Wrban Prollen MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR HUMPHREY The following are points which could be included in Senator Humphrey's speech at The New School on December 7. The commemoration of Pearl Harbor is a particularly fitting time to discuss the importance for a democracy to maintain an alert and well informed citizenry. In our determination to ensure that no such calamity shall ever again strike us, and to prevent the devastation of another world war, it is essential that our citizens have sufficient information and understanding of the rapid developments in a fast-paced world so that they can make clear and intelligent decisions. For example, the complexities of the space age and the problems arising from it were not covered in the school curriculum for most adults. This is one of many subjects of vital and broad interest, which spurs the alert adult to go back to schoff. The widespread interest in adult ducation among our citizens, springing in large part from efforts to keep up with a rapidly changing world, are evidenced by the sharp increase in enrollment in adult education classes. Almost 40 million people, equal to the entire number of children and youths attending public schools, are now enrolled in some form of adult education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare figure, February, 1959). We must stop considering that education is only for children and young people. "School age" should be our entire lifetime. Our children can never be expected to take full advantage of their schooling if education is not a way of life in their homes. No better example could be set for children than having their parents utilize one evening a week for polf enrichment in adult education programs offered in their localities. One of the major goals of adult education must be to stimulate discussion as a major force in our democracy. cannot maintain our vitality as a nation on spoon-fed entertainment which tends to dull our senses and anesthetize us from some of our more painful problems. Tente In Continuation Study Auslin Courses Aukir Osswal

## 000116

Instead, we must encourage widespread discussion of every aspect of the issues confronting us at all levels -- great conferences\*, town meetings, community gatherings, universities and schools, and, perhaps most important of all, in the home.

Knowledge and insight are products not of formal degrees but of constant curiosity and alertness. Continuing education should be a way of life in the home and a goal of citizens from every economic and social group -- a perpetual challenge for all our citizens regardless of how much formal education they have.

3. The pioneering work in adult education done by The New School should stimulate the imagination of school administrators across the country. Programs such as The New School's should be a part of a broad nation-wide effort.

As originally conceived by most state education departments, adult education was a means of teaching English to foreigners. Forty years ago, when The New School first opened its doors as an experimental pioneer in this field, it was unique in that it offered courses for the student interested not in a degree but in serious study on an adult level. The New School philosophy has now won wide acceptance and is practiced by the extension divisions of universities across the country.

4. Our large cities and universities have already made considerable progress in establishing meaningful adult education programs. However, as earlier retirement, shorter work weeks and longer vacations increase the amount of leisure time available to ever greater numbers in our population, the need for broader programs of adult education becomes more pressing. Co-ordinated efforts to improve adult education where it already exists and extend it to areas where no such facilities are now available must be a priority matter of public concern and action. An educated citizenry is the only way to maintain the vitality of our great experiment in democracy.

\*Large conferences on important issues such as the White House conference on education.

N. y. C Dec. 7th Alaio bestiether
000117
It is plain from this dinner tonight that the Democratic
3estorzeal -
Party has lost none of its variety or distinctiveness.
For what other party would hold a dinner where the
speakers so nearly outnumber the audience? (fills them to well, I'm not sure In formpel)
And what other party would have more Presidential candidates
than dellars in its treasury?
In this respect, we clearly differ from the Republicans.
They have exactly two presidential contenders each trying to
look like the other Hay to be keek the keek to he
If this keeps up, these two Republican rivals will soon
blend into a single, dark-haired blur which, if you will think
back on 1948, is not exactly new for the Republicans
There is another respect in which we differ from the
Republicans and I say thank God for it:
We have Eleanor Roosevelt.
Of course, Mrs. Roosevelt couldn't really be anything but
a pemocrat - for she symbolizes the best that our Party can and

0	
When something needs to be said, she says it and to find	1
Jet 2	L
When something needs to be done, she does it.	0
1 get so 9	
Eleanor Roosevelt has never been afraid of being controversi	
She is gentlet strong Kind Brave - genero	-1
Eleaner Reesevelt, like her husband before her, sets the	
guidelines for our party to follow:	
We must say what needs to be said.	
We must do what needs to be done.	
We must not create false controversy; but neither should we	
hide from honest debate and dissent.	
This !	
Controversy is the source or our strength and our vitality,	
our growth and our adaptability.	
Surely our Party must never deny its highest honor to anyone	
because he is controversial whether because of his religious	
His Sertion of the Country or	
faith or the depth of his belief in human rights.	
conforta conformity or	
And our Party must not, for the sake of respectability,	
be satisfied in a world of change with things as they are.	

000119
anthusiasticale,
The Democratic Party must
A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
enlegace and electify thelf evith
Transfer of the state of the st
Buffe fragues for pricious words on the
VAN AND THE STATE OF THE STATE
entrance of Lean and Justine of Comocracy
lean with Justice
7 6
Should the day ever come when we are satisfied with things
/
as they are, we will no longer be entitled to call ourselves the
Party of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt.
I promise our frager -
Com f############################
0
"We must move forward
with a Strong and Acline
5 -011
Faith"

## DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL of the DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

FOR RELEASE TO A.M. NEWSPAPERS TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1959:

REMARKS BY SEN. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE TRIBUTE TO ELEANOR ROOSEVELT DINNER, DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL, HOTEL WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK, DECEMBER 7, 1959

It is plain from this dinner tonight that the Democratic Party has lost none of its variety or distinctiveness.

so nearly outnumber the audience? \_\_ Im so impussed with a

And what other party would have more Presidential candidates than dollars in its treasury?

