government bearing 50 percent of the cost, it is entirely appropriate that the States be required to modify their present long-residence requirements. These were perhaps necessary safeguards so long as the pensions were paid wholly from State funds, but they frequently cause considerable hardship and are unnecessary and unwise with 50-percent Federal support.

The grants in aid to the States for old-age pensions will enable the States already having such laws to make more generous grants and to care for a larger number of their dependent aged persons. They will also stimulate the remaining States to enact such laws. This part of the program wisely builds upon the existing system. It recognizes the primary responsibility of local and State governments for the care of their dependents but concedes that it is a national responsibility as well. It takes into account the variations in standards and in cost of living in different parts of the country and permits the development of old-age pensions designed to meet these conditions. The greatest protection to the Federal Treasury and to all taxpayers in this system is the requirement that the State and local governments assume one-half of the cost. If the Federal Government were to go further and take over the entire problem of old-age pensions, as is advocated by some, it would be contrary to our fundamental political institutions and would place upon the National Government a tremendous financial burden without the protection of local vigilance which will prevail if local taxpayers are required to bear part of the cost.

This is a practical program which can be put into operation without delay. It is well within the financial ability of the Nation and will advance, rather than retard, economic recovery. It will provide care for needy old persons immediately in the 29 States which have such laws, and, in the remaining States, will do so as rapidly as the necessary legislation is enacted. While this program may be attacked on the ground that the old-age pensions are not generous enough, it should be borne in mind that on the scale proposed, they will be the most generous in the world. No limit is placed by the Federal Government on the pensions which any State may pay. The only limitation is upon that part of the pension which will be paid by the Federal Government.

This measure of protection for needy old persons does not represent a new outlay but rather a better method of caring for these persons than the present method of emergency relief.

While the value of old-age pensions as a means of providing for dependent aged persons is well recognized, we must, nevertheless, clearly understand its limitations. It can never be other than a form of public charity, to be granted to persons who are in need. The amounts which can be provided will always necessarily be small. Even upon a moderate scale the financial burden of gratuitous old-age pensions will tend to increase rapidly with the increasing number of old persons and the anticipated increase in dependency. Actuaries of the Committee on Economic Security estimate that within another generation the cost of old-age pensions alone, at an average of \$25 per person per month, would amount to over two and one-half billion dollars annually, or nearly as much as the normal operating cost of the Federal Government. If we provide only for these old-age pensions, we may be sure that constant pressure will be exerted always to increase them. In order to avoid this huge cost, it is necessary to set up a system of old-age benefits by which the worker will receive benefits as a matter of right rather than

as a public charity and in an amount much more adequate than is possible with gratuitous old-age pensions.

Practically every other country in the world which has established free old-age pensions has also found it necessary to set up a system of old-age insurance. If our constitutional limitations did not prevent, this would be, for us as well, unquestionably the best basis for old-age security. It is an infinitely more satisfactory and self-respecting method from the point of view of the worker. It stimulates thrift.

The old-age pension provisions of this bill contained in title I provide for State participation, and the Federal Government will contribute to the States on a 50-50 basis up to \$15 a month per person. The State governments can make the amount as large as they please. They can provide for a pension of \$15 or \$20 or \$30 or \$50, but the Federal Government will participate on a 50-50 basis up to \$30 per month in the aggregate.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. With respect to a State that has no old-age-pension law at present, is there any provision in this measure for these Federal funds to be available until such time as the State passes its law?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; there are 29 States that now have such laws, and it is supposed that the other States will immediately proceed to enact legislation to conform to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GREEN. And during the grace period there is no Federal benefit?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No.

Mr. FIESINGER. The gentleman just stated "\$30 in the aggregate." Does that refer to the amount that the State provides?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; the States can go as high as they please.

Mr. FIESINGER. But the Government does not go over \$30?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; the Government will not contribute over \$15. The amount to be paid is left to the determination of the State. One State can have one rate and another State a different rate, because in certain sections of the country it takes a larger amount to provide for those dependent and destitute than in other sections of the country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman reached the point in his discussion where it is agreeable to him to yield for questions?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I would prefer to conclude my statement, but I shall not decline to yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question right there?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The State of New York today is paying \$30 a month. Assuming this measure is passed providing \$15 by the Government, the State of New York can continue paying the \$30, plus \$15, bringing it up to a total of \$45.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. There is nothing in this bill that will prevent any State from paying pensions at any amount they desire.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. Does not the gentleman feel that if the United States Government recognizes the responsibility as a national one, it would be fairer for the United States Government to pay a certain basic amount and then let the States add to that where they are able to do so? In other words, the richer States could then augment this sum to any extent they saw fit, while in the poorer States that might not have money to add to it, the people of such States would not be deprived of this national aid which we are trying to give them.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If all the burden were placed upon the Federal Government we all know that would be unfair to the States that did participate.

Mr. COX. Would not the effect of a law of that kind manifestly be to put the entire burden on the Federal Government?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Absolutely. More than that, if the Federal Government should make the entire contribution, then, of course, the Government would insist on Federal administration, whereas this bill provides State administration.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. We have a constitutional provision in my State which says that the State cannot contribute to old-age pensions, but the counties can. Is there anything in this bill that would prevent matching that fund?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. That arrangement could be made, but the bill provides that there must be some participation by the States.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That would have to be done through cooperation by the State and county.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, it is necessary for every State to provide for a pension for the aged.

