

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION
LEGISLATIVE ACTION CONFERENCE

Washington, D. C.

March 3, 1976

It is both an honor and a privilege to take part in the first "Birthright Dinner" of the American School Food Service Association.

Your theme, "Enough to Eat is Everyman's Birthright," which is taken from Genesis, expresses very appropriately the underlying philosophy of your Association which successfully runs this nation's school lunch and child nutrition programs.

In this land of plenty we also should make this our national goal.

Through the years, the application of this concept has made it possible to strengthen, improve and expand the child feeding programs as the single most important factor in improving the nutrition of our nation's children.

The Congress, in successive legislative acts, has approved major changes and additions in these programs to broaden the scope and increase the effectiveness of the child nutrition programs.

Today, over 25 million children are eating nutritious lunches every day. Of this total, over 10 million lunches are received by children who aren't able to afford the regular lunch price.

And the lunch program now is available to nearly 90 percent of all children enrolled in school.

It is a remarkable record of achievement, and one in which you justifiably can be proud.

Despite this record, the concept of a universal school lunch and nutrition program for all children -- which you and I have joined in supporting -- is being strongly challenged.

In fact, existing school lunch and child nutrition programs -- which have been so carefully built over a period of 30 years -- are under serious attack.

I am referring specifically to the so-called bloc grant proposal which is contained in the Federal Budget for fiscal year 1977, submitted to the Congress this past January.

Quite simply, this proposal calls for the complete elimination of the existing child nutrition programs -- including the school lunch, the breakfast program, special milk, the child care program, non-food assistance for needy schools, the summer food service program, commodity assistance, and the supplemental feeding program for women, infants and children -- known as W.I.C.

To replace these worthwhile programs, a system of grants to each state is proposed, based on the number of needy children. These funds would be used only to provide food for children from families with incomes at or below the poverty income guidelines -- currently \$5,050 for a family of four.

Children from near poor families with incomes less than 195 percent of the poverty line who now can purchase lunches for 20 cents or less would be denied the benefits of the program.

And according to USDA's own information, another seven million children would be forced out of the program because lunch prices would reach 85 to 90 cents without the present federal assistance.

This proposal also ignores the burden which suddenly would be thrust onto our states, plus the fact that the Congress just last year overwhelmingly indicated the future direction for these programs.

Without doubt, thousands of schools would find it impossible to continue food service, or they would be able to offer packaged items only. In other schools, only the very poor children would be able to receive the complete lunch. We would be left, not with a nutrition program, but a poverty program without even nutritional guarantees for the poverty child.

This, in itself, would be the rankest form of descrimination, and one which is forbidden by federal law.

As you are aware, when a similar proposal was submitted to Congress last year, no member of Congress was willing even to introduce it.

However, it is no time to relax with the comfortable feeling that this is an empty proposal which will blow away in the winter winds, as it did before.

Take a good look, for instance, at the appropriations structure for the child nutrition programs in the fiscal year 1977 budget. You will be hard put to find reference to the National School Lunch program. But you will find something called "Institutional Nutrition Support."

This line item is designed to indicate that federal funds are being used to assist in providing better nutrition for children who now pay for their lunches.

By presenting it this way, an attempt is being made to create the impression that it somehow is sinful and wasteful for the federal government to support a nutrition program by compassing all children.

In fact, the O.M.B. has developed the term "non-needy" in referring to federal assistance provided to paying students. This not only demonstrates a lack of appreciation for good nutrition, but it also represents a crude kind of insensitivity.

This approach is directly contrary to the intent of Congress when it approved the National School Lunch Act some 30 years ago.

At that time, Congress said "It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a matter of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children..." We seem to have lost sight of the importance of good health and nutrition as they relate to our national security.

It is my firm expectation that the Congress will accept neither the new appropriations structure nor the bloc grant approach.

However, there are other signs that the school lunch and child nutrition programs are under attack.

A request has been forwarded to Congress to discontinue the special milk program as of March 1, 1976, and to rescind a total of \$40 million in appropriated funds which would insure the full operation of the program during this fiscal year.

I can assure you that the Congress will not approve this rescission, and I will do my part in this fight. But it is one more effort to confuse, frustrate and prevent the accomplishment of clearly stated nutritional goals and objectives.