In this respect, we clearly differ from the Republicans.

They have exactly two presidential contenders -- each trying to look like the other.

If this keeps up, these two Republican rivals will soon blend into a single, dark-haired blur -- which, if you will think back on 1948, is not exactly new for the Republicans.

There is another respect in which we differ from the Republicans -- and I say thank God for it:

We have Eleanor Roosevelt.

Of course, Mrs. Roosevelt couldn't really be anything but a Democrat, for she symbolizes the best that our Party can and should be.

When something needs to be said, she says it.

When something needs to be done, she does it.

Eleanor Roosevelt has never been afraid of being controversial.

Eleanor Roosevelt, like her husband before her, sets the guidelines for our party to follow:

We must say what needs to be said.

We must do what needs to be done.

We must not create false controversy; but neither should we hide from honest debate and dissent.

Controversy is the source of our strength and our vitality, our growth and our adaptability.

Surely our Party must never deny its highest honor to anyone because he is controversial -- whether because of his religious faith or because of the depth of his belief in human rights.

And our Party must not, for the sake of respectability, be satisfied in a world of change with things as they are. When that

The Democratic Party must stand for the three P's of Power in this world of change -- People, Progress and Peace. If being for these three things makes our Party controversial, then we are on the right side.

Should the day ever come when we are satisfied with things as they are, we will no longer be entitled to call ourselves the Party of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt.

# # #

000122 Dr Berger

Annual Convention, United States Poultry and Egg Producers Association

New York City December 7, 1959

Derection of

I am happy to be with you at the second annual convention of this young and growing organization.

In the weeks since Congress recessed, I have been talking with farmers in the middle west — in my own state of Minnesota, in North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, and Texas. I know what farmers are up against. The farm price and farm income situation is bad. For farmers, the clock has turned back to 1940, a low-price, low-income pre-war year.

In just this one year of 1959, farm income has dropped 17 percent from a year ago.

In 1952, the parity ratio stood at 100. Today this measure of how farmers are doing stands at 77. Can you remember 1939? You have to go that far back to find the parity ratio as low as it is today. It was 77 in 1939, too.

I wish I could tell you that we had reached the bottom of the farm price slide and there was no place to go but up. That just isn't so. Economists in the Department of Agriculture say that next year will be worse. Republican sliding scale policies keep right on pushing farm prices and income down.

The record clearly shows the cause of this disaster — the Republican farm policy of low and lower prices and high and higher production.

This blight of lower prices was deliberately introduced in the price-supported crops. Now it has spread into the nonsupported livestock area. Hog producers and poultry and egg producers find this a sorry year. Cattlemen are looking with dread toward next year, and the year after, when they will once again be pushed to the wall.

The Republican hucksters talk about this year of 1959 being a boom year. They remind me of sleight-of-hand artists, who keep up a running line of deceptive patter so that audience attention will be diverted from what is actually going on. Farm problem? Yes, indeed.

Just look at the 12 big wheat loans, look at the trick slick picture of

the Secretary of Agriculture surrounded by a great mound of wheat.

Unhappily, this technique works. After all, city people have no quick way of knowing which are the false and which are the true answers in this rigged show.

Well, poultry and egg producers cannot be diverted. Egg producers know that their prices haven't gone down just to the 1940 levels. In terms of what a dozen eggs will buy, egg prices at the farm for the first 9 months of 1959 have been the lowest ever recorded.

Minnesota, as you know, is a big egg producing state. My
constituents write to me. I don't have to read the big slick magazines
to find out what is happening on the family farm. Last week, a

Minnesota farmer sent me the sales slip for 30 dozen eggs he had
marketed -- 30 dozen eggs brought him exactly \$5.00. How long can

a man stay in business at prices like that?

Republican farm policy is one major force that has worked against the poultry and egg farmer. Another — vertical integration — shares the responsibility for your industry's trouble.

I don't have to describe the vertical integration process to you people. This is the problem you face every day. It moved in first on the broiler industry. It has made great progress in the turkey industry. Now the off-farm capital vertical integration interests are turning to egg production. The integration process is in itself a simple and reasonable one if viewed as a system that will provide the producer a constant market at a reasonable profit and the consumer a dependable quality product at a reasonable cost. But that is not the way it usually turns out. Profit is made at every stage of the process -- on chicks, on feed, on credit, on veterinary and management services -- at every stage except by the producer himself. The man who owns the land and the buildings and furnishes the labor gets the short end.

While total production of eggs has gone up and up, the price received by the producer has gone down and down. The story here is the same as that of almost every other commodity. With feed grains, government policies have pushed production up, with resulting

downward pressure on the market price; the tremendous feed grain supply itself provides the impetus to push livestock production up and livestock prices down. With poultry and eggs, production is also pushed up by the forces of vertical integration.