Mr. DOUGHTON. States must do so to receive Federal grants. That is under title I.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Under title I, do I understand that the State must provide as much money as the Government; in other words, must the State provide \$15 to match the \$15 of the Government?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, yes; it may do more, but it cannot do less and receive Federal aid.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. If the State gives \$10, then the Federal Government only gives \$10.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understood the gentleman, a number of States have old-age pensions?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Twenty-nine States and two Territories.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that it is necessary for the State to pass old-age-pension laws before it can receive aid under title I. If they have a law, and it is not operative, that gives them no right to the fund.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct. Their laws must operate in order to get the Federal aid.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further for me to ask a question touching title I of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COX. As I interpret section 1 of title I, the benefit under the law is altogether on the statement of need.

The bill says:

For the purpose of enabling each to furnish financial assistance assuring, as far as practicable, a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health to aged individuals without such subsistence—

And so forth.

I presume that the benefits under this title are all on the basis of need.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. If the gentleman will permit, the need is to be determined under the State law.

Mr. COX. Yes; and I presume the need of one State establishing one rule of law and of another State establishing another, the general Government, of course, would recognize the law of the State.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is one of the benefits of State participation. If it were altogether from the Federal Government, it would have to be uniform.

Mr. COX. In the report on the bill I find a statement that there are about seven and one-half million people in the country at this time over 65 years of age. If all of those were to come under the provisions of the law, it would mean an expenditure on the part of the general Government alone of \$1,350,000,000 annually. What percentage of the seven and one-half million does the gentleman contem-

plate will come under the provisions of the law? You say in another place in the report that there are about a million now depending upon the public for charity.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The majority of those are on relief. Mr. COX. On relief. What percentage of the total seven and one-half million does the gentleman figure would come under the provisions of title I?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I think it is fair to state, and I am sure the chairman will agree, that the best evidence presented to the committee while this matter was given very careful and thorough consideration, is to the effect that experience has shown that about one-third of the people of the age limit may reasonably be expected to be able to qualify eventually. It was also shown to the committee that in some States where they have some of the best and most effective and successful old-age-pension plans now in effect, about one-fourth of those of the age limit have been able to qualify.

Mr. COX. If one-third of the seven and one-half million should qualify, it would mean a present charge upon the General Government of around \$500,000,000.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. Seven and a half million is the number over 65. About 1,000,000 of those are dependent.

Mr. COX. The studies of the committee disclose that probably a third or a fourth of the total would come under the law. If that be true, then it would mean an amount above \$400,000,000 to provide for them.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. At the present time there are 29 States and 2 Territories that have old-age-pension laws. The total annual expenditure under the existing laws of the States total \$31,000,000 plus. Take, for instance, the State of Ohio. There are eligible for old-age pensions in the State of Ohio 414,000 people. As a matter of fact, after this plan has been in operation for a number of months there are 24,000 people who have qualified under the State law with restrictions that the State legislature throws around the law, and the expenditures there amount to something like \$31,000,000 annually.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Table 2 on page 5 of the report shows the number of eligible age, 1930, in the third column, to be 2,330,390. In the column immediately preceding that is shown the number of pensioners and they amount to 180,003. That is out of a total number of eligibles, 2,330,390.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. And might I add that the Ohio rate is practically \$14 per month.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. To make an observation in connection with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky. I wonder if any very safe conclusion can be arrived at from the experience of the States. For example, Michigan has an old-age-pension law, but the legislature in passing the law made very inadequate provision for raising the money with which to pay the pensions, so that the number actually receiving pensions under that law is very insignificant as compared to the number who would be able to qualify to receive them if there was any money with which to pay them. For that reason no one can draw any reasonable conclusion as to the number of persons in the State who might qualify to receive an old-age pension under a proper law.

Mr. COX. That is the thought that I was about to develop. Does not the Committee accept it with certainty that with Federal participation, and with the power of compulsion in a sense, there will be a more liberal grant on the part of the States under the new law than has heretofore been the case?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I think it would certainly encourage the States to grant greater benefits to the aged.

Mr. COX. I am wondering just how the gentleman and his committee figured it out that forty-nine and one-half million dollars could be stretched far enough to take care of two and a half million pensioners paid at the rate of \$15 per month.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is only for the first year. It will take time for them to qualify. They will not pay \$15 a month to all of them. It does not mean that every pensioner will get \$30 a month, half of this from the Federal Government. They may have a home or they may have a small garden and they may not need half of that amount. They may need the full amount. Moreover, it will take some time to get this law into operation and for them to qualify and get on the pension roll.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is making a statement that is informative to me at least. In other words, the gentleman does not understand it to be the intention of this new board that is being set up to compel uniformity of grants on the part of States? In other words, a State might grant a pension of \$5 a month to one pensioner and \$15 to another and \$30 to another?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, absolutely, owing to the need. The State law determines that.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. In States that have old-age-pension laws, where the funds are raised and disbursed by county governments at their discretion, would the people of those States receive old-age pensions under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. In States that have old-age-pension laws, where the funds are raised and disbursed by county governments at their discretion, would the people of those States receive old-age pensions under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That will depend upon the State law.

