

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

PART VI—CASH-BENEFITS AMENDMENTS

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
RUSSELL B. LONG, *Chairman*



OCTOBER 30, 1967

Printed for the use of the Committee on Finance

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana, *Chairman*

GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico

ALBERT GORE, Tennessee

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota

VANCE HARTEK, Indiana

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Connecticut

LEE METCALF, Montana

FRED R. HARRIS, Oklahoma

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware

FRANK CARLSON, Kansas

WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah

CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska

THURSPON B. MORTON, Kentucky

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

TOM VAIL, *Chief Counsel*

EVELYN R. THOMPSON, *Assistant Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

I. Staff—HEW Suggestions-----	Page
II. Printed Amendments-----	1
III. Administration Recommendations-----	9
IV. House-Passed Provisions Not Discussed Previously-----	15
V. Other Changes Suggested By Witnesses at Hearing on H.R. 12080-----	19
	35

**I. STAFF—HEW SUGGESTIONS**  
**SECTIONS 116 AND 117: STATE AND LOCAL**  
**EMPLOYMENT**

Present Law

H. R. 12680

*Covers employees of State and local governments provided the individual States enter into an agreement with the Federal Government to provide such coverage, with the following special provisions:*

a. *States have the option of covering or excluding employees in any class of elective position, part-time position, fee-basis position, or performing emergency services.*

b. *Excludes the services of the following persons, specifying that they cannot be included in a State agreement and cannot, therefore, be covered:*

- (1) *Employees on work relief projects;*
- (2) *Patients and inmates of institutions who are employed by such institutions;*
- (3) *Services of the types which would be excluded by the general coverage provisions of the law if they were performed for a private employer, except that agricultural and student services in this category may be covered at the option of the State.*

*Exceptions to general law concerning coverage in named States:*

(1) *Split-system provisions.*—Authorizes Alaska, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin, and all interstate instrumentalities, at their option, to extend coverage to the members of a State retirement system by dividing such a system into 2 divisions, one composed of those persons who desire coverage and the other of those persons who do not wish coverage, provided that new member of the retirement system coverage group are covered compulsorily. Also authorize similar treatment of political subdivision retirement systems of these States.

Emergency services are excluded on a mandatory basis. Also services of election officials who are paid less than \$50 in a calendar quarter would not be covered at the option of the State. Effective Jan. 1, 1968.

Adds Illinois to the list of States entitled to split their retirement systems. Effective upon enactment.



**SECTIONS 116 AND 117: STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYMENT—Continued**

Present Law

H.R. 12080

Those employees covered by a divided retirement system who did not elect coverage in the original agreement, may nevertheless elect coverage until 1966, or, if later, until 2 years after the date on which coverage was approved for the group that originally elected coverage. Also provides that the coverage of persons electing under this amendment would begin on the same date as coverage became effective for the group originally covered. People who are in positions under a retirement system who are not eligible to join the system due to personal disqualifications, such as those based on age or length of service, cannot be covered under the divided retirement system procedure.

Permits States if coverage is extended under the divided retirement system procedure to modify their agreement after 1967 to cover individuals who are not eligible to be members of the retirement system. Effective January 1, 1968.

**Suggestions**

Modify House-passed provisions to:

1. Extend through 1969 the period in which a State may modify its agreement for social security coverage under the divided retirement system provisions in cases where the agreement is more than 2 years old. The new agreements would permit the transfer to the separate covered system of individuals who were not covered under the original agreement. (Amendment 299 (Ribicoff).)
2. Provide for the validation of coverage erroneously reported.
3. Permit Nebraska policemen and firemen to be covered under State agreements and validate the coverage of firemen who were erroneously reported.
4. Permit coverage of policemen and firemen in Puerto Rico.

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

National Conference of State Social Security Administrators.

*Favors H.F. 4902 to allow coverage of policemen and firemen in Puerto Rico*

Polanco-Abreu, Hon. Santiago, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

*Favors amendment No. 295 (Ribicoff) which would keep in force the clause excluding firefighters, except that the insurance system may be made available to firefighters in any State which has a statute requiring that said insurance system shall be a supplement and addition to the State or local retirement system covering such firefighters*

International Association of Fire Fighters.

*Favors draft provision (suggestion 2) that when States extend coverage to State and local coverage group, may elect to deem those employees who had been erroneously reported for whom no refund has been made, to be members of the coverage group during period when erroneously reported*

National Conference of State Social Security Administrators.

**SECTION 152: UNDERPAYMENTS**

Present law

H.R. 12080

**Cash benefits—**  
In the case of cash benefit underpayments where an individual dies before payment of the amount due him, and such amount at the time of his death does not exceed an amount equal to 1 month's benefit, payment is to be made to his surviving spouse who was living in the same household, or, if there is no such spouse, to the legal representative of his estate.

**Cash benefits—**  
The amounts due a beneficiary at the time of death would be paid in the following order: (1) to his surviving spouse if she was entitled to monthly benefits on the same earnings record, (2) to his surviving children if they were entitled to benefits on the same earnings record, (3) to his parents if they were entitled to benefits on the same earnings record, (4) to the legal representative of his estate, (5) to the surviving spouse not entitled to benefits on the same earnings record, or (6) to his surviving children not entitled to benefits on the same earnings record. Effective on enactment.

**Medical insurance benefits—**  
No provision for unpaid medical insurance benefits under part B of medical care.

**Medical insurance benefits—**  
Claims for unpaid part B benefits would be in the following order: (1) to the person who paid the bill, (2) to the legal representative of his estate, (3) to the surviving spouse who was living with him at the time he died, (4) to the surviving spouse if she was entitled to monthly benefits on the same earnings record, or (5) to the surviving children. Effective on enactment.

**Suggestion**

Provide that amounts due under part B after the beneficiary's death be paid first to the person who paid for the services or the person who provided the services. (If the person who paid for the services is the decedent, the payment would be made to the legal



representative of his estate, if there is one.) Then provide the following uniform order of payment for both cash benefits and part B benefits:

1. Spouse living with individual at time of his death or to spouse not living with individual but entitled to benefits on same earnings record.
2. Child entitled to benefits on same earnings record.
3. Parent entitled to benefits on same earnings record.
4. Spouse who was neither entitled to benefits on same earnings record nor living with individual.
5. Child not entitled to benefits on same earnings record.
6. Parent not entitled to benefits on same earnings record.
7. Legal representative of individual's estate, if any.
8. Person related to individual by blood, marriage, or adoption determined by Secretary to be proper person to receive the payment due.

