President Truman's Courageous Leadership

As this issue of Capital Comment goes to press, President Truman has taken decisive measures for the security of the world with his forthright statement and courageous actions in the face of unwarranted aggression against Korea.

President Truman's courageous world leadership in standing firm for the rights of free people and his terse, bold announcement won the approval of the leaders of the Congress. Once again the President has made a major contribution toward strengthening the United Nations.

All Americans—and all peace-loving peoples everywhere—unite in their praise of the President.

Oregonians -- Democrats and Republicans alike -- last week sat down and broke bread with the leadership of the Democratic National Committee and told the story of what they want and need to insure the future wealth and greatness of the Pacific Northwest.

The meeting was unique in my experience for many of the speakers were registered Republicans; but all who attended this history-making meeting in The Dalles, Oregon, were sincere, honest Americans, speaking from the heart.

The meeting was arranged by Monroe Sweetland, Democratic National Committeeman from Oregon, and his associates, Mrs. Nancy Robinson, National Committeewoman, Les Joestin, State Chairman, and Mrs. Joena Leonard, State Vice Chairman. Its purpose was to give the National Committee an opportunity to learn directly from representatives of farm, labor and business just what they feel should be done to build the future prosperity of the State of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest.

This was a striking example of democracy at work. It is the only method by which a political party can determine how the people who are actually facing important problems in their everyday life feel about those problems.

It is on such a basis that the Democratic Party operates, for it is only from the people that the desires and needs of the people can be determined. Ten leaders of economic groups of the Northwest outlined the needs of the area. They spoke on diverse subjects but all bore heavily on the problem of Oregon's future and how it affects the nation as a whole.

Mrs. Linde Edwards, who sat with me and listened while these Americans told their wants and aspirations, summed up at the conclusion of the meeting. She said:

"It does my heart good to find that of all the things you in the Northwest want, there is not one that is not a part of the present Democratic Administration's program."
Here are excerpts from the very interesting non-partisan remarks made by leaders of Oregon economic life:

Charles Baker, President, Inland Empire Waterways Association and head of the Pacific Cooperative Supply, said: "Hood River Dam was the first step in a great program to improve the Northwest and open it for expansion. The Republican Party should perhaps see how the Democrats operate. What is needed now is to continue the program as it is laid down but with greater speed."

Mr. Baker stressed the need for more water power for industry, more water for irrigation and reclamation and better transportation facilities on the waterways. He concluded:

"To get the maximum benefits that are vital we must have a major, overall coordinating program."

Mr. Baker has been registered as a Republican.

T. J. Carson, Oregon legislative chairman of The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, a Republican, spoke briefly on the needs of railroad labor. He was followed by Chester Doster, CIO Regional Director. Mr. Doster, a Democrat, called for an overall, integrated expansion of the program for development of the Columbia River Basin.

He pointed out that the re-forestation of the rapidly diminishing timberlands of the Northwest is vital to our future, and further said that this should be one major consideration in the development of the Columbia River.

Valney Martin, of the AFL Oregon State Building Trades Council, declared:

"We want peace in the world, first and foremost. We are tired of seeing our boys killed.

"We want jobs for our people, and not jobs resulting from war employment."

"We want the Taft-Hartley Act repealed and we want an extension of Social Security, an increase in the benefits, and a lowering of the age limits.

"We want a National Health Program. The people I represent are the ones hardest hit by illness—in illness which takes all savings and leaves my people all too often as wards of the State."

James Hill, Jr., Manager, Pendleton Shuntovers' Association, stressed the need for a "permanent farm program with a minimum of subsidies and a maximum of local control."

Cecil Pusey, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Education Association, called for prompt passage of the President's program to aid education. He pointed out the severe problems facing Oregon schools and school teachers in the next ten years and concluded: "If the nation is to be free in the next fifty years it will depend on what we do now to educate our children for freedom."

Ralph Perry, Pendleton Master, Hood River County Grange, declared for a strong farm program. He said the Administration farm program and the program of the National Grange were so close that there was no need for a dual list.

Arthur H.Bowen, Editor of the Oregon Union-Register, also came out strongly for the Administration farm program. He said it was vital that the farmer's income be stabilized to prevent economic disaster in the future.