While these nutrition programs have been expanded, the administrative expense funds provided to the states have not kept pace with inflation. In fact, thus far this year less money has been provided than last year.

You would think that this Administration -- with its vocal support for running programs at the local level -- would try to help states do a good job by providing adequate administrative funds.

By not providing these funds, some programs may be turned back to be run directly by the U.S.D.A.

That's a case of the Administration getting caught between its rhetoric about doing things at the local level, and the desire to save money.

There are many similar examples which I could cite for you. I am especially concerned that the U.S.D.A. has, on its own, decided not to follow the congressional directive with regard to using carry-over funds for the Women, Infant and Children Program.

We specifically directed that any unused money from last year be used this year. But despite this clear directive, \$35 to \$50 million may not be used unless concerned people and Senators take up the cause. And the Administration also is trying to avoid using the full \$250 million provided for this year.

I and others had to go to court to get the Department to launch the W.I.C. program as directed by Congress. But the Administration apparently is still trying to ignore the law.

There is one other important issue to put on your work agenda.

In the coming weeks you will be asked for your views in curbing waste in the school lunch program. I have asked the General Accounting Office to look into this problem, and it will be reporting back by late summer.

We attempted to deal with this issue in H.R. 4222 last fall by allowing students to choose not to accept certain foods or full portions.

It is a difficult task to allow some flexibility in food offerings, assure a nutritionally balanced meal, avoid waste and yet run a program for 25 million students.

The G.A.O. study also will examine the issue of providing cash for schools rather than commodities. We will need your counsel on this study.

I also have developed a bill on nutrition information and training which will be introduced shortly.

This program would, through grants to the states, provide for the training of food service and educational personnel in the principles of sound nutrition.

This effort would bring together the training of the classroom and that of the lunchroom.

We have only begun to scratch the surface as to what can be done and what needs to be done in nutrition education.

These are challenges to be met head on. There comes a time when a decision must be made between working hard toward accomplishing the program goals or turning back before the onslaught of one's critics.

I know which decision you will make, and I will continue to help you.

At the same time you must continue to press forward in support of a universal nutrition education and food service program for children.

It is morally wrong and economically unsound to continue the present practice of singling out, in a discriminatory fashion, certain children for free lunches, others for lunch at a nominal price, and with still others required to pay the regular price. We never have done this with respect to other school activities.

I always have maintained that you can judge a society by how it responds to the needs of the young and the elderly -- those at the beginning or in the shadow of life.

Your theme, "Enough to Eat is Every Man's Birthright," is precisely the kind of broad goal that can bring people together.

However, many well-intentioned people will not face up to the need for a national food policy to meet this objective. We must assure our producers a fair return so that they can produce the abundant supplies needed to meet this goal.

There are other similar goals to which we should direct our attention -- such as a decent job for all Americans, the opportunity to buy a home and the opportunity for our elderly to live their last years in dignity.

I am reminded of President Roosevelt's 1937 Inaugural Address when he stated:

"The test of our progress is not whether we add to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

We have just experienced the worst recession since the great depression. And we still face major economic uncertainties.

Most disturbing to me, we seem to have a cloud over our spirit and our determination. We lack the optimism and daring of our earlier years.

In short, we need to begin to think again in terms of building a better America. I commend you in taking a broad approach to this session, and in reminding the nation of a major unmet goal.

If you light a fire in the minds of your leaders and in the hearts of your countrymen, you will have performed a great service.

Let us work together toward that goal.

#

Pres Elsie King
John Correyman
Pres Elect Josephine Martin
Vernon Carpenter

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

LEGISLATIVE ACTION CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MARCH 3, 1976

not as hilarious as the
Alan Martin Roast —

nor as contentious as meet the Press
face the Nation
Issue & Answer

but

but, hopefully more
informative than any of them!

IT IS BOTH AN HONOR AND A PRIVILEGE TO TAKE PART IN THE
FIRST "BIRTHRIGHT DINNER" OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE
ASSOCIATION.