Mr. WHITE. In the State of Idaho, which I represent, we have an old-age-pension law, but we permit the counties to raise the money. The State provides for paying the old-age pensions. Some counties pay and some do not. I would like to know if that State would benefit from the provisions of this act?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It would have to be a State-wide law, operative in all the counties.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It must be in effect in all of the subdivisions affected, and if it is in all of the subdivisions affected, it must be mandatory. Furthermore, the Federal Government transacts its business with the State agency; makes the Federal contribution to the State agency.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. In that connection, our legislature is in session now, considering the advisability of amending the constitution so that we can have a general State tax and a State machine to participate. Pending that arrangement, I suppose from the gentleman's remarks it would be impossible for the various county units, provided every county unit did it, to raise its old-age pension or welfare fund, but it must be paid through the same State agency?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. In other words, in section 2 of the bill it is stated in plain language:

A State plan for old-age assistance must (1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them.

Then following that provision the bill states there must be a single State agency.

Mr. GREEN. Then the State, in large measure, almost entirely, writes its own provisions in the State old-age pension?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my friend, a member of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not believe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON] has quite answered the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]. That is going to be a question that will be asked many times, and I think the gentleman from Kentucky is probably as well informed on this bill as anyone else, and if the distinguished Chairman will permit him to elaborate on that, I think he should do so, because that is a question that will be asked many times. In many States the counties administer the old-age pension. Where this is the practice many counties do not have old-age pensions. Just as in Ohio we have a blind pension. There the blind payments are made by the counties. In the poorer counties the poor blind people get practically nothing. What will this bill do in those States? Is it not true that, for instance, the State of Idaho will have to convene its legislature and pass a law that will be uniform in its application all through the State, and every county will have to pay something?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. If a State permits the county to provide the funds, every county in the State must operate. It must be State-wide in that respect. If they propose to operate through subdivisions it is mandatory upon those subdivisions.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Let us carry that to a conclusion. Suppose in the State of Idaho there are 10 counties, and 5 of them are pretty well fixed and 5 of them have been able to pay a pension in times gone by, and 5 of them have not been able to carry it; but the 5 who have not been able to carry it and the other 5 will have to pay something to establish a system of old-age pensions and at least pay a minimum?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. That is correct. In other words, it must be applicable to all subdivisions of the State. It would not be fair to have rich counties participate and the poor counties which need it most, not participate. It must be State-wide in its application, and if you operate under subdivisions, then all subdivisions must make proper provisions in dollars. It is mandatory upon all the subdivisions.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is not necessarily uniform in each county in a State, because the needs may be greater in one county than in another county, or in an urban district greater than in a rural district.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would like to develop that a little further, so that we may conclude it as far as I am concerned at least. Again let us suppose in Idaho there are 10 counties and 5 of them have been able to carry the load. Those five, of course, will be able to continue carrying the load. Suppose they are able to carry \$10 a month pension. Suppose over here is a poor county that cannot pay \$10 a month but can pay \$2 a month, but the rich county will get \$10 from the Federal Government and the other county must do something; is that not right?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I think that subdivision 2 of section 2, which calls for financial participation by a State, will take care of, in large degree, the question which the gentleman raises. In other words, there must be some financial participation on the part of the State. If the richer and more wealthy counties are able to carry their load and the poorer counties cannot carry their burden the State may help the latter with such burden. As I understand, it is mandatory upon the State to participate in bearing this burden.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is a matter that will have to be regulated by the State.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is it not true that each State could assume the whole burden as a State and then could deal with the counties as it saw fit, except that the treatment would have to be uniform in each county?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The State may look to the subdivisions for the money. But if the State so legislates, it is mandatory upon all such subdivisions.

Mr. DOUGHTON. But it would not necessarily be uniform in every county.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Before we get through I would like to ask the gentleman a further question.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Notice that I said "not necessarily."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand the bill, if a State passes a pension law, each applicant must be treated alike under similar conditions; the same conditions would apply and the same sums must be paid under like conditions.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; under like conditions.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I shall not decline to yield, but if the Members would only read the report, it contains a more detailed explanation of this bill than any Member could give on this floor in half a day. Nevertheless, I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman is in position to advise the committee if there has been an expression of the administration's views on the question of State participation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There has been a very definite and very emphatic expression of the views of the administration on this subject. This is one of the things on which I do not think there would be any compromise so far as the administration is concerned.

Mr. COX. And the whole thing is impossible except upon a basis of that kind.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I believe it will be fair to say that some of us have discussed this very phase of the matter with the President, the question of State participation, and that he is very definite and certain in his view and convictions that there must be State participation. I believe perhaps he has expressed himself further on this question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. Would it be possible for citizens of the same State to draw different sums of money from the Federal Government even though the entire State was not participating?