What can you do about it? That is the question you want answered.

The Republican method of turning your back on a problem and talking about something else simply won't make the problem go away.

This is not a temporary situation that will be automatically corrected. The ills of the poultry and egg industry are chronic.

Individual action, individual decisions, individual initiative (
cannot possibly cope with the matter. This is a case where group
action is necessary to solve what is a group problem.

As I see this situation, there are three possible answers.

One is to emulate the integration process, substituting farm capital for the off-farm capital control. Many poultry and egg producers have embarked on this course through their cooperatives. What can

happen here, of course, is that even greater total production may result, with producer prices continuing downward. This would not help solve the problem of the family-farm producer.

#

The second possibility is a nation-wide, producer-controlled
marketing program. This past spring, when egg prices plunged downward,
groups of poultry and egg producers all over the country became
painfully aware that they had no bargaining power. Leaders of the
United States Poultry and Egg Producers Association met with other
groups and individuals to study possible lines of action. They
agreed that legislation was needed to provide an industry-wide,
self-financed marketing program, managed by producer-committees
within rules and regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I introduced a bill providing for such a program last August.

This is the National Poultry Stabilization Act, S. 2516.

Under this proposal, assessments would be made to finance such activities as the promotion of product consumption; research and survey studies relating to the commodity; the establishing and maintenance of grade, quality, and labeling standards; and the

no ag Jeg

regulation or restriction of production or marketing, either by
the creation of reserve pools or other methods. Advisory boards
composed of producers would be responsible for actual administration
of the programs.

This is good legislation based on sound principles of group initiative and responsibility. It could bring stability to the poultry and egg industry at very small cost to the government, with regulation accomplished by the industry itself rather than the government.

In the past session of Congress, hearings were held by the

House Agriculture Committee on various bills designed to bring aid

and assistance to the poultry and egg producers. Much valuable

information was brought to light, but no action was taken.

Do you know why there was no action? It was because not enough groups could agree on any one proposal. There simply was no strong support for any one bill. And enough effort had not been made to get the grass-roots thinking of individual producers before the Committee.

I am happy, therefore, to learn that the National Poultry

Stabilization Act has the unanimous and strong support of the United

States Poultry and Egg Producers Association. And I am glad to know

you have been joined in this support by other groups who realize

that producers themselves can prevent wild market price fluctuations

if they are enabled to adjust production and marketing to consumption

needs.

I hope to have hearings before the Senate Agriculture Committee in this coming session on the National Poultry Stabilization Act. I hope that poultry and egg producers from all over the country will come before the committee. I hope that they will present a vivid picture of the difficulties that beset them and clearly show their willingness to cooperate with the government in correcting these difficulties.

And I hope also that producers from all parts of the country will write to their elected representatives in Congress and let them know that they support the National Poultry Stabilization Act. I cannot

000130

over-emphasize the importance of making every Senator and every

Representative on Capitol Hill aware of the true grass-roots sentiments

of their poultry and egg producers.

I think perhaps this is the year we may get constructive legislation passed. Certainly if a majority of the members of Congress could visit the farming sections of the country as I have, they would be aware of the urgent need for poultry and egg legislation. I think the climate may be right for positive action now.

I want to point out that there is a third possible way that price and income stabilization for poultry and egg producers could be secured.

If the Humphrey Family Farm Program Development Act became law, poultry and egg producers would be able to establish their marketing program through another approach.

The Family Farm Program Development Act is a comprehensive proposal based upon the idea that a prosperous farm economy is essential to a prosperous national economy. It has four major goals:



- 1. To improve farm prices and family farm income; 0 0 | 3 |
- 2. To assure ample supplies of food and fiber for all domestic needs, for commercial exports, for a national safety reserve, and for use by our government in building world peace;
- 3. To lower farm program costs by enabling producers to adjust market supply to realistic consumption needs;
- 4. To conserve soil and water resources for future generations rather than waste them in unneeded production.

Through this bill, an over-all farm program can be developed that will establish a new concept of parity -- a concept of a fair price -- based upon current income and cost factors.

Plans would be made to meet total food and fiber consumption needs through expanded school lunch and milk programs, and a food allotment program for our needy. In addition, food would be used as an instrument of foreign policy to help build world peace and to encourage the development of the emerging nations of the free world.

One part provides for farmer-elected commodity committees to share in selecting the most suitable method to adjust supply to true

demand through a national marketing quota program approved by twothirds of the producers in a nation-wide referendum. Under this
provision, poultry and egg producers would be able to set up the kind
of marketing program we have been talking about this afternoon.

The bill also calls for an expanded agricultural resources conservation program that would include land-use adjustments and temporary retirement of land not currently needed for production.

The problems presented by low production, low income farms would be met in a variety of ways, including expanded supervised credit programs, individual farm and home management guidance, and, for those people on the farm who wish to seek opportunity elsewhere, special vocational training and employment services.

After seven years of Republican farm program mis-management, seven years of falling farm prices and income, it is high time that farm producers make their voices heard in Washington.

## Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.