L YOUR THEME, "ENOUGH TO EAT IS EVERYMAN'S BIRTHRIGHT,"
25th chapter in Book 9
WHICH IS TAKEN FROM GENESIS, EXPRESSES VERY APPROPRIATELY THE

do
UNDERLYING PHILOSOPHY OF YOUR ASSOCIATION WHICH SUCCESSFULLY

administer
RUNS THIS NATION'S SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

L IN THIS LAND OF PLENTY WE ~~AND~~ SHOULD MAKE THIS OUR
NATIONAL GOAL. — *Enough to Eat is Everyman's Birthright*

L THROUGH THE YEARS, THE APPLICATION OF THIS CONCEPT HAS

MADE IT POSSIBLE TO STRENGTHEN, IMPROVE AND EXPAND THE CHILD

FEEDING PROGRAMS AS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN

and guarding the health
IMPROVING THE NUTRITION OF OUR NATION'S CHILDREN.

THE CONGRESS, IN SUCCESSIVE LEGISLATIVE ACTS, HAS APPROVED
MAJOR CHANGES AND ADDITIONS IN THESE PROGRAMS TO BROADEN THE
SCOPE AND INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CHILD NUTRITION
PROGRAMS.

TODAY, OVER 25 MILLION CHILDREN ARE EATING NUTRITIOUS
LUNCHES EVERY DAY. OF THIS TOTAL, OVER 10 MILLION LUNCHES ARE
RECEIVED BY CHILDREN WHO ~~WENT~~ ^{becoming low income would not be able} TO AFFORD THE REGULAR

LUNCH PRICE.

AND THE LUNCH PROGRAM NOW IS AVAILABLE TO NEARLY 90 PERCENT
OF ALL CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SCHOOL.

THIS IS A REMARKABLE RECORD OF ~~ACHIEVEMENT~~, AND ONE IN
WHICH YOU JUSTIFIABLY CAN BE PROUD.

But

DESPITE THIS RECORD, THE CONCEPT OF A UNIVERSAL SCHOOL
LUNCH AND NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR ALL CHILDREN -- WHICH YOU

AND I HAVE JOINED IN SUPPORTING -- IS BEING STRONGLY CHALLENGED.

IN FACT, EXISTING SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION
PROGRAMS -- WHICH HAVE BEEN SO CAREFULLY BUILT OVER A PERIOD
OF 30 YEARS -- ARE UNDER SERIOUS ATTACK.

I AM REFERRING SPECIFICALLY TO THE SO-CALLED BLOC GRANT
PROPOSAL WHICH IS CONTAINED IN THE ^{*President's*} ~~FEDERAL~~ BUDGET FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1977, SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS THIS PAST JANUARY.

QUITE SIMPLY, THIS PROPOSAL CALLS FOR THE COMPLETE
ELIMINATION OF THE EXISTING CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS --INCLUDING
THE SCHOOL LUNCH, THE BREAKFAST PROGRAM, SPECIAL MILK, *and*

THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM, NON-FOOD ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY SCHOOLS,

THE SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM, COMMODITY ASSISTANCE, AND THE

SUPPLEMENTAL FEEDING PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN --

KNOWN AS W.I.C.

TO REPLACE THESE WORTHWHILE PROGRAMS, A SYSTEM OF GRANTS

TO EACH STATE IS PROPOSED, BASED ON THE NUMBER OF NEEDY

CHILDREN. THESE FUNDS COULD BE USED ONLY TO PROVIDE FOOD FOR

CHILDREN FROM FAMILIES WITH INCOMES AT OR BELOW THE POVERTY

INCOME GUIDELINES -- CURRENTLY \$5,050 FOR A FAMILY OF FOUR,

CHILDREN FROM NEAR POOR FAMILIES ^{just above the} WITH INCOMES LESS THAN

195 PERCENT OF THE POVERTY LINE, WHO NOW CAN PURCHASE LUNCHES

FOR 20 CENTS OR LESS, WOULD BE DENIED THE BENEFITS OF THE

PROGRAM.

L AND ACCORDING TO USDA'S OWN ^{estimate} ~~estimation~~, ANOTHER SEVEN
MILLION CHILDREN WOULD BE FORCED OUT OF THE PROGRAM BECAUSE
LUNCH PRICES WOULD REACH 85 TO 90 CENTS WITHOUT THE PRESENT
FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

L THIS PROPOSAL ~~also~~ IGNORES THE BURDEN WHICH SUDDENLY
WOULD BE THRUST ONTO OUR STATES, PLUS THE FACT THAT THE
CONGRESS JUST LAST YEAR OVERWHELMINGLY INDICATED THE FUTURE
DIRECTION FOR THESE PROGRAMS.