The concluding speaker was W. J. Titus, executive vice president, Western Forest Industries Association. Mr. Titus asked for government action to curb monopoly in timber and for passage of a law, now pending in Congress, which would free necessary roads so that small timber operators could harvest the timber on government lands on a basis of free competition.
The meeting was one that I will always remember as outstanding in its application of democratic principles. I took full and complete notes and I promised I would make a full report to the President of the United States and to the Democratic leadership in the Congress.

The Democratic National Committee is not a government agency; its position is purely advisory. Yet the Committee remains close to the people. Its purpose must always be to carry the message of the people, their wants and aspirations — carry this message to the elected heads of our government.

In this way we carry out the mission of the Democratic Party and strengthen the entire process of the government of free men.

Last week we gave you the facts about voluntary health insurance plan coverage so you would be able to understand and answer the expensive advertising campaign of the American Medical Association, which is designed to sell the idea that voluntary plans make national health insurance unnecessary.

This week we want to give you the facts to answer the other phase of the AMA campaign, which will try to sell the public the idea that the Administration’s health program for the nation is “socialized medicine.”

Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, is the head of the government agency entrusted with our national health standards and our national health problem. He has studied at first hand the national medical program in Great Britain and talked with the persons who are running that program. Recently he made a speech in which he compared the two programs and told why he was AGAINST “socialized medicine.”

These excerpts from his speech give you the FACTS which show that the Administration’s health program is the best way to give good medical care to all Americans and to AVOID “socialized medicine”:

“A few months ago, while I was in England on an official mission, I looked into the workings of the British Health Service. I was especially interested to see what they had done with their hospitals. As you may know, the British government took over the hospitals lock, stock and barrel. Nearly every hospital in Great Britain today is government property.

“While I was in London, I had several conversations — you might even call them arguments — with the Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan. He tried to persuade me that you cannot improve the health standards of a nation today unless the government owns and runs the hospitals. I told him flatly that he would not get the President of the United States to agree with him, or the Federal Security Administrator, or anyone else in the government of the United States.

“We think our hospitals are well run. We do not believe that the Federal Government would run them better...

“How am going to let you in on a secret. This one may surprise some of you.

“Just as I am opposed to Federal control of hospitals, so too I am opposed to Federal control of medicine. I am against socialized medicine. Perhaps I ought to repeat that, slowly. I am against socialized medicine.

“I am AGAINST any system whereby all doctors work for the government, and must treat the patients that the government assigns to them.

“I am AGAINST any system whereby all patients — meaning the public — get their medical and hospital care paid for out of general taxes, and must accept the treatment of the doctor that the government assigns to them.”
"I am AGAINST any system whereby the government can tell a doctor exactly how he must treat a particular illness, what drugs he can or cannot use, how much time he must or must not spend on a patient. They have that kind of socialized medicine in Russia, and I don't want any part of it...

"But I would not be fulfilling my responsibilities as Federal Security Administrator if I stopped there...

IT'S BEEN FIshed OUT FOR YEARS

"Our health, by and large, is good in America -- better than in any other country in the world. We have some of the finest doctors in the world. We have some of the finest hospitals in the world. We have made some of the most miraculous medical discoveries in the world.

"But it is not enough...

"Tens of thousands -- even hundreds of thousands -- of American will have died this year because they could not afford to pay for the medical and hospital care that might have saved their lives...

"The problem is mathematical -- how to arrange for people to pay their own way, as far as medical and hospital care is concerned, without setting up the kind of socialized medicine, the Federal control of medicine, which none of us want.

"Now I am going to tell you another secret. I am not wedded to National Health Insurance. It is altogether conceivable to me that there is some better way to solve this problem than by the insurance method. I would gladly give up the proposal for National Health Insurance -- and President Truman would gladly give it up -- if someone would come along with a better way to do the job.

"Somehow, someday soon, we will solve our health problems. We will make sure that the dollar bill need no longer stand in the way of good health. We will have the doctors and nurses and research workers that we need...

"Does that sound like 'socialized medicine' to you? It doesn't sound like 'socialism' to me and I think every American who has the facts will agree."

I would like to ask you to study these observations and facts carefully, so that you can help to keep the public informed, because when the voters know all the facts, they will know that the Democratic Party has a real program for the people.

William M. Boyle, Jr., Chairman

We hope you are passing "Capital Comment" around among your friends.

Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited.