tobacco or soft drinks, candy, jewelry, chewing gum, or beer, liquors or wines, or attends picture shows or theaters, or who uses public transportation will necessarily pay taxes to the Federal Government. They also pay Federal taxes in other ways. Therefore, if the people of the United States can use $50,000,000 of their money to save themselves, the people of the United States, $335,000,000, it will certainly be a good trade for them.

In addition to the saving to the consumer, the cost of living will be held down and demands for wage and salary increases successfully answered.

CONGRESS NOW ASKING PRESIDENT TO NOT CARRY OUT FORMER MANDATE TO KEEP DOWN COST OF LIVING

Congress in the passage of the Second Price Control Act, which became effective October 2, 1942, authorized and directed the President of the United States to stabilize wages, salaries, and all things entering into the cost of living as of September 15, 1942, insofar as practicable.

At the same time authority was given the President to correct gross inequalities and injustices. The President has been trying to carry out this positive mandate and accordingly has been proceeding upon what is called the "hold-the-line order," and all agencies of the executive department have been trying to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, on prices, wages, and salaries.

Now, if Congress passes another law, such as proposed in the one herein discussed, that will compel the President to increase the prices of things that go into the cost of living, the President will no longer be able to hold salaries and wages down.

The result will be that prices will increase, which will immediately run up the cost of living; then wages and salaries must be increased; then on account of wages and salaries being increased, prices will have to increase again. This will be a race between wages and salaries on one side and the cost of living on the other. The result will be just like putting a match under a barrel of gunpowder. Prices will go out of control, and the sky will be the limit, and we will be faced with unbridled inflation.

CONGRESS OFFERS NO ALTERNATIVE FOR SUBSIDIES

The President has repeatedly told Congress that if Congress will suggest an alternative for the price control scheme, he would gladly accept it. Sufficient price to encourage production without subsidies, and at the same time prevent runaway inflation.

The argument is made that it is wrong for the taxpayers to pay a part of anyone's grocery bill. The correct statement would be that it is not wrong for a taxpayer to permit a part of his tax money to be used by his Government to keep down his food bill, if it will save him $5 for every $1 so paid and will at the same time prevent ruinous inflation.

OPPONENTS DO NOT OPPOSE ALL SUBSIDIES--JUST A FEW

Those who proclaim so long and loud that they are opposed to the Government paying any part of anyone's grocery bill are perfectly willing to pay certain subsidies. For instance, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives have a bill, known as the "hold-the-line" legislation, which amounts to about $1 per barrel, thereby placing themselves in the position of saying it is all right for the Government to pay part of anyone's fuel bill, but wrong for the Government to pay any part of the grocery bill. Furthermore, our Republican friends are in favor of subsidized housing which results in the taxpayer's paying a part of the rent bill for each family who resides in one of these houses. So the net result is they are not against all subsidies—they are just against some subsidies.

It will be noticed that in the very provision written into this bill against subsidies, in section 3 at the end, there is a provision which recognizes subsidies for certain commodities and will permit their continuance. The exact language at the end of section 3 is:

Provided further, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments of doubt incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed.

How can we consistently contend that the farmers producing peanuts, cottonseed, soybeans, and other such fats and oils shall be benefited by subsidies, and shall continue to receive them, but our farmers who grow other things shall not be so benefited by being permitted to continue to receive them? Another thing I cannot understand is why it is all right to have someone buy one gallon of milk and pay part of one's fuel bill, and housing, and pay part of one's rent bill, and for peanuts and cottonseed and soybeans and other commodities, but it is absolutely wrong for anyone to buy bread and other items that go directly into the cost of living that would cause a spiral of inflationary prices.