**RECOVERY OF OVERPAYMENTS**

<p>Present law</p> <p>Provides that overpayments may be recovered from the overpaid person while he is getting benefits; recovery may not be made from any other person getting benefits on the same account. There is no specific provision for recovering an overpayment while the beneficiary is alive if he is not getting benefits.</p>	<p>H.R. 12080</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	-------------------------------------

*Suggestion*

Authorize the Secretary of HEW to recover overpaid benefits by requiring the overpaid beneficiary or his estate to refund the overpayment or by withholding the benefits payable to him, his estate or to any other person entitled to benefits on the same earnings record. A similar provision was adopted by the Senate in 1965 but dropped in conference. A provision of this type was suggested in a GAO report dated July 25, 1961.

**SECTION 161: RESIDUAL PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN CHILDREN**

<p>Present law</p> <p>The 1965 social security amendments made survivor benefits payable to the illegitimate child of a male worker if the worker acknowledges the child in writing; or has been found by a court to be the child's father, or has been ordered by a court to contribute to his child's support, or is shown by other satisfactory evidence to be the child's father. Benefits to such children are paid just as the benefits to any other legitimate child.</p>	<p>H.R. 12080</p> <p>Benefits to an illegitimate child could not exceed the difference between the total amounts payable to other persons on the worker's earnings record and the family maximum amount.</p>
--	--

*Suggestion*

Provide that the benefits payable to a person on the effective date of the 1965 amendments which were reduced because an illegitimate child became entitled to benefits under the 1965 amendment will be reduced in the future. For people who became entitled after the effective date of the 1965 amendments or become entitled in the future the provisions of present law will apply.

**CHILD'S BENEFITS FOR PERSONS DISABLED AFTER AGE 18 AND BEFORE AGE 22**

<p>Present law</p> <p>Child's benefits are payable (if the parent dies, becomes disabled, or retires) to a person who is disabled before he reaches age 18. Child's benefits are paid up to age 22 to children who are attending school.</p>	<p>H.R. 12080</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	-------------------------------------

*Suggestion*

Provide for paying child's insurance benefits to people who are disabled after reaching age 18 and before they reach age 22.

**Cost:** HEW estimates additional cost would be negligible.

**COLLECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES FROM THE AMISH**

<p>Present law</p> <p>Amish who were self-employed in taxable years ending before December 31, 1965, must have applied for an exemption from social security taxes on or before April 15, 1966. Those who are first self-employed after 1965 must file an application for exemption on or before the due date of their tax returns for such first year.</p>	<p>H.R. 12080</p> <p>No change.</p>
---	-------------------------------------

Some Amish have not yet filed their application for exemption but the Internal Revenue Service is reluctant to proceed against them for unpaid taxes, preferring instead to extend the exemption filing date for past services and to provide a more flexible application date for the future.

*Suggestion*

Provide that an application for an exemption from social security taxes may be filed by the Amish on or before December 31, 1968, for persons who had self-employment income in any taxable year ending before December 31, 1967, and for people who first have self-employment income in later years, allow them to file an application



for an exemption at any time within 3 months after the time the Internal Revenue Service notifies them that they have unpaid social security taxes.

**BENEFITS PAID ON BASIS OF ERRONEOUS REPORTS OF DEATH IN MILITARY SERVICE**

Present law	H. R. 12080
Benefits paid as the result of erroneous reports of death issued by the Department of Defense are overpayments and attempts to collect the payments must be made.	No change.

*Suggestion*

Provide that all benefits paid on the basis of official reports of death issued by the Department of Defense will be considered lawful payments even though it is later determined that the person who was reported dead is alive. (He may be in a prisoner of war camp.) This conforms treatment under social security for such overpayments to the treatment already applicable under the Veteran laws in the case of overpayment under the same circumstances.

**SECTION 115: COVERAGE OF MINISTERS**

PRESENT LAW	H. R. 12080
Covers duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed ministers, Christian Science practitioners, and members of religious orders (other than those who have taken a vow of poverty) serving in the United States, and those serving outside the country who are citizens and either working for U.S. employers or serving a congregation predominantly made up of U.S. citizens. Coverage is available under the self-employment coverage provisions on an individual voluntary basis regardless of whether they are employees or self-employed.	Services of a clergyman (including members of religious orders who have taken a vow of poverty) would be automatically covered unless he elects not to be covered on the grounds that he is conscientiously opposed to social security coverage. Effective for taxable years after 1967.

*Suggestion*

Delete House-passed provision providing coverage for religious who have taken a vow of poverty (thus retain present law). Permit a clergyman to elect not to be covered if he is conscientiously opposed to social security coverage, as in H.R. 12080, or if he opposes such coverage on grounds of religious principle.

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

National Conference of Catholic Charities (if grounds for refusing coverage include "opposed in principle" and poverty oath members of orders are excluded).  
National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA.

**SECTION 163: ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY**

Present law	H. R. 12080
The Commissioner of Social Security is chairman and 12 other persons appointed by the Secretary are members of the Council. The Councils are to be appointed in 1968 and every 5th year thereafter.	The Secretary would appoint the Chairman as well as the other 12 members of the Council. The Councils would be appointed in February 1969 and in February of every 4th year thereafter.

*Suggestion*

Provide that Advisory Council be appointed at any time (rather than in February) in 1969 and every 4 years thereafter. As in present law each Council would report to the Secretary not later than the first day of the second year following the year in which it is appointed, such report to include any interim reports the Council may have issued. Also permit the Secretary to appoint the Chairman, as in H.R. 12080.

**EMPLOYMENT OF A PARENT AS A DOMESTIC**

Present law	H. R. 12080
The definition of employment excludes employment of a parent as a domestic.	No change.

*Suggestion*

Provide an exception to the exclusion from the definition of domestic employment services performed by a parent for a son or daughter. The exclusion would apply to a parent if the parent's employing son or daughter is (a) a widow or widower with a child under age 18 or disabled child or (b) a person who has a disabled spouse as well as such a child.

**EXPEDITED BENEFIT PAYMENTS**

Present law	H. R. 12080
No provision	No provision.



*Suggestion*

Provide for the establishment of special procedures to expedite the payment of benefits: If, after 45 days have elapsed since a beneficiary last received his monthly benefit, or after 90 days have elapsed since a claimant filed his application and submitted all requested evidence, no benefit check has been received, the claimant could make written request for expedited payments. The provision would not apply to disability benefits or negotiated checks. Also the provision would not limit the Secretary's authority to make earlier payments in appropriate cases.

The suggestion is similar to S. 1954 (Scott, Bennett, Brooke, Cotton, Dirksen, Fong, Hruska, Jordan, Miller, Pearson, Percy, Thurmond, Tower).

**II. PRINTED AMENDMENTS****Amendment 293 (Moss)**

This amendment provides a general benefit increase of about 15 percent with a \$60 minimum workers' benefit. The tax base would be increased to \$7,800 on Jan. 1, 1968, to \$9,000 on Jan. 1, 1971, and to \$10,800 on Jan. 1, 1974.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates—

Outgo—\$1 billion in 1968 and \$1.1 billion in 1972.

Income—\$0.2 billion in 1968 and \$2.5 billion in 1972.

**Amendment 295 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment provides an exception to the police and firemen exclusion from social security coverage so that firemen can be covered if: (a) the State law requires that social security coverage be supplemental to the State retirement system; (b) positions of firemen are a separate system and no other positions are included in such system; (c) the protection provided firemen under the State system was not diminished in the 3 years prior to the date of the referendum; (d) a majority of the firemen vote in favor of social security coverage.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates no significant cost.

**Amendment 303 (Smathers)**

This amendment provides an exception to the earnings limitation in the Social Security Act under which earnings for services performed in the treatment, prevention, and cure of injury and disease would be counted provided that the person performing the work was 67 or over in the entire taxable year in which the services were performed and the Surgeon General certifies that qualified persons to provide such services are difficult to find.

Senator Curtis has indicated interest in an amendment along these lines and it has been suggested by HEW that a more limited amendment might be acceptable. Such amendment would provide an exclusion from the definition of earnings of wages and self-employment income derived by a person age 60 or over from personal services performed in a private home or other place of residence to a person who requires the regular aid and attendance of another person. The services would have to be providing regular aid and attendance and not be primarily domestic services or professional or practical nursing services.

In addition HEW suggests the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to certify that there was a shortage of people



to perform services of this type in the area in which the services were performed.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates early-year cost at \$35 million a year.

## Amendment 313 (Hartke)

This amendment freezes the present social security tax rates at their present levels and authorizes an appropriation from general revenues of such amounts as may be needed to maintain the actuarial soundness of the social security trust funds, other than the supplementary medical insurance trust fund.

## Amendment 325 (Hartke)

This amendment provides a general increase in social security benefits of 20 percent with a minimum worker's benefit of \$100.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$4.3 billion in 1968 and \$4.8 billion in 1972.

## Amendment 334 (Hartke)

This amendment would increase the special benefit paid to certain people over 72 who have not worked long enough to qualify for regular benefits from \$40 under H.R. 12080 (\$35 under present law) to \$70 for one person, and from \$20 under H.R. 12080 (\$17.50 under present law) to \$35 for a spouse.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$608 million in 1968 and \$300 million in 1972.

## Amendment 336 (Miller)

This amendment provides an alternative to the earnings test under which the earnings limitations would not apply to that part of a person's earnings that together with his social security benefits total \$2,700 a year.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates early-year savings of \$110 million a year.

## Amendment 337 (Fong)

This amendment provides for an automatic increase in social security benefits whenever the consumer price index rises by at least 3 percent. Benefit increases would not be calculated more often than once each year.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates cost could be met with no increase in tax rates.

## Amendment 366 (Hartke)

This amendment provides for the payment of disability insurance benefits to blind persons who have at least six quarters of coverage under the social security program.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$140 million in 1968 and \$200 million in 1972.

## Amendment 376 (Randolph)

This amendment provides that an individual may waive all or part of any old-age, survivor, or disability insurance benefit to which he may be entitled. Any benefit which is waived shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not be taken into account in determining the individual's eligibility for veteran's benefits or any Federal benefit.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates relatively small savings.

## Amendment 377 (Pell)

This amendment increases the earnings limitation to \$2,400 per year (\$200 per month).

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$630 million in 1968 and \$1.1 billion in 1972.

## Amendment 378 (Pell)

This amendment provides for an automatic increase in social security benefits whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by at least 3 percent. Benefit increases would not be calculated more often than once each year. It also provides for automatic increase or decrease in social security benefits whenever the Consumer Price Index changes by at least 3 percent. Adjustments shall be made annually. Also, whenever the application of this provision would result in an actuarial deficit, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report to the Congress recommendations for needed changes in social security financing.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates cost could be met with no increase in tax rates.

## Amendment 379 (Hartke)

This amendment eliminates the earnings test.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$2.1 billion in 1968 and significantly more in future.



## Amendment 386 (Ribicoff)

This amendment would provide for a general benefit increase of 17½ percent with a minimum workers' benefit of \$52 a month.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$1.1 billion in 1968 and \$1.3 billion in 1972.

## Amendment 387 (Fong)

This amendment would increase the exempt amount under the earnings test to \$2,400 a year.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$630 million in 1968 and \$1.1 billion in 1972.

## Amendment 388 (Fong)

This amendment would increase the widows' benefit from 82½ to 100 percent of the workers' benefit.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$700 million in 1968 and \$900 million in 1972.

## Amendment 389 (Fong)

This amendment would increase the workers' minimum benefit to \$70.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$750 million in 1968 and \$675 million in 1972.

## Amendment 390 (Fong)

This amendment would provide for an increase in the special benefits paid under the "Prouty" amendment to \$50 for a single person and to \$75 for a couple.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$148 million in 1968 and \$72 million in 1972.

## Amendment 398 (Hartke)

This amendment would increase the number, five under present law, of years of little or no earnings which can be dropped in computing benefits by an additional year for each 10 years of coverage credited to an individual.

## Amendment 399 (McGovern)

This amendment would eliminate the earnings test under the social security program.

**Cost:**

HEW estimates additional cost of \$2.1 billion in 1968 and significantly more in future.