Mr. DOUGHTON. They do not draw anything from the Federal Government. The Federal Government makes grants to the States. The State gives the money, it comes through the State. The Federal Government makes the grant to the State and the State determines that.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. But would the money sent to the State by the Federal Government on proper request, on duly established forms, be paid out in different sums to different citizens of the same State?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The Federal Government would not have a thing to do with that. It would depend entirely on the State law. Of course, different citizens of the same State would get different sums, but that is discretionary with the State authorities and is based upon need.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Do I understand that all citizens in one county shall receive the same amount of Federal aid?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; not at all. That will be determined by the State upon the basis of need. One citizen might be able to half support himself. The bill is intended to supplement that half support so he may have full support.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is the situation this, that individual need is the basis of determining what a person shall receive?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Absolutely. That is the intent of the law. Of course, we cannot say just what will happen in the administration of the law. It just provides for a grant to the States, but that is the purpose of it.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I want to get this clear in my mind, for instance. The State of Pennsylvania now pays a maximum pension of \$30 a month. Some people receive \$15, some receive \$10. According to information I received just recently, the Governor has asked \$10,000,000 to provide a pension for the aged. If this bill is passed, would it mean that the Federal Government would give \$10,000,000 to the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Not necessarily. The amount contributed by the Federal Government is not based upon the amount of money appropriated or allocated in the State for old-age pensions. There is a limit of \$15 a month per individual. Of course, the State may have a larger pension than \$15 if it so choose.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. For example, how would the gentleman figure this out: The maximum pension is \$30 a month.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The gentleman is now speaking of the present law?

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. They are not paying any old-age pension in Pennsylvania now.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Yes; they are.

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; they are.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The report we had at the hearing showed that none were being paid in Pennsylvania at that time.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. But I assure the gentleman they are and have been since last year.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Let us assume that they are, for the sake of argument; what is the gentleman's question?

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. My question is, if the maximum is \$30, how would they arrange that if they still retained the \$30 maximum?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The Federal Government would pay in any case a maximum of not over \$15.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is correct in his question. If the State of Pennsylvania pays to its citizens for old-age pensions \$10 and they do not pay over \$30, the Federal Government would match that amount of money.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; not at all. That might compel the Federal Government to pay as much as \$30 in order to match what the State paid. The Federal Government will not contribute over a maximum of \$15 per month.

Mr. FULLER. I know that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It was not clear from the gentleman's statement. The Federal Government will match up to \$15. If there were no limit they could go up to \$100 in Pennsylvania or any other State as far as that is concerned.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. Is not this the situation, that the Federal Government will match what the State government gives providing it is not more than \$15 per month?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. FULLER. The object of the Pennsylvania law is that they will get a limit of \$30, \$15 of which will come from the Federal Government, and on that basis the Federal Government will pay half.

Mr. SIROVICH. Some get \$5, some get \$10, and some get \$12, and each case will have to be matched, provided it does not require more than \$15 in an individual case.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The gentleman from Pennsylvania stated that the pension in Pennsylvania was a maximum of \$30.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Yes; but some of the aged get only \$10 a month.

Mr. SIROVICH. Our Government gives \$15 and that is matched in each case below that amount.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I know of a man who gets \$30 and his wife gets \$15.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. What is the age limit in Pennsylvania?

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Seventy.

Mr. FOCHT. They are not paying \$30. The law authorizes \$30, but the State of Pennsylvania is paying less, and only because they do not have the money.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The law says the maximum is \$30, and quite a number in my district are getting \$30. That is probably because I am a better politician than the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. They have a better administrator in the gentleman's district perhaps.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. The law provides for a maximum of \$30.

Mr. FOCHT. That is right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. May I inquire how the determination is to be made in the individual case as to the amount which that individual is to obtain?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That will be under State law and will be determined entirely by State law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will there be different formulas set up in the different States, or will there be one national formula?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; the National Government will not have anything to do with it. The administration of the law is left entirely to the States.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The National Government and none of its agencies or instrumentalities will have anything to say about how much the individual gets in a State?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not a word. The State might set up a system that the Federal Government would not approve, but it will not have the right to say just how much the State should give or not give. Of course, the Federal Government may withhold the appropriation from a State. That would be within its discretion. They would not have any right to say what amount should be paid. That would be left entirely to the State law.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. May I refer to section 2, page 2 of the bill entitled "State Old-Age-Assistance Plans", which covers the situation fully. There are seven provisions set out. In subdivision (a) of section 2 those seven provisions are set out and they apply to the State plans. Subdivision (b) sets out three provisions that must be observed by all these State plans. In effect, it simply means that the State legislature of every State enacts a statute which embraces a plan for that State and these guides that are set out in section 2 have to be observed by the State legislature in setting up the State plan.

Mr. GILDEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GILDEA. The State of Pennsylvania has been mentioned by two of my colleagues from Pennsylvania. May I say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. Pennsylvania is not paying old-age pensions because it has not the money with which to pay these pensions. I am just wondering if making the States responsible for the lending of this money is not going to result in the States repudiating their loans just the same as the foreign governments.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is not a loan. The States do not have to repay this money. It does not have to be repaid to the Federal Government, and there is no obligation on the part of the State. It is not a loan but a grant outright.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. GILDEA. May I carry that thought a little further? The State of Pennsylvania requires residence in the State or citizenship for 15 years before pensions are granted. In writing a national law should we not seek to correct that situation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The State law will have to be changed in order to get these benefits because the law may require a residence of not over 5 years during the preceding 9 years.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Section 2 of the bill covers that fully in very simple language.

Mr. GILDEA. You still have State regulations which must be recognized. May I refer to a particular case. A citizen of the State of Pennsylvania for 13 years, whose son died in the World War, was denied insurance.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They would have to change the State law in order to get this Federal benefit.