The dairy farmer has found himself in a squeeze. The prices of his feed have been going up but the price of his milk has remained stationary because of the effort being made to stabilize the cost of living. The War Food Administration has recently inaugurated subsidies that will give the farmers a quarter in the form of a subsidy to the producer. It was contended that this should be made in the form of an increased price of 1 cent instead. If it had been, maybe the producer would have received it and maybe he would not, as it would have necessarily gone back through several hands before reaching the producer. In the case of dairy products, if the Government can spend $100,- 000,000—I am just using this arbitrary amount for the purpose of illustration only—and save the consumers $500,- 000,000, it looks like it might be a good bargain for the customers who are also taxpayers, and therefore a good bargain for the taxpayers. The farmer is entitled to and must receive a good price, but I am sure he will not object if a part of that price is paid in a subsidy if it will give him just as much money and at the same time protect him against ruinous inflation.

BILLS UP WEEK AFTER NEXT

It is probable that this bill will come before the House of Representatives Friday, October 25. An effort will be made at that time to strike out section 3 of the bill.

Proposed Social-Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very notable series of articles by Fred W. Perkins, the Scripps-Howard newspaper, on the Social-Security bill introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Montana (Mr. MURPHY) and myself, and in the House of Representatives by Representative Dungeon.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington News of September 27, 1943]

SOCIAL-SECURITY FIGHT
(By Fred W. Perkins)

The Social Security System was 8 years old last month. Its champions say this new link between Government and citizen has proved its worth, and that the time has come to extend it toward its complete conception, even though the Nation is busy with a war.

Here, they say, is a way to attain one of the "four freedoms" for which our men are fighting—freedom from want—by enlarging the benefits already provided by social security, by making them available to some 20,-000,000 workers who now lack such protection, and by giving special consideration to the men and women who will return to civil life from the armed services.
A bill providing for a sweeping extension of the Social Security System has been introduced in Congress by Senator Wagner (Democrat, New York), Senator Mussey (Democrat, Montana), and Representative Murray (Democrat, Oregon). It is largely the product of study and recommendations by the American Federation of Labor, which is sponsoring it. The Congres of industrial Organizations is also back of the legislation, and other labor groups are expected to be active.

Support in general has been announced by the Social Security Board. Also lined up are the New Deal interests, headed by President Roosevelt, which get the credit for the original Social Security Act of 1935, sponsored by Senator Wagner and others.

The known opposition, to the proposed changes has two principal centers: (1) A strong group of State officials expects to continue its resistance to federalization of State unemployment-compensation systems, and (2) The American Medical Association and others.

Another target of possible opposition is the Social Security Board. Also believe that socialization of the welfare system is not the proper vehicle for the intended purposes.

They hope it will not be stuck on the great expansion of the social-security system that is projected in this country.

The American plan, as embodied in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills now pending in the House, provides that the Central Government, through one office, to serve all employers and workers.

---

[From the Washington News of September 29, 1943]
tor, charwomen, telephone operators, and other maintenance staffs and workers, when the benefits to which professional staff members are entitled:"

"It is pointed out also that private pension plans are only retirement or annuity arrangements for the employee, with no further provision of benefits for his family.

Most employers and their employees have changed their views on this subject, says the Board, which recommends that some protection be extended to them but with a provision against loss of other kinds of protection they now hold. The self-employed group in the United States, estimated at 11,000,000, is made up mostly of independent farmers or businessmen, but includes also such extremes in economic status as professional men, on the one hand, and persons who make a living by renting rooms, delivering daily magazine subscriptions, taking in washing, and selling newspapers at street corners. Many low paid employees of the Social Security Board has found other reasons why they need social insurance as much as the people attached to a regular pay roll.

As to governmental employees, the Social Security Board reports that only about half of those in the State and local agencies are covered by retirement systems, that in the Federal service large numbers of civilian war workers may lose the protection the Federal-Postal employment will acquire comparable protection in their Government jobs. The Board's recommendations for coverage are extended to these groups without harm to any protection they now have.

[From the Washington News of September 30, 1943]

FIGHT FOR SECURITY

(By Fred W. Perkins)

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, now pending in Congress and proposing a great extension of the Social Security System, uses 19 of its 90 pages to outline legislatively what it calls: "Federal medical, hospitalization, and related benefits"—an enterprise which some oppose as socialized medicine, and which an unfriendly organization of physicians calls totalitarian medicine.