## Amendment 423 (Kennedy of Massachusetts)

This amendment provides the Secretary of HEW with authority to terminate social security coverage agreements with less than 2 years' notice from the States under such conditions as he deems appropriate.

## Amendment 424 (Kennedy of New York)

This amendment provides a 20-percent benefit increase with a \$100 minimum workers' benefit; increases the tax and benefit base to \$8,400 on January 1, 1968, and to \$10,800 on January 1, 1971; and provides a cost-of-living increase in future benefits. The cost of these changes would be financed, in part, by payments from general revenues equal to 11 percent of the social security taxes paid after December 31, 1971.

## S. 1576 (Talmadge)

This amendment provides social security coverage on a voluntary basis under the self-employment provisions of law for State and local constables and justices of the peace who are paid on a fee basis by persons other than the State or local government, provided their positions are not covered under the State's agreement.

### III. ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Special minimum for long-term employment.*—A special minimum benefit would be given for long-service workers. It would be equal to \$4 multiplied by the number of years of coverage up to 25, so that a worker with 25 years or more of coverage will receive a benefit of at least \$100 a month. About 140,000 people would benefit under this provision. About \$8 million in additional benefits would be paid in 1968.

2. *Transfer of Federal employment credits.*—Under present law, Federal employees subject to the Civil Service or Foreign Service retirement system or the Central Intelligence Agency retirement system have no survivor or disability protection during the first 5 years of service. Employees who leave after 5 or more years of service lose their survivor and disability protection. Therefore, the administration recommends a provision to provide for transferring credit to social security for Federal employment under the Civil Service, Foreign Service or Central Intelligence Agency retirement systems for employees with less than 5 years of Federal service. The cost of any social security benefit payable under this provision would be paid out of general revenues.

3. *Social security coverage of farm employees.*—Under present law, the farm worker's earnings in regard to his work for an employer are covered only if the employer pays him \$150 or more in cash wages during the year or the employee works for the employer on 20 or more days in the year for cash pay on a time basis—e.g., if he is paid by the hour, day, or week. A farmworker earns one quarter of coverage credit, to a total of four in a year, for each \$100 of annual covered farm wages.

The annual cash wage test for social security coverage of farmworkers would be reduced from the present \$150 to \$50, the 20-day time test would be reduced to 10 days, and a quarter of coverage credit would be given, to a total of 4 in a year, for each \$50 of annual covered farm wages. These changes would have no cost effect.

4. *Eligibility of certain children for monthly benefits.*—The amendment would provide for the payment of child's benefits, based on the earnings record of a worker who was not the child's parent if the child was living with and supported by the worker for at least a year before the worker died or at least 5 years before the worker became disabled or retired. Under this provision about 15,000 people would be affected immediately and \$11 million would be paid out in calendar year 1968.

5. *Parent's insurance benefits.*—The amendment would provide for the payment of benefits to the parents of retired and disabled workers. The benefits for the dependent parents of living workers would be actuarially reduced if taken before age 65 and parent's insurance benefits, including the benefits to parents of deceased workers, in the future would be residual. Under this provision about 30,000



people would be affected immediately and about \$15 million would be paid out in the first full year.

The combined cost of the above provisions for paying benefits to children and the provision for parent's benefits is 0.01 percent of payroll.

PROVISIONS OF TITLE I OF H.R. 12080 THAT THE DEPARTMENT BELIEVES SHOULD BE MODIFIED

1. *Increase in special payments to certain people age 72 and older.*—H.R. 12080 provides for increasing from \$35 to \$40 for a single person (from \$52.50 to \$60 for a couple) the amount of the monthly payments to people age 72 and older who are not insured for regular retirement benefits. In keeping with the minimum benefit of \$70 that the Department is proposing for people who meet the regular insured-status requirements, the Department recommends special payments of \$50 (\$75 for couples) for those age 72 and older who do not meet these requirements.

2. *Benefits for disabled widows and widowers.*—Under the provision in H.R. 12080 for paying benefits to disabled widows and widowers, benefits would not be payable before age 50 and the benefits would be reduced according to the disabled widow's or widower's age at entitlement. The Department favors removal of the age-50 limitation and payment of the full amount of the benefit—82½ percent of the spouse's benefit—to disabled widows and widowers. The Department also recommends that the definition of disability for widows and widowers in H.R. 12080 be modified to specify a level of severity that would be deemed sufficient to preclude any *substantial* gainful activity (rather than any gainful activity). The Department would retain the requirement in H.R. 12080 that determinations of disability be based on medical factors only. The cost of the provision now in H.R. 12080 is 0.03 percent of taxable payroll; the cost of the provision we recommend is 0.06 percent of taxable payroll.

3. *Limitations of payments to aliens outside the United States.*—H.R. 12080 includes a provision under which the 10-year-residence and 40-quarters-of-coverage exceptions would not apply to a citizen of a country that has a social insurance system under which benefits would not be paid to otherwise qualified Americans while they are outside that country. The Department believes that the present provision is satisfactory and that no further restriction should be placed on the application of the 10-year-residence and 40-quarters-of-coverage exceptions of present law.

The Department strongly recommends that, in the event that any restriction on the applicability of the 10-year-residence and 40-quarters-of-coverage exceptions is retained in the bill, it be made entirely prospective in effect—that is, that it apply only to aliens who become eligible for benefits in the future.

The Department recommends that the provisions relating to benefits for people in countries where Treasury regulations prevent payment be modified so that amounts accumulated before enactment of the amendments now being considered, as well as benefits that are withheld by the Treasury Department in the future, would be payable in full to the beneficiary from whom they have been withheld. If he has died before the ban is lifted, the withheld benefits would be

payable only to a survivor entitled on the same earnings record and only in an amount equal to the last 12 months' benefits that have been withheld. As under present law, where the beneficiary is alive when payments are resumed, the full amount of the withheld benefits would be payable to him.

The Department of State recommends that, in each of the sections of present law with a 5-year residence requirement regarding aliens, a proviso be included to the effect that the requirement will not be applied contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

The Department of State also recommends amendment of section 160(b) and (c) of H.R. 12080.

Under section 160(c) the application of Treasury Circular 655 would deprive certain aliens of benefits that they would otherwise have a right to receive. The operation of these provisions would seem to have the effect of penalizing an individual who is entitled to benefits but who resides in a Communist country.