Mr. GILDEA. They would have to conform with this bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. They certainly would in that respect.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KENNEY. The money with which to pay the Federal Government's share of these pensions will come from general taxation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has just brought into the discussion the matter of the foreign governments. Does the committee intend to discuss on the floor some of the systems the foreign governments use in connection with their old-age pensions?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know enough about them to enter into a discussion concerning their systems.

Mr. KENNEY. Norway has a very admirable plan to pay their pensions. The money is raised there by lottery. [Applause.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman advocate that in this country? The Federal Government, I am sure, will not care how the State raises its money.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GILDEA], I understood him to say that the State of Pennsylvania does not give an old-age pension. Whether you call it a pension or assistance, I do not think the gentleman meant to say that the State does not give anything. The law was passed, I believe in 1933, and the way they were to obtain the money was from the liquor stores. It is true that all the men and women who made application for a pension did not get it, but at least several thousand are receiving it, and I know this is a fact, because I had something to do with the law. The maximum amount is \$30. So they do get a pension, although they might call it relief, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GILDEA. I shall accept the correction with this explanation. They are still considering November applications, and they are 4 months behind in handling the applications.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman, and the reason they are behind is because the people in Pennsylvania did not drink enough booze to pay the pensions.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. If the gentleman will yield, I would suggest that the gentlemen from Pennsylvania get together and have a caucus on this subject before they come in here with their questions.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. We have in Pennsylvania a pension law. We do not call it a pension, but call it assistance. We do not call it a pension because we cannot give pensions to those in civil life, and for this reason we call it an assistance fund, and it comes through the mothers' assistance fund, and they administer it. We give \$30 a month if we have the money you provide here \$15, which will match the State money and will make \$45.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If you continue to give \$30.

Mr. FOCHT. Of course, we could reduce it. The county will then give \$15 and that makes a pretty fair pension.

Now I want to ask my friend on the other side a question. He said that somehow or other Pennsylvania did not have the money. I was not going to say anything about how they get the money or where it is to come from until the gentleman mentioned it. It is to come from the sale of whisky, and I would like to ask him this question: Since they have bought \$50,000,000 worth of whisky up there to be sold, with the profit applied to the old-age pensions, why do they not sell the whisky? It is because it is so rotten that nobody will buy it, and they do not show any profit because the people buy their whisky outside, and this is under the new Democratic administration up there. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I shall have to refuse to yield for any further joint debate between the gentlemen from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question if he will yield a moment.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. WOOD. Since we have finished this discussion of Pennsylvania and whisky, there is some doubt in some minds as to just how this Federal aid is going to be administered. For instance, a State has an old-age-pension law with a minimum of \$10 a month and a maximum of \$20. If one person is drawing \$10 a month from the State, he would then draw \$10 from the Federal Government, would he not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; he would not draw anything from the Federal Government—not a cent.

Mr. WOOD. I mean there would be a contribution from the Federal Government including the \$10.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He would get that through the State.

Mr. WOOD. If he were receiving \$30 a month from the State then he would receive an additional \$15 a month to augment the \$30 from the Federal Government, making a total of \$45 a month.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. WOOD. In other words, there was some question about whether a State can participate, although they are paying less than \$30 a month.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There should not be any question about that.

TITLE II

The system of direct Federal old-age benefits is included under title II. The benefits payable are based upon the wages of the employee. The minimum benefit is set at \$10 per month and the maximum at \$25 and the benefits become payable in 1942.

It must be clearly understood that neither Federal aided State old-age pensions nor Federal old-age benefits, taken alone, will be adequate to care for the problem of old-age dependency, a problem which is certain to become greater as time goes on. We cannot wisely adopt one of these measures without the other. We must recognize that what the American citizen wants is not public charity, but an opportunity to care for himself in old age in a self-respecting manner and on a more adequate basis than he can ever hope for through State pensions. Old-age pensions are provided for those who are already old and dependent and those who cannot be covered under the Federal-benefit system in the future.

Titles III and IX deal with unemployment compensation. Title III provides grants in aid to the States for the administration of State unemployment compensation laws. There is authorized under title III to be appropriated during the fiscal year ending 1936, the sum of \$4,000,000, and in 1937 and thereafter, the sum of \$49,000,000 for this purpose. This will not be an ordinary type of grant in aid, for it is expected that this will be sufficient to pay the entire administrative cost of the State systems.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will there be anything done for those who are now unemployed or is this for those who are now employed who may become unemployed?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is for the latter.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It will cover those now employed who become unemployed?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Certainly.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. And who qualify under the State law?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Who qualify under the State law; yes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wish to call attention to the fact that the 15,000,000, more or less, and there is disagreement about the number, now unemployed will not be covered by this bill, unless I am mistaken, and if I am I hope the gentleman will correct me.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. LUNDEEN. There will be nothing for those who are now unemployed in this bill and I think there will be bitter disappointment over that phase of the measure.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman has evidently forgotten the relief measure just enacted, providing over \$4,880,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to help that class of people. The gentleman certainly is not unmindful of the passage of that act and, certainly, the gentleman does not expect the Government to do everything for everybody, which would certainly make it beyond the capacity of the Government to help anybody.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Then I will ask the very able and distinguished gentleman whether, in his opinion, this \$4,000,000,000 will take care of the 15,000,000 who are unemployed?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is intended, of course, to give employment to the employable who are unemployed. It is a relief measure and is intended to take the place of the dole. I think the gentleman will agree that the Government is going a long way, and much further than any government under the sun has ever gone, in its effort in so many directions to help not only the unemployed, but every class of business which is in distress, as well as individual distress.

The gentleman realizes that every burden, physical and economical, cannot possibly be carried on by the Federal Government. It seems to be the opinion abroad in the land that the funds of the Government are inexhaustible.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wish to observe that I voted for the \$4,800,000,000 bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. And I hope that the gentleman will vote for this bill.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I cannot pledge myself to do that until we are through with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I know the gentleman's humanitarian instincts and I know of his desire to help the unemployed and needy, and I am confident he will vote for this measure.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Judging from the disappointingly small number of people employed as a result of the \$3,650,000,000 appropriation of the last Congress, I have my doubts that this \$4,800,000,000 bill will help very many of the 15,000,000 now unemployed. If we do not aid them, we shall hear from them.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. His bill, H. R. 2827, I believe is a good piece of legislation, and would relieve the unemployment, would it not?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I dislike to take any more time from the gentleman from North Carolina, but I am certain that it will.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Title IX provides for an excise tax on employers based upon pay rolls of 1 percent beginning January 1, 1936, 2 percent the following year, and 3 percent thereafter. Against this tax, employers may credit payments to State unemployment-compensation systems up to 90 percent of the Federal tax. A few minimum requirements are imposed which State plans must satisfy in order to qualify for credit, the principal one being that the fund shall be used solely for the payment of unemployment benefits. In general, the States are left free to determine the provisions of their un-

employment-insurance laws, the scale of benefits which they will pay, and the other features.

The need for unemployment insurance is well recognized. Eighty-five percent of the families on relief are in want because of unemployment. Unemployment, or the fear of unemployment, has been the principal reason for the unfortunate decline of our purchasing power. No greater hazard confronts the American worker today than that of losing his job. Many State and Federal commissions have recommended the enactment of laws along this line for a number of years. But, in spite of this, States have found it impossible to enact such legislation until the Federal Government protects their industries from unfair competition by placing a uniform tax upon industry throughout the country for this purpose. Only one State had enacted an unemployment-insurance law prior to this year, although two other States have already enacted State laws in anticipation of the Federal legislation contained in the bill.

Unemployment insurance is based upon the principle of laying aside reserves during periods of employment to be used in periods of unemployment. It places part of the financial burden upon industry, and in that way provides an incentive for stabilization of employment. The Federal bill does not provide for unemployment insurance but merely makes it possible for the States to do so. Unemployment insurance has been used in many foreign countries for a number of years and no country, once having adopted such a system, has ever abandoned it. In this country unemployment-compensation systems have been operated by a number of labor organizations and large industrial plants.

It is undoubtedly true that what the American citizen wants and needs, above all else, is steady employment, but under modern economic conditions and with the rapid development of machine techniques, it is inevitable that large numbers of workers will be thrown out of work from time to time. Given this situation, it must be acknowledged that unemployment insurance will provide the best means of protecting workers against this greatest of all causes of dependency. It does not place a new burden upon industry, the cost will not be greater than the present cost of unemployment relief; rather, it shifts that cost and distributes it far more equitably than heretofore.

Title IV: I come now to those sections of the bill concerned with security for children. I am told that the present relief rolls carry more than 9,000,000 children under 16 years of age, children who in a few years will be the citizens upon whom the responsibilities of our Government will rest. Many of them have never known a normal secure childhood, never known a time when their father had a steady job. All the measures in the bill may be truly called measures for the protection of American childhood, inasmuch as they protect family life. Even old-age measures, in freeing families of the burden of caring for old people, will enable them to care for their young children more adequately. But there are other children for whom special care is necessary. Many of the children on the relief rolls are in families where there is no breadwinner, where the only head is a young mother who is needed to care for her children. There can be no question that for families of this kind, provision through ordinary public relief is socially undesirable.

Enlightened public opinion has long recognized that the most desirable type of public aid for such families is in the form commonly known as mothers' pensions—that is, aid to dependent children to maintain them in their own homes under their mothers' care. Forty-five States have laws providing for mothers' pensions but many of these States, for lack of funds, have been unable to care for more than a fraction of the families eligible to receive such assistance. Federal aid will permit the mothers' pension type of care to become nationally operative and is particularly necessary in view of the withdrawal of Federal support for unemployment relief.

TITLE V

Another part of the social-security bill dealing with protection of children, title V, provides an appropriation of

\$3,800,000 for maternal and child-health services under the supervision of the Children's Bureau. The great need for the Federal Government to again assume leadership and lend aid in this field was borne out by the testimony before the committee given by members of the medical profession from all parts of the country. Two million eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars is also provided for Federal grants for services for crippled children, particularly in rural areas where such hospital care is now largely nonexistent. Title V authorizes small appropriations for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children, and children in danger of becoming delinquent, and for vocational rehabilitation. These very essential services have again been greatly curtailed during the depression years.