L WITHOUT DOUBT, THOUSANDS OF SCHOOLS WOULD FIND IT
IMPOSSIBLE TO CONTINUE FOOD SERVICE, OR THEY WOULD BE ABLE TO
OFFER PACKAGED ^{food} ~~items~~ ONLY. IN OTHER SCHOOLS, ONLY THE VERY
POOR CHILDREN WOULD BE ABLE TO RECEIVE THE COMPLETE LUNCH.

WE WOULD BE LEFT, NOT WITH A NUTRITION PROGRAM, BUT A POVERTY PROGRAM WITHOUT EVEN NUTRITIONAL GUARANTEES FOR THE POVERTY CHILD.

THIS, IN ITSELF, WOULD BE THE RANKEST FORM OF DISCRIMINATION, AND ONE WHICH IS FORBIDDEN BY FEDERAL LAW.

AS YOU ARE AWARE, WHEN A SIMILAR PROPOSAL WAS SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS LAST YEAR, NO MEMBER OF CONGRESS WAS WILLING EVEN TO INTRODUCE IT.

HOWEVER, IT IS NO TIME TO RELAX WITH THE COMFORTABLE FEELING THAT THIS IS ^{another} EMPTY PROPOSAL WHICH WILL BLOW AWAY IN THE WINTER WINDS, AS IT DID BEFORE.

TAKE A GOOD LOOK, FOR INSTANCE, AT THE APPROPRIATIONS STRUCTURE FOR THE CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1977 BUDGET. YOU WILL BE HARD PUT TO FIND REFERENCE TO THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM.

L BUT YOU WILL FIND SOMETHING CALLED "INSTITUTIONAL NUTRITION
SUPPORT."

L THIS ["]LINE ITEM IS DESIGNED TO INDICATE THAT FEDERAL
FUNDS ARE BEING USED TO ASSIST IN PROVIDING BETTER
NUTRITION FOR CHILDREN WHO NOW PAY FOR THEIR LUNCHES.!

L BY PRESENTING IT THIS WAY, AN ATTEMPT IS BEING MADE
TO CREATE THE IMPRESSION THAT IT SOMEHOW IS SINFUL AND
WASTEFUL FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO SUPPORT A NUTRITION
PROGRAM ENCOMPASSING ALL CHILDREN.

L IN FACT, THE O.M.B. HAS DEVELOPED THE TERM "NON-NEEDY"
IN REFERRING TO FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO PAYING STUDENTS.

L THIS NOT ONLY DEMONSTRATES A LACK OF APPRECIATION FOR GOOD
NUTRITION, BUT IT ALSO REPRESENTS A CRUDE KIND OF INSENSITIVITY.

and THIS APPROACH IS DIRECTLY CONTRARY TO THE INTENT OF
CONGRESS WHEN IT APPROVED THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT SOME
30 YEARS AGO.

AT THAT TIME, CONGRESS SAID "IT IS HEREBY DECLARED TO
BE THE POLICY OF CONGRESS, AS A MATTER OF NATIONAL SECURITY,
TO SAFEGUARD THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF THE NATION'S
CHILDREN..." *the administration* ~~HE~~ SEEMS TO HAVE LOST SIGHT OF THE IMPORTANCE
OF GOOD HEALTH AND NUTRITION AS THEY RELATE TO OUR NATIONAL
SECURITY.

I predict
~~IT IS MY FIRM EXPECTATION THAT THE CONGRESS WILL~~ *not accept*
~~NEITHER THE NEW APPROPRIATIONS STRUCTURE~~ *or* ~~THE BLOC GRANT~~
APPROACH.

HOWEVER, THERE ARE OTHER SIGNS THAT THE SCHOOL LUNCH
AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS ARE UNDER ATTACK.

Lin Administration

L REQUEST HAS BEEN FORWARDED TO CONGRESS TO DISCONTINUE
THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM AS OF MARCH 1, 1976, AND TO RESCIND
A TOTAL OF \$40 MILLION IN APPROPRIATED FUNDS WHICH WOULD
INSURE THE FULL OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM DURING THIS FISCAL
YEAR. *! Once again,*

L I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT THE CONGRESS WILL NOT APPROVE THIS
RESCISSION, AND I WILL DO MY PART IN THIS FIGHT *(BUT IT IS ONE*
MORE EFFORT TO CONFUSE, FRUSTRATE AND PREVENT THE ACCOMPLISHMENT
OF CLEARLY STATED NUTRITIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.