The Department of State recommends that the provisions of section 160(c) be modified so that benefits earned before their enactment, as well as benefits that are withheld by the Treasury Department in the future, would be paid to the beneficiary.



Changes in cost for administration proposal as compared with H.R. 12080 as passed by House of Representatives, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefit changes, by calendar year

[In millions]

	Provision in H.R. 12080	Provision in administration proposal	Increase in cost over bill				
			1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
A. General benefit increase. <sup>1</sup> (See Section IV) of this print.)	12½ percent, with \$50 minimum PIA.	15 percent with \$7 minimum PIA.	\$1,263	\$1,312	\$1,348	\$1,392	\$1,414
B. Benefit increase for certain persons aged 72 or over. <sup>2</sup>	\$40 (\$60 for couples).	\$50 (\$75 for couples).	148	126	106	89	74
C. Special \$100 minimum benefit for 25 years of coverage.	None	Yes	8	9	10	11	12
D. Benefits for disabled widows and widowers.	At age 50, with reduced rate.	At all ages, with full benefits.	11	13	14	14	14
E. Benefits for dependent parents of retired or disabled workers.	None	Yes	15	17	19	20	20
F. Benefits for children dependent on workers other than parents.	None	Yes	11	16	20	23	25
G. Total			1,456	1,493	1,517	1,549	1,589

<sup>1</sup> The figures for the administration proposal are derived on the assumption that the maximum earnings base schedule therein is adopted; if the earnings base in H.R. 12080 were to prevail, the figures for the change shown here would be slightly lower.

<sup>2</sup> About 90 percent of the increase in cost is paid by the general fund.

#### IV. HOUSE-PASSED PROVISIONS NOT DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY

##### SECTION 101: BENEFIT INCREASE

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080 which provides for a 12½ percent benefit increase with a \$50 minimum.*

American Association of Homes for the Aging.  
American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.  
Colorado State Department of Public Welfare.  
Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ.  
Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin.  
Hearnes, Hon. Warren E., Governor of Missouri.  
Hoff, Hon. Philip H., Governor of Vermont.  
International Association of Health Underwriters.  
Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado.  
Machinery & Allied Products Institute.  
National Association of Manufacturers.  
National Federation of the Blind.  
National Grange.  
United Stone & Allied Products Workers of America, Local No. 177.  
Winter Park, Fla., Chamber of Commerce.

*Favor provision for 15 percent benefit increase with minimum of \$70 (as in H.R. 5710)*

Administration.  
AFL-CIO.  
American Federation of Government Employees.  
American Nurses Association.  
Arthritis Foundation, New York Chapter.  
Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress.  
Community Council of Greater New York.  
Community Service Society of New York  
Council of Jewish Federations & Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.  
Episcopal Action Group on Poverty.  
Halpern, Hon. Seymour, Member of Congress.  
Health & Welfare Council of the National Capital Area.  
National Consumers League.  
National Council of Senior Citizens.  
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.  
Physicians Forum.  
Puerto Rico Medical Association.  
YWCA.



*Favor higher benefit increases*

Flint, Mich., Chapter of National Association of Social Workers (favors 20-percent increase).  
 Javits, Jacob K., U.S. Senator (favors increase greater than 12½ percent and favors \$70 minimum).  
 Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator (favors 20-percent benefit increase).  
 Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator (favors 20-percent weighted at the lower benefit level(s)).  
 National Association of Social Workers (favors 50-percent benefit increase).  
 National Conference of Catholic Charities (favors benefit increase "larger than that proposed by the administration").  
 National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers (favors higher benefit increase than 12½ percent).  
 National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons (favors 17-percent benefit increase with \$70 minimum).  
 New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, and New York Labor-Management Council of Health and Welfare Plans (favors increase "in excess of 20 percent \* \* \* toward the goal of 50 percent").  
 National Social Welfare Assembly (favors 20-percent increase with \$70 minimum).  
 Page, Hon. Peter J., mayor, Borough of Bethel Park, Wis.  
 United Auto Workers (favors 50-percent increase in benefits).

*Oppose benefit increases in bills, but suggest lower amounts*

The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the Life Insurers Conference (favors benefit increase in line with 7-percent increase in cost of living).  
 Chamber of Commerce (favors increase of 9 to 10 percent).  
 Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, Pa. (favors 8-percent increase).  
 Council of State Chambers of Commerce (favors 8-percent increase).  
 Government Affairs Committee, American Hotel & Motel Association (favors 8 percent).  
 National Association of Life Underwriters (favors increase in benefits to maintain purchasing power).  
 Pomona, Calif., Chamber of Commerce (favors 8-percent increase).  
 Weiss, Morton, Rego Park, N. Y. (favors 8-percent increase).

*Favor higher minimum*

Alabama League of Aging Citizens (favors \$100 minimum).  
 American Public Welfare Association (favors \$70 minimum benefit).  
 Brooke, Hon. Edward W., U.S. Senator (favors minimum of \$75).  
 Flint, Mich., Chapter of National Association of Social Work (favors \$100 minimum for individuals, \$150 for couples).  
 Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator (favors \$100 minimum for individuals, \$150 for couples).

Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator (favors \$100 minimum, \$150 for couples).  
 National Association of Social Workers (favors \$100 minimum, \$150 for a couple).  
 National Conference of Catholic Charities (no amount specified).  
 National Council on the Aging (favors minimum benefit of \$125 a month).  
 National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (favors "higher minimum than is in H.R. 12080").  
 National Council of Senior Citizens (favors \$70 minimum; favors as benefit goal \$150 a month for individuals and \$250 a month for couples).  
 National Farmers Union (favors \$100 minimum, \$150 for a couple).  
 National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers (favors \$100 minimum, \$150 for a couple).  
 Sixty Now, Inc. (favors minimum benefit of \$100 and maximum benefit of \$250 a month).  
 Townsend Foundation (favors establishing a presumed average wage for each man or woman sufficient to qualify him for a benefit of \$125 a month).  
 United Auto Workers (favors minimum of \$100 for individuals, \$150 for couples).  
 Weiss, Morton, Rego Park, N. Y. (favors \$75 minimum).  
 Wyman, George K., commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services (favors \$70 minimum).