This is probably the most controversial part of the bill. Its advocates see in it a blessing for the millions of low-income families whose members delay or neglect visits to physicians and hospitals because of the cost. Its foes say it would abolish private medical practice and set up a government monopoly. Less spending by the head of the Public Health Service, with $3,000,000,000 a year to spend, would eventually engulf the patients and physicians in the country and the controller of all hospital beds.

Proposals are divided. Some nationally prominent physicians support the general principles of this proposed legislation, and through their Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, Inc., have said it "provides a framework and a basis for discussion from which it is sincerely hoped that a constructive program for improved medical and health care of the American people may be developed."

Dr. George E. Bigge, Social Security Board member, says: "There is nothing in our recommendations, or, so far as I can see, in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which would in any way affect the doctor or the hospital in their relations with their patients. The purpose of the proposal is simply to make sure that patients will have the money with which to pay their bills. I can see no reason why any doctor or hospital should be subject to that." The American Federation of Labor description of the proposed new health-insurance program is more partial, but it would extend medical and hospital care to all persons covered under old-age and survivors' insurance and for their dependents.

"The proposal assures free choice of any regularly licensed general practitioner, arrangements for use of specialists' services, and varied methods of remunerating doctors, with emphasis on maintenance and development of the quality of medical care, and provision for grants to aid medical education and research."

The National Physicians' Committees declare: "Our concern is that if enacted into law, the entire system of American medical care would be destroyed."

"Say we are on social security: "We have no desire to interfere in the scientific matters of the medical profession, in which doctors alone are competent, but we are concerted to make medical care available to those who need it."

As to the other end of the plan, the A.F. of L. committee says: "Voluntary hospitalization covers around 10,000,000 people, while hospitalization insurance under social security should cover something like eighty to one hundred million."

[From the Washington News of October 1, 1943]

FIGHT FOR SECURITY

(By Fred W. Perkins)

Many Americans oppose private insurance policies under which, if disabled temporarily or permanently, they receive regular payments from the insurance companies.

The pending Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, for expansion of the Security System, calls for payments by the Federal Government to the temporarily and permanently disabled—payments collected partly from employers and partly from workers. The potential beneficiaries would be much more numerous than those who now deal with the insurance companies.

This proposal is backed by the Social Security Board, as well as by the labor and other groups that are advocating immediate extension of social security.

The Social Security Board's position is that permanent disability should be handled as if it were premature old age, while temporary disability should be handled like temporary unemployment.

"Say the S. S. B.: "When only one exception (Spain), the United States is the only country which provides insurance against old age without also providing against temporary or permanent disability * * *. There is no comprehensive system in the United States providing protection against wage losses due to temporary disability * * * * *." Twenty-eight nations now provide insurance protection to their workers against temporary disability.

"The American Federation of Labor says: "When a man is permanently disabled his wife and children need help as much as if he had died. No wage earner can afford to buy enough insurance from private insurance companies to give his family the help they require if he becomes permanently disabled. Only social insurance can make it possible and affordable to have this kind of protection at a price we can afford."

Some complications in benefits for temporary disability are pointed out by the A. F. of L.:

"People who are out of work because they are sick need an income to make up for their loss of earnings; just as much as well people need their unemployment benefits."

"Much of our experience with insurance is all of us to buy this kind of disability," the A. F. of L. continues, "has come from the trade union or fraternal sickness-benefit societies and not from other groups. In these small employee societies where people were

acquainted with each other the trustees of the benefit funds knew when one of the members was laid up or too sick and also when he was well again and able to go back to his job.

"We will exchange the personal relationships of the little group—sickness-benefit plans for the greater strength and security of a national social-insurance system, which will come up first before the House and Senate, and a Federal-State enterprise."

The State argument will be that federalization of unemployment compensation would mean loss of the concentration of a Federal-State enterprise. The S. S. B., however, recommends that actual administration be "strongly decentralized, with representative advisory committees and appeals councils in all the States."

