

October 11, 1946

Mrs. C. W. Korp
Rural Route 1
Claremore, Oklahoma

Dear Mrs. Korp:

Your letter of October 1st has been received at Congressman Schwabe's Washington office. The Congressman is in Oklahoma at this time, but I shall bring your letter to his attention upon his return to Washington, for I am sure he will be interested in having your views on Social Security and the labor situation.

I am glad you received the Agricultural bulletins safely, and hope you will not hesitate to call upon our office whenever we can be of service.

With assurances of Congressman Schwabe's desire to render every possible assistance to the people of his District, and that he will much appreciate your nice letter when he returns to Washington, and with all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

A. L. Warren, Secretary

Rt. No. 1
Claremore, Okla.
Oct. 1, 1946

Honorable George B. Schwabe
Congressman, 1st District, Okla.
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir:

In the morning's mail I received the bulletins of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. I am glad to have these. I wish to add that I have appreciated all the literature which you have sent. It has been my desire to write you upon other occasions but it seems time for farmers is much too limited to take time out for expression.

Your attitude toward the affairs of the state and the government is to my liking. I read your recent comments concerning the Old Age Pension fund and I thoroughly agree with you. Much, a large part of the red tape should be cut and the pensioners receive the benefit or be returned to the fund. What I should like to know Mr. Schwabe, can the government really afford the cost of this fund as it runs today? I wonder if the amount of \$50 per month is not a liberal amount for each pensioner. I wish to compare this fund with Social Security;

How much social security benefit can the average wage earner expect to receive should he reach the age of sixty-five and be retired today? I doubt if the average wage earner would receive \$50 per month, would it not be nearer \$35 or \$40? This laborer has his labor and a financial investment over a period of time. The old age pensioner receives benefit and he is not required to have anything invested, just to live to reach the age of sixty-five.

Now, my husband is a machinist and has been in his trade all his life, really grew up with it. He is now sixty-six and is still working and receiving the regular wage for his work. Naturally at his age, he has lost a lot of time during the last few years because of illness, but he is still with the same company he has been with since ^{he belongs} social security became effective. In as much as we are farmers too, I believe we are a little better off than if we were purely wage earners. My point is not to be confined to ourselves entirely, what of these laborers who have to depend entirely upon their retirement through social security. At the age of sixty-five only a few people are able to earn much on the side. The sixty-five year old laborer has no more earning capacity than the sixty-five year old pensioner. If there is to be any difference the laborer should have the added difference because of his investment.

Am I right or am I wrong? They all have to live.

Very sincerely

Mrs. C. W. Korp