*Favor giving those with lower benefits larger increases than those getting higher benefits*

Community Council of Greater New York.  
 National Association of Social Security Beneficiaries.  
 New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, 244 New York Labor-Management Council of Health and Welfare Plans.

*Opposes benefit increases*

National Federation of Independent Business.

*Favor cost-of-living or other automatic benefit increase mechanism*

Allott, Hon. Gordon, U.S. Senator (cost-of-living).  
 American Foundation for the Blind, Inc. (cost-of-living).  
 Blinded Veterans Association, American Association of Workers for the Blind (cost-of-living).  
 Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress (cost-of-living).  
 Community Council of Greater New York (cost-of-living or increase in national productivity).  
 Government Affairs Committee, American Hotel & Motel Association.  
 Halpern, Hon. Seymour, Member of Congress (cost-of-living).  
 International Association of Health Underwriters (cost-of-living).  
 Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator (cost-of-living).



Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator (cost-of-living).  
 Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator (cost-of-living).  
 National Council on the Aging (tied to gross national product).  
 National Council of Senior Citizens (reflecting the rise in living standards or rise in the productivity of workers).  
 Sixty Now, Inc. (cost-of-living).  
 Townsend Foundation (with increases in per capita income).  
 United Auto Workers (cost-of-living).

*Opposes automatic increases*

The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the Life Insurance Conference.

*Favor use of general revenues*

Community Council of Greater New York.  
 Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator.  
 Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator.  
 National Association of Social Workers.  
 National Farmers Union.  
 National Social Welfare Assembly.  
 New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, 2d New York Labor-Management Council of Health and Welfare Plans.  
 Rosanetz, Herman, New York, N.Y.  
 Sixty Now, Inc.  
 United Auto Workers.  
 Williams, Hon. Harrison A., Jr., U.S. Senator.  
 Wyman, George K., commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services.

*Oppose use of general revenues*

The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the Life Insurance Conference.  
 Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, Pa.  
 International Association of Health Underwriters.  
 National Association of Life Underwriters.

*Favors \$50 minimum*

Allott, Hon. Gordon, U.S. Senator.

*Favors across-the-board benefit increase of 15 percent with \$60 minimum*

Moss, Hon. Frank E., U.S. Senator.

*Prefers 15 percent and an increased minimum benefit*

Curtis, Hon. Kenneth M., Governor of Maine.

*Favors raising social security to "a decent standard of living"*

Fraser, Tom, Sitka, Alaska.

*Opposes unless States are required to pass on increase to public assistance recipients*

Rosenstein, Fredric, New Haven, Conn.

*Favors more realistic increase in benefits*

National Council of Jewish Women.

*Favors permitting working couples to pool their income for purposes of determining benefits*

National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

**SECTION 102: INCREASE IN BENEFITS FOR PEOPLE BLANKETED IN AT AGE 72**

Present law	H. R. 12080
Special benefit of \$35 for single person and \$47.50 for a couple for people age 72 who do meet insured status requirements.	Increases amount to \$40 for a single person and to \$60 for a couple.

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

National Federation of the Blind.  
 Puerto Rico Medical Association.

*Favor provision in H.R. 5710*

AFL-CIO.  
 Community Service Society of N.Y.  
 Halpern, Hon. Seymour, Member of Congress.  
 Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator.  
 National Consumers League.



*Favor extending provision to residents of Puerto Rico*

Polanco-Abreu, Hon. Santiago, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.  
Rosametz, Herman, New York, N. Y.

*Opposes, would set amounts at same minimum as for insured individuals and would finance benefits out of social security taxes*  
Chamber of Commerce.

*Favor paying benefits regardless of other pensions received*

Alabama Department of Pensions and Security.  
National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons.  
Philadelphia Public School Retired Employees' Association.

*Favors changing provision to (1) change 72 to 70 years, (2) pay benefits regardless of other annuities received, and (3) set the benefit at \$50*  
Pittsburgh Retired Teachers' Association.

*Favors elimination of exclusion for veterans and widows of veterans; favors reducing age from 72 to 70 and paying for this out of general revenues*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress.

*Favors applying \$5,000 a year income test*

Polanco-Abreu, Hon. Santiago, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

**SECTION 103: MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF WIFE'S OR HUSBAND'S BENEFIT**

Present law	H. R. 12080
No provision.	Limits wife's and husband's benefit to maximum of \$105.

*Oppose provision in H.R. 12080*

Chamber of Commerce.  
Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, Pa.

**SECTION 104: BENEFITS TO DISABLED WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS**

Present law	H. R. 12080
Provides monthly benefits for disabled workers meeting eligibility requirements. Benefits are computed in the same way as retirement benefits. No provision for monthly benefits for disabled widows and widowers.	Monthly social security benefits would be payable between ages 50 and 62 to disabled widows and widowers of covered deceased workers. If benefits are first payable at age 50, they would be 50 percent of the primary insurance amount. Higher percentages would be payable—depending on the age at which benefits begin—up to 82½ percent of the primary insurance amount at age 62. The reduction would continue to apply to benefits payable after that time.

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Alabama Department of Pensions & Security (opposes special definition of disability).  
The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the Life Insurance Conference.  
Colorado State Department of Public Welfare.  
Community Council of Greater New York.  
Council of State Chambers of Commerce.  
International Association of Health Underwriters.

*Favor provision in H.R. 5710*

AFL-CIO.  
American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.  
Blinded Veterans' Association, American Association of Workers for the Blind.  
National Consumers League.  
National Council of Senior Citizens.  
National Federation of the Blind.  
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.  
National Social Welfare Assembly.  
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.  
Perkins, Hon. Carl D., Member of Congress.  
YWCA.



**SECTION 105: INSURED STATUS FOR YOUNGER DISABLED WORKERS**

<p>Present law</p>	<p>H. R. 12080</p>
<p>Young workers who are blind and disabled: May meet an alternative insured status requirement under which workers disabled before age 31 are insured if not less than one-half (and not less than 6) of the quarters during the period elapsing after age 21 and up to the point of disability were quarters of coverage or, in the case of those disabled before age 24, at least one-half of the 12 quarters ending with the quarter in which disability began were quarters of coverage.</p>	<p>Extends to all young workers the alternative insured status provisions which under present law apply to the blind only.</p>

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Chamber of Commerce.  
Perkins, Hon. Carl D., Member of Congress.