Title VI provides an appropriation of \$8,000,000 for grants in aid to the States for the extension of public health services. Only about one county out of every six in this country has a regular full-time health officer. During the depression the State and local expenditures for health services throughout the country have been drastically reduced, despite the fact that the need for them was never greater. It cannot be denied that the first step in a program to reduce the economic cost of sickness and ill health is through the building up of our preventive public health services.

Title VII establishes a social-security board of three members, appointed by the President for overlapping terms of 6 years each. The social-security board will have charge of the administration of the grants in aid to the States for old-age pensions and the administration of the Federal old-age-benefit system. It will also be responsible for the certification of State unemployment-compensation systems and is charged with the duty of making actuarial and scientific studies of the broad problems of social security.

Titles VIII and IX levy taxes designed to finance the major cost of the social-security program. These I have discussed already.

Mr. Speaker, I have only touched upon the more essential provisions in my brief explanation of the bill. There are many sections dealing with questions of administration, and matters relating to the subjects I have enumerated.

This bill is the product of many weeks of laborious effort on the part of the membership of your committee, ably assisted by the splendid and expert personnel of the office of the legislative counsel, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, representatives of the Treasury and Labor Departments, and other branches of the Government. I desire to express my appreciation for the splendid and most valuable assistance they have rendered, in which I am sure the other members of the committee join.

Mr. Speaker, we are today fashioning the foundation stones upon which will rest the happiness and welfare of future generations. Our task is not an easy one, for we have no mileposts to guide us. We are pioneering in a field never before undertaken by any previous Congress. This bill, in my opinion, is a well-rounded-out program, upon whose foundation we can build in the future after we have had an opportunity to observe and study its workings.

While we may not all be in agreement with respect to the many provisions contained in this measure, I am sure we are all in accord with its objectives to bring about the proper solution of the problem our country faces in caring for the needs of those who have already, and who in the future, will have reached the age when they can no longer provide for themselves.

We are building for the future. Let us not weaken that foundation upon which the welfare of future generations must depend. Some think various provisions are too inadequate. I, for one, would far rather start cautiously than to go too far and bring about the collapse of our handiwork in the future. Some would remove certain sections of the foundation supports incorporated in this bill, and are saying we are going too far and placing too heavy a burden upon industry at this time. If that be so, why has not industry opposed this measure. Never during my service in this House have I seen less opposition to a measure, both during

the hearings and its consideration for the past several months.

Let me remind those holding this view that industry, along with all others, is today assuming a tremendous burden, which will continue to grow more burdensome year by year unless we adopt a broad rounded-out program, not a piecemeal one, that will eventually bring about the lessening of the burden we now have.

Let us not be swayed by the clamor of those advocating fantastic remedies, or those who hesitate and whose thoughts in the past have been of the favored classes and not the masses.

Today we have a leader in the White House whose every action has demonstrated his concern for the welfare and happiness of the common people—the forgotten men, women, and children of this country.

Let us emulate the foresight and wisdom of our forefathers who builded for the future, as President Roosevelt is building today, by the adoption of his program for social security, by the enactment of this measure.

American conditions today demand courageous action. We cannot safely delay social reforms that are necessary to preserve our economic and political institutions. There is no great reform which has ever occurred which was not looked upon in its time as a bold and perhaps dangerous step. When Columbus set forth with his three small vessels to sail across the uncharted Atlantic and discover a new world, it required the highest courage, the kind of courage which was displayed by our Revolutionary forefathers when they fought the Revolutionary War and our country secured its independence. The progress of America has ever been marked by that great quality of boldness and determination which inspired our pioneer forebears. To bring about a great social reform such as is proposed in this bill requires the same quality of far-sighted leadership. I am confident that in this House, among the elected representatives of the American people, this quality will not be found lacking. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from North Carolina use some more of his time at this time? In case I find it possible to yield some of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina, could he continue a little longer this afternoon and let my side begin tomorrow?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it will do a great lot of good to talk this afternoon or not. Everybody is ready to go home, and I rather have the idea that most of you have just about made up your minds on how you are going to vote on this bill anyway. If Members have to sit around and listen to 20 hours of debate and hear all sorts of suggestions made they will be so confused by the time debate is over that they will have to fall back on their own fundamental, basic philosophies of old-age pensions. This will mean that everything said in the meantime will be more or less cast aside, and you will vote convictions formed years ago. These convictions, I suspect, are deep-seated. I would not be surprised but that that is the main difficulty in the minds of a lot of Members in this House. Most of us have sort of grown up with certain fundamental concepts and convictions. When we were learning them they were perhaps correct. In the meantime, however, so much has happened, and things have changed so in the past few years that many people are left in a confused state of mind. It is, I know, difficult for a man with settled convictions to change his mind on any subject, no matter what the arguments offered are. It is sometimes difficult to recognize a new idea when it is presented to you. I am not going to find any particular fault with the Ways and Means Committee because of this. They have developed certain convictions through their lifetimes, and it is asking almost too much to have them throw all of those aside and adopt brandnew ideas.

When they were forming their opinions very few people believed in unemployment insurance or old-age pensions. Rugged individualism was the accepted theory. Then, all

of a sudden, because of talk, and because of the necessity of the times, unemployment insurance and old-age pensions became fairly respectable. We coasted along with considerable talk and agitation until now we are in a position where everybody is in favor of old-age pensions, or at least with the principle of pensions. But keeping that same idea, that perhaps older, more settled minds cannot progress as rapidly as younger minds, their first reaction is, now, let us keep these pensions just as small as we possibly can; let us keep these benefit pensions down. They come back to those old shibboleths, those old concepts that they have always had and recognized, and say we cannot put something new in because it will disrupt something we have always had. A lot of younger minds in the country and a lot of minds that have been giving considerable study to the subject are already letting those concepts go by the boards. If we cannot do the thing we want to do, which is establish economic security for every citizen in the United States, and still maintain some of the old theories and some of the old institutions we have always known, let us get rid of them, or let us change them in some way or another, so that we can do what we want to do.

I read a story just yesterday that seems to me to illustrate this inability to recognize a new idea. A woman was hiring a new maid, and in the course of the conversation and instructions to the maid she was telling her of the things they were going to have to buy. She said, "Oh, yes; there is one other item that you will have to have in the kitchen, and that is a griller." Most up-to-date kitchens nowadays, I suppose, have grillers. The maid looked at her with a blank expression on her face. The woman said, "What is the matter; don't you know what a griller is?" The maid said, "Sure, I know what it is; it is a big ape that looks like a human being, but if you think I have to have a new one in this kitchen, I am going to quit right now."

Somebody comes along and points out the idea that for the first time in history we have built up an organization that makes it possible for us to produce wealth in such quantities that everybody could live on a decent standard of living. That is hard to grasp, because it has not been true until recently. Too many Members in this House formed their convictions during the era of scarcity and cannot think in terms of abundance. Our technological development has tended to throw men out of employment, but at the same time it is tending to increase the national income, the wealth that is produced each year. We then run up against the question of how are we going to use what technology can produce and give it to people who cannot work because of technology. Perhaps one way that we could do it is with old-age pensions or unemployment insurance, but they must be adequate to maintain the recipients in decency and comfort. Now, with scarcity-era convictions, the only way we seem to be able to accomplish it is to try to take it away from those that have it and give it to those who do not have it, and the whole argument in favor of this particular bill and in opposition to a more liberal pension bill is that we cannot levy a high enough tax on legitimate business as it exists under this system to get enough money to pay a larger old-age pension. That is the argument that has been used against all of these plans that call for higher pensions. Where are you going to get the money? Which brings me back to the contention in the first place that people have talked and legislated and studied and analyzed money for so long that the only kind of money they know anything about is the kind they have always had; the only way they can attack the problem is by saying what will it do to sound money?

This argument came up once before when we were talking about bonus legislation: "If you put out this currency, you wreck the monetary system. You do not have sound money any more." Well, after all, money simply buys the things that we produce, as a medium of exchange. If you recognize the fact that we have not anywhere near the same kind of sound money that we had before we went off the gold standard, that that kind of sound money has ceased to exist, then we can get a different slant on the money question and use it as a medium of exchange to transfer those things that we

produce into the hands of the people who want to consume them. If we are going to insist upon maintaining and keeping the old institutions that we have long known, that will be impossible. I doubt whether we can take enough from those who get to give to those who do not get to maintain them on a decent standard of living. But that does not keep us from accomplishing the original purpose of guaranteeing economic security. Once earlier in our history, when they were digging the Panama Canal, they ran up against an epidemic of yellow fever. They could not go ahead with the digging as long as the epidemic existed. They could not keep their workmen alive. Nobody was foolish enough, however, to say that the way to cure the epidemic was to take the patient and treat him and try to cure him. They went to the seat of the difficulty and eliminated the cause. They said, "If we want to go ahead, we have to prevent the epidemic, and the only way to do it is to get rid of the mosquitoes, and the only way to do that is to dry up the swamps." Can we not attack our economic difficulties in the same way? The trouble is we have been getting the poor fellow after he has been knocked down, getting the unfortunate victim after he has been thrown out of the economic system and cannot earn a living any more, and trying to do something for him. Our solution of this difficulty, it seems to me, should go back to the thing that knocked him out. I mean the changes in our economic system that make it impossible for men to get jobs. It does not make any difference what particular phase of this subject we take up for discussion, if you think it over, we get right back to the money question every time. The money question today is the seat of each one of our particular difficulties.

I am in sympathy with the idea of old-age pensions and with unemployment insurance, but you cannot get them if you are going to insist on maintaining some of these eighteenth-century ideas on the money question. [Applause.] The funny part about it is that we were so willing to move clear up to the twentieth century as far as our technological development is concerned, but when somebody comes along with an invention in the social field we turn it down because our minds cannot grasp a new idea.

Mr. LUNDEEN. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If one does come along with some new and fundamental idea in the social field, then it is a radical, a "red", a socialistic idea and should be turned down at once?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, there are a lot of us who have ceased to be worried by names and epithets. We always get that when we attempt to secure progressive legislation. Every liberal thinker has been called names. We get used to it.

May I suggest to the Members that in the consideration of how much money we can give in pensions they make constant reference to a book called "The Chart of Plenty", by Harold Loeb and associates. It is a preliminary report of the national survey of potential product capacity and cannot, must not be ignored.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield, from the 10 hours allotted to me, 1 hour to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McREYNOLDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7260, the social security bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.