L WHILE THESE NUTRITION PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN EXPANDED *by congress,* THE
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE FUNDS PROVIDED TO THE STATES HAVE
NOT KEPT PACE WITH INFLATION. IN FACT, *L* THUS FAR THIS YEAR
LESS MONEY HAS BEEN PROVIDED THAN LAST YEAR.

L You would think that this Administration -- with its
VOCAL SUPPORT FOR RUNNING PROGRAMS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL -- WOULD
TRY TO HELP STATES DO A GOOD JOB BY PROVIDING ADEQUATE
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.

~~L BY NOT PROVIDING THESE FUNDS, SOME PROGRAMS MAY BE
TURNED BACK TO BE RUN DIRECTLY BY THE U.S.D.A.~~

~~L THAT'S A CASE OF THE ADMINISTRATION GETTING CAUGHT
BETWEEN ITS RHETORIC ABOUT DOING THINGS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL,
AND THE DESIRE TO SAVE MONEY.~~

L THERE ARE ^{other} ~~MANY SIMILAR EXAMPLES, WHICH I COULD CITE FOR YOU~~

L ~~I AM ESPECIALLY CONCERNED THAT THE U.S.D.A. HAS~~ ~~ON ITS OWN~~ DECIDED

NOT TO FOLLOW THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVE WITH REGARD TO USING

CARRY-OVER FUNDS FOR THE WOMEN, INFANT AND CHILDREN ^{feeding} PROGRAM.

↳ WE SPECIFICALLY DIRECTED THAT ANY UNUSED MONEY FROM
LAST YEAR BE USED THIS YEAR. BUT DESPITE THIS CLEAR DIRECTIVE,
\$35 TO \$50 MILLION MAY NOT BE USED UNLESS CONCERNED PEOPLE AND
SENATORS TAKE UP THE CAUSE. AND THE ADMINISTRATION ALSO IS TRYING
TO AVOID USING THE FULL \$250 MILLION PROVIDED FOR THIS YEAR.

↳ I AND OTHERS HAD TO GO TO COURT TO GET THE DEPARTMENT of Agr.
TO LAUNCH THE W.I.C. PROGRAM AS DIRECTED BY CONGRESS. BUT THE
ADMINISTRATION APPARENTLY IS STILL TRYING TO IGNORE THE LAW. !

↳ THERE IS ONE OTHER IMPORTANT ISSUE TO PUT ON YOUR WORK AGENDA.

↳ IN THE COMING WEEKS YOU WILL BE ASKED FOR YOUR VIEWS
IN CURBING WASTE IN THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. I HAVE ASKED
THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE TO LOOK INTO THIS PROBLEM, AND
IT WILL BE REPORTING BACK BY LATE SUMMER.

h WE ATTEMPTED TO DEAL WITH THIS ISSUE IN H.R. 4222

LAST FALL BY ALLOWING STUDENTS TO CHOOSE NOT TO ACCEPT CERTAIN
FOODS OR FULL PORTIONS.

h IT IS A DIFFICULT TASK TO ALLOW SOME FLEXIBILITY IN
FOOD OFFERINGS, ^{to} ASSURE A NUTRITIONALLY BALANCED MEAL, ^{to} AVOID
WASTE AND YET RUN A PROGRAM FOR 25 MILLION STUDENTS.

h THE G.A.O. STUDY ALSO WILL EXAMINE THE ISSUE OF PROVIDING
CASH FOR SCHOOLS RATHER THAN COMMODITIES. WE WILL NEED YOUR
COUNSEL ON THIS STUDY.

h I ALSO HAVE DEVELOPED A BILL ON NUTRITION INFORMATION, *Education*
AND TRAINING WHICH WILL BE INTRODUCED SHORTLY.

h THIS PROGRAM WOULD, THROUGH GRANTS TO THE STATES, PROVIDE
FOR THE TRAINING OF FOOD SERVICE AND EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL
IN THE PRINCIPLES OF SOUND NUTRITION.

*Teach nutrition
in schools*

L THIS EFFORT WOULD BRING TOGETHER THE TRAINING OF THE
CLASSROOM AND THAT OF THE LUNCHROOM.

L WE HAVE ONLY BEGUN TO SCRATCH THE SURFACE AS TO WHAT
CAN BE DONE AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE IN NUTRITION EDUCATION.

L THESE ARE CHALLENGES TO BE MET HEAD ON. L THERE COMES A
TIME WHEN A DECISION MUST BE MADE BETWEEN WORKING HARD TOWARD
ACCOMPLISHING THE PROGRAM GOALS OR TURNING BACK BEFORE
THE ONSLAUGHT OF ONE'S CRITICS.

L I KNOW WHICH DECISION YOU WILL MAKE, AND I WILL CONTINUE
TO HELP YOU.

L AT THE SAME TIME YOU MUST CONTINUE TO PRESS FORWARD IN
SUPPORT OF A UNIVERSAL NUTRITION EDUCATION AND FOOD SERVICE
PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN.

2 IT IS MORALLY WRONG AND ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND TO CONTINUE
THE PRESENT PRACTICE OF SINGLING OUT, IN A DISCRIMINATORY
FASHION, CERTAIN CHILDREN FOR FREE LUNCHES, OTHERS FOR LUNCH
AT A NOMINAL PRICE, AND WITH STILL OTHERS REQUIRED TO PAY THE
REGULAR PRICE. WE NEVER HAVE DONE THIS WITH RESPECT TO OTHER
SCHOOL ACTIVITIES. *Compulsory Education* {
Military Service }

I ALWAYS HAVE MAINTAINED THAT YOU CAN JUDGE A SOCIETY BY
HOW IT RESPONDS TO THE NEEDS OF THE YOUNG AND THE ELDERLY --
THOSE AT THE BEGINNING OR IN THE SHADOW OF LIFE.

YOUR THEME, "ENOUGH TO EAT IS EVERY MAN'S BIRTHRIGHT,"

IS PRECISELY THE KIND OF BROAD GOAL THAT CAN BRING PEOPLE

TOGETHER.

h HOWEVER, MANY WELL-INTENTIONED PEOPLE ^{have} ~~will~~ NOT FACE ^{deep}

TO THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL FOOD POLICY TO MEET THIS OBJECTIVE. ^{first}

hall, WE MUST ASSURE OUR ^{farm} PRODUCERS A FAIR RETURN SO THAT THEY CAN

PRODUCE THE ABUNDANT SUPPLIES NEEDED TO MEET THIS GOAL.

h THERE ARE OTHER ~~SIMILAR~~ GOALS TO WHICH WE SHOULD DIRECT

OUR ATTENTION -- SUCH AS A DECENT JOB FOR ALL AMERICANS, THE

OPPORTUNITY TO ^{own} ~~buy~~ A HOME AND THE OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR ELDERLY

TO LIVE THEIR LAST YEARS IN DIGNITY.

I AM REMINDED OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S 1937 INAUGURAL

ADDRESS WHEN HE STATED:

"THE TEST OF OUR PROGRESS IS NOT WHETHER WE ADD TO
THE ABUNDANCE OF THOSE WHO HAVE MUCH; IT IS WHETHER
WE PROVIDE ENOUGH FOR THOSE WHO HAVE TOO LITTLE."

WE HAVE JUST EXPERIENCED THE WORST RECESSION SINCE
THE GREAT DEPRESSION. AND WE STILL FACE MAJOR ECONOMIC
UNCERTAINTIES.

MOST DISTURBING TO ME, WE SEEM TO HAVE A CLOUD OVER OUR
SPIRIT AND OUR DETERMINATION. WE LACK THE OPTIMISM AND DARING
OF OUR EARLIER YEARS.

IN SHORT, WE NEED TO BEGIN TO THINK AGAIN IN TERMS OF BUILDING
A BETTER AMERICA. I ~~COMMEND YOU IN TAKING A BROAD APPROACH TO~~
~~THIS SESSION, AND IN REMINDING THE NATION OF A MAJOR UNMET GOAL.~~

IF YOU LIGHT A FIRE IN THE MINDS OF YOUR LEADERS AND IN THE
HEARTS OF YOUR COUNTRYMEN, YOU WILL HAVE PERFORMED A GREAT SERVICE.

~~LET US WORK TOGETHER TOWARD THAT GOAL.~~

As the Bible Says -
"Enough to eat is every man's Birthright"

#####



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.



www.mnhs.org