**SECTION 107: EARNINGS LIMITATION**

<p>Present law</p>	<p>H. R. 12080</p>
<p>Provides that benefits will be withheld from a beneficiary under age 72 (and from any dependent drawing on his record) at the rate of \$1 in benefits for each \$2 of annual earnings between \$1,500 and \$2,700 and \$1 in benefits for each \$1 of annual earnings above \$2,700. Benefits not withheld for any month during which the individual neither rendered services for wages in excess of \$125 nor rendered substantial services in a trade or business.</p>	<p>Increases the annual exempt amount from \$1,500 to \$1,680. Permits payment of full benefits to beneficiary, regardless of the amount of his annual earnings, for any month in which he does not earn wages of more than \$140, instead of more than \$125. Increases the uppermost limit of the \$1-for-\$2 "band" from \$2,700 to \$2,880, so that \$1 in benefits would be withheld for each \$2 of earnings between \$1,680 and \$2,880, with \$1-for-\$1 reductions above \$2,880. Effective for taxable years ending after 1967. No change.</p>

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080 (and in H.R. 5710)*

**AFL-CIO.**  
The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the Life Insurance Conference.  
Community Council of Greater New York.  
Community Service Society of New York (but allow beneficiaries to add difference between their benefit and the maximum benefit to the exempt amount).

Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ.  
International Association of Health Underwriters.  
National Association of Manufacturers.  
National Consumers League.  
National Council of Senior Citizens.  
New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, and New York Labor-Management Council of Health and Welfare Plans.

*Favor higher exempt amount than is in the bill*

Allott, Hon. Gordon, U.S. Senator (\$2,220).  
American Federation of Teachers (liberalize).  
American Nurses Association (\$2,700).  
Halpern, Hon. Seymour, Member of Congress (\$3,000).  
Moss, Hon. Frank E., U.S. Senator (\$1,800).  
National Conference of Catholic Charities (\$1,800).  
National Grange ("further liberalization").  
National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons (\$200 a month).  
Page, Hon. Peter J., mayor, Bethel Park, Wis. (\$4,800).  
Weiss, Morton, Rego Park, N.Y. (\$1,740).  
Winter Park, Fla., Chamber of Commerce (\$2,400).

*Favor elimination of the retirement test*

Asheburnst, John, Chicago, Ill.  
Brooke, Hon. Edward W., U.S. Senator (or substantial increase in exempt amount).  
Carlough, V. E., North Miami, Fla.  
Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator.  
Kennedy, Edward M., U.S. Senator (or treatment of other income on same basis as earned income).  
National Federation of Independent Business.  
Thom, Patricia J. (for survivor beneficiaries).

*Opposes reducing widow's benefits if she returns to work*

National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

**SECTION 108: INCREASE IN TAX AND BENEFIT BASE**

<p>Present law</p>	<p>H. R. 12080</p>
<p>Base is \$6,600 a year.</p>	<p>Base would be \$7,600 starting in 1968.</p>

**Cost:**  
See section 109.



*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*  
 Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin.  
 International Association of Health Underwriters.

*Favor provision in H.R. 5710*  
 Administration.  
 AFL-CIO.  
 American Federation of Government Employees.  
 Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress.  
 Halpern, Hon. Seymour, Member of Congress.  
 Moss, Hon. Frank E., U.S. Senator.  
 National Council of Senior Citizens.  
 Physicians Forum.

*Favor increase to other amounts*

Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ (should go higher).  
 Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator (higher than \$7,600).  
 Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator (in steps to \$14,740).  
 Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator (\$8,400 next January and to \$10,800 on January 1, 1971).  
 National Association of Social Workers (gradual increases to \$15,000).  
 National Farmers Union (\$15,000).  
 Sixty Now, Inc. (\$10,000).  
 United Auto Workers (several annual stages to \$15,000, with exemption for the first \$600 of earnings).

*Oppose increase in base*

The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the Life Insurance Conference.  
 Chamber of Commerce.  
 Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

*Oppose provisions in H.R. 5710*

National Association of Life Underwriters.  
 Townsend Foundation.

SEC. 109.—TAX RATES

Tax rates under present law and H.R. 12080

[In percent]

Period	OASDI		HI <sup>1</sup>		Total	
	Present law	H. R. 12080	Present law	H. R. 12080	Present law	H. R. 12080
			Employer-employee, each			
1967-----	3.9	3.9	0.5	0.5	4.4	4.4
1968-----	3.9	3.9	.5	.5	4.4	4.4
1969-70-----	4.4	4.2	.5	.6	4.9	4.8
1971-72-----	4.4	4.6	.5	.6	4.9	5.2
1973-75-----	4.85	5.0	.55	.65	5.4	5.65
1976-79-----	4.85	5.0	.6	.7	5.45	5.7
1980-86-----	4.85	5.0	.7	.8	5.55	5.8
1987 and after-----	4.85	5.0	.8	.9	5.65	5.9
			Self-employed			
1967-----	5.9	5.9	0.5	0.5	6.4	6.4
1968-----	5.9	5.9	.5	.5	6.4	6.4
1969-70-----	6.6	6.3	.5	.6	7.1	6.9
1971-72-----	6.6	6.9	.5	.6	7.1	7.5
1973-75-----	7.0	7.0	.55	.65	7.55	7.65
1976-79-----	7.0	7.0	.6	.7	7.6	7.7
1980-86-----	7.0	7.0	.7	.8	7.7	7.8
1987 and after-----	7.0	7.0	.8	.9	7.8	7.9

<sup>1</sup> Hospital insurance.



**Costs:**

*Changes in cost for administration proposal as compared with H.R. 12080 as passed by the House of Representatives, financing changes, by calendar year*

[In millions]

	Provision in H.R. 12080	Provision in administration proposal	Increase in tax income over bill				
			1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
A. Increase in maximum taxable earnings base.	\$7,600 in 1968 and after.	\$7,800 in 1968-70; \$9,000 in 1971-73; \$10,800 thereafter.	\$202	\$306	\$337	\$1,819	\$2,458
B. Increase in hospital insurance contribution rates.	0.2 percent increase in combined rate <sup>1</sup> for 1969 and after.	0.3 percent increase in combined rate <sup>1</sup> for 1969 and after.		320	377	404	424
C. Total			202	626	714	2,223	2,882

<sup>1</sup> For employer and employee combined.