"The A. F. of L. and the S. S. B. join in the view that State administration of unemployment compensation is so lacking in uniformity that a central coordinating agency is demanded."

After-war conditions are cited as probable reasons why the 48 States should not attempt to handle unemployment compensation without regard to the rest of the country; a Federal agency, it is argued, would have the broad view.

The same line of thought is back of the proposal for a national system of employment offices, about which there is less agreement. Less spending by the head of the Public Health Service, with $3,000,000,000 a year to spend, would eventually engulf the patients and physicians in the country and the controller of all hospital beds.

Proposals are divided. Some nationally prominent physicians support the general principles of this proposed legislation, and through their Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, Inc., have said it "provides a framework and a basis for discussion from which it is sincerely hoped that a constructive program for improved medical and health care of the American people may be developed."

Dr. George E. Bigge, Social Security Board member, says: "There is nothing in our recommendations, or, so far as I can see, in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which would in any way affect the doctor or the hospital in their relations with their patients. The purpose of the proposal is simply to make sure that patients will have the money with which to pay their bills. I can see no reason why any doctor or hospital should be subject to that." The American Federation of Labor description of the proposed new health-insurance program is more partial, but it would extend medical and hospital care to all persons covered under old-age and survivors' insurance and for their dependents.

"The proposal assures free choice of any regularly licensed general practitioner, arrangements for use of specialists' services, and varied methods of remunerating doctors, with emphasis on maintenance and development of the quality of medical care, and provision for grants to aid medical education and research."

The National Physicians' Committees declare: "Our concern is that if enacted into law, the entire system of American medical care would be destroyed."

"Say we are on social security: "We have no desire to interfere in the scientific matters of the medical profession, in which doctors alone are competent, but we are concerted to make medical care available to those who need it."

As to the other end of the plan, the A. F. of L. committee says: "Voluntary hospitalization covers around 10,000,000 people, while hospitalization insurance under social security should cover something like eighty to one hundred million."

[From the Washington News of October 2, 1943]
EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 15 (Legislative day of Tuesday October 12), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the Honorable Edward Warren Brown, at Riverhead, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on Wednesday evening, October 13, 1943, to the Suffolk County Farm Bureau and other farm organizations. Let me add that Mr. Brown is president of the American Unity League, Inc.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We have two wars on our hands—a world-wide military war abroad and a socio-economic war at home.

Since our unpreparedness for war 2 years ago, we have reaped heavily. We may now reasonably expect to do our share in the military war. All bets favor the United Nations against the Axis Powers.

A socio-economic war at home, however, has developed intense difficulty and confusion, to the extent of threatening our military victory. Politics for the next year is expected to the extent of threatening our military victory—our military victory not the American prosperity brand of genuine social security—not the foreign housewife type of the dictator. The bases for my convictions are these:

"That a majority of the citizens must organize for this or any other, self-help method to our everyday ways of living, of working, and of doing business; that history, society and lasting prosperity come, there must come a moderate reconstruction of our social order; that there must be no industrial, fiscal, or political revolutionary tactics used to accomplish our purposes; that the specific and definite ways and means must be coordinated and reconciled to agree with the principles of humanity and decency, which I again repeat in the words of Thomas Jefferson, ‘Equal rights for all, special privileges for none. Now, gentlemen, you may have a mental picture of America’s greatest war need—unity of purpose and action—and how the objectives desired by every income group may be realized. The specific and definite ways and means which are embodied in the surplus-wages system involve many complex details, but it is thought that we are able to give to their consideration at this meeting. Therefore, I suggest that every member of your organizations obtain through your secretaries copies of my brochure entitled “War-Time Edition—Surplus Wages (A New Nation)”, and give it the same emphasis entitled “Catechism for the Surplus-Wages System.”

The condensed outlines of objectives and methods will aid you to understand how your interests will be favorably affected when the surplus-wages system is adopted and as it has already been done in Europe.

Questions addressed to me at Blue Point, Long Island, N. Y., will be answered as rapidly as facilities permit.