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*  
 National Association of Life Underwriters.  
 Weiss, Morton, Rego Park, N. Y.

*Favors provisions in H.R. 5710*  
 Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress.

*Oppose provision for increase in tax rate*  
 Council of State Chambers of Commerce.  
 National Farmers Union.

*Favors financing benefit increase from surplus and tax increases if necessary*  
 Chamber of Commerce.

**SECTION 110: ALLOCATION TO DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND**

Present law	H. R. 12080
<p>The Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund receives an amount equal to 0.70 of 1 percent of taxable wages plus 0.525 of 1 percent of self-employment income, from which benefit and administrative expenses are paid for the disability insurance program.</p> <p>These funds are administered by a Board of Trustees consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, as managing trustee, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.</p>	<p>The allocation to the Disability Insurance Trust Fund, for years beginning after 1967, is increased to 0.95 of 1 percent of taxable wages and 0.7125 of 1 percent of taxable self-employment income.</p>

*Favors provision in H.R. 12080*  
 Chamber of Commerce.



**SECTION 151. CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING  
CHILD'S DEPENDENCY ON MOTHER**

<p align="center">J Present law</p>	<p align="center">H. R. 12080</p>
<p>A child is dependent on his father or adopting father if the child is living with the father or the father is making regular and substantial contributions to the child's support. A child is also dependent on his father or adopting father unless the child has been adopted by someone else or the child is neither the worker's legitimate nor adopted child. A child is dependent on his stepfather if he is living with the stepfather or the stepfather is providing at least ½ of the child's support. A child is dependent on his mother or adopting mother if she is currently insured. If she is not currently insured, the child is dependent on her only if: (A) she is contributing at least ½ of the child's support or (B) she is living with the child or is making regular contributions to the child's support and the child's father is neither living with the child nor making regular contributions to the child's support.</p>	<p>Would provide the same dependency requirements for benefits based on the earnings of a woman worker as present law requires for benefits based on the earnings of a male worker. Effective for 2d month after enactment.</p>

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Alabama Department of Pensions and Security,  
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs,  
Inc.

**SECTION 156: DEFINITION OF DISABILITY**

<p align="center">Present law</p>	<p align="center">H. R. 12080</p>
<p>For benefits or for the freeze, an individual must be precluded from engaging in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a physical or mental impairment. (For purposes of the freeze only, a specified degree of blindness is presumed disabling.) The impairment must be medically determinable and one which can be expected to exist for not less than 12 months.</p>	<p>New guidelines would be provided in the law under which a person (other than a disabled widow or widower) could be determined to be disabled only if due to a physical or mental impairment (as defined) he is unable to engage in any kind of substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy even though such work does not exist in the general area in which he lives. A widow (or widower) would be determined to be disabled only if he has a physical or mental impairment that makes it impossible for him to perform <i>any</i> gainful work rather than substantial gainful work. Effective on enactment.</p>

*Favors occupational definition of disability at age 50 or 55*

ARL-CIO.

*Favors provision to make blind persons with at least 6 quarters of coverage eligible for disability cash benefits without regard to ability to engage in substantial gainful activity*

Blinded Veterans Association, American Association of Workers for the Blind,  
National Federation of the Blind (S. 1681).



**V. OTHER CHANGES SUGGESTED BY WITNESSES  
AT HEARING ON H.R. 12080**

*Favors increase in number of dropout years in computing benefits*  
AFL-CIO.

*Favors adoption for physicians of an "alternative insured status" provision; favors "dropping out" a number of years for physicians*  
American Medical Association.

*Favors "expansion and extension of the social insurance provisions"*  
South Dakota chapter, National Association of Social Workers.

*Favors amending law so that a woman who was divorced after age 40 after 14 years of marriage would be eligible for wife's or widow's benefits*  
Woodworth, Dorothy, Palo Alto, Calif.

*Favors elimination of prohibition against social security coverage of employment by a spouse*  
Union de Mujeres Americanas, Puerto Rico.

*Favors (1) no age limit for wife's and widow's benefits, (2) 100% of PIA for widow, (3) computation based on high-5 years, (4) coverage for those not now covered*  
Sixty Now, Inc.

*Favors removing social security tax for post age 65 earnings*  
American Federation of Teachers.

*Favors comprehensive independent study of the social security program*  
National Association of Life Underwriters.



*Favors reduction from 20 to 10 years in the length of time a divorced woman must have been married to her former husband to be considered eligible for a wife's or widow's benefit*  
National Council of Senior Citizens.

*Favors higher benefits for delayed retirement*  
Allott, Hon. Gordon, U.S. Senator.

*Favors increasing widow's benefit to 90% of her husband's benefit*  
Allott, Hon. Gordon, U.S. Senator.

*Favors paying widow 100 percent of husband's benefit*  
New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, and New York Labor-Management Council of Health & Welfare Plans.  
Union de Mujeres Americanas, Puerto Rico.

*Favors requirement that at least one member of the Advisory Council on Social Security be a recipient of social security or public welfare*  
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator.

*Favors authorizing fathers' as well as mothers' insurance benefits*  
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

*Favors making dependent sisters eligible for cash benefits and medicare*  
Flax, Leonard H., M.D., Baltimore, Md.

*Favor special minimum benefit for long-term workers as in sec. 102 of H.R. 5710*  
AFL-CIO.  
American Public Welfare Association.  
Community Service Society of New York.  
National Consumers League.  
National Council of Senior Citizens.  
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.  
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.

*Opposes special minimum benefit for long-term workers as in sec. 102 of H.R. 5710*  
Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, Pa.

*Favors elimination of provisions denying benefits to individuals because of membership in certain organizations as in sec. 110 of H.R. 5710*  
American Civil Liberties Union.

*Favor extension of coverage of agricultural workers as in sec. 115 of H.R. 5710*  
AFL-CIO.  
Community Council of Greater New York.  
National Consumers League.  
National Council on the Aging.  
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.  
National Council of Negro Women.  
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

*Oppose transfer of Federal employment credits as in sec 116 of H.R. 5710*  
American Federation of Government Employees (studying provision).  
AFL-CIO.  
Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO.