

"But I would hope that as a result of the McCarthy experience, all of us have become much more sensitive on this issue."

Father Fitzgerald thinks universities such as Georgetown "should seek to be responsible critics of society."

"A university in many ways is better qualified than anyone else to perform this role," he contends. "People in the university are less exposed to outside pressure and coercion."

Father Fitzgerald sees demands for more student freedom as part of "an awakening all over the world to the value of personal freedom." The civil rights movement and the awakening of undeveloped nations to their own sovereignty are part of the picture.

He sees one cause of the student movement as the more permissive rearing of children. But he says television has had "an incalculable effect."

"It has put us in the middle of things. I didn't realize this until the Kennedy assassination. I think the whole country felt it was standing at graveside."

### Charges Against Administration's Farm Program False

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, some ancient and long-ago discredited charges against this administration's farm programs and policies are being heard in these Chambers like a phonograph needle stuck in a broken record.

For example:

First. The oft-repeated charge that "grain dumping" was done deliberately in order to depress farm prices has been heard here again in recent days.

The charge is refuted by the facts. In November of 1965 the price of corn was about \$1.02 per bushel. The Commodity Credit Corporation sold corn in the winter and spring of 1966. By May of 1966 corn was up—I repeat, up—to \$1.10 per bushel. By harvesttime in October of that year it was up to \$1.29 per bushel.

The corn sold by the CCC was in surplus. It was costing taxpayers \$64 million per year to store. By selling it on a rising market—which is the free enterprise way the market indicates it needs more of a given commodity—this corn was put to use. And it was sold without driving corn prices down. Prices continued to rise throughout the entire sale period.

Second. Another old charge popped up again recently in the criticism of alleged "sharp curtailment" of domestic buying of pork, lamb, and dairy products by the military. But what do the facts show? Defense Department domestic pork purchases in 1966 were 14 million pounds above 1965. This year they are expected to be 50 million pounds above 1966. In terms of milk equivalent, domestic military purchases of dairy products were larger in 1966 than in 1965 and are expected to continue larger in 1967. Domestic lamb purchases in 1966 and estimated for 1967 are as large or larger than in 1965.

Third. It was also alleged by some of

our friends on the other side of the aisle that the Department of Agriculture had made: "Repeated decisions to increase imports of raw sugar into the United States." There have been several increases in imports this year in accordance with the provisions of the Sugar Act, as enacted by Congress, but this fact does not support the conclusion that domestic growers were thereby disadvantaged.

Under the Sugar Act total supplies of sugar must be limited in accordance with demand to support the domestic price of raw sugar at the highest possible level. When it was found that early estimates of imported raw sugar were too low to accommodate actual requirements, imports were increased. The method used to control supplies of sugar in 1967 gave the greatest assurance of supporting prices at the level contemplated by Congress. This is borne out by the fact that the price of refined sugar in September 1967 was 12.16 cents per 5 pounds compared with 12.12 cents per 5 pounds in September of last year.

Fourth. It has also been charged that actions on the export control of hides for a part of 1966 weakened our farming industry. This statement is completely unfounded. Export quotas were applied to hides and skins in March 1966. They were liberalized in May and completely removed in November. Hide prices dropped slightly in April 1966—but then increased sharply during the summer. Exports in 1966 totaled 14.3 million, for an increase of 1 million over a year earlier.

Fifth. Another assertion from across the aisle is that imports of meat and dairy products are jeopardizing domestic producers. The facts are that imports of beef and veal this year are running considerably below the high levels of 1963 and 1964 and well below the levels that would bring import quotas into effect. Most of the increase in beef supplies this year has come from increases in domestic production. Prices received by farmers for cattle this year will average about the same as last year and higher than in other years since 1959.

Those making these hackneyed charges choose to completely overlook the June action of President Johnson which proclaimed quotas which are to hold annual dairy imports to a rate 75 percent below the level that would otherwise enter this country in the absence of the President's action.

They make no mention of the fact that the Johnson administration is spending more than \$5 billion on price supports and direct purchases of food and fiber from overseas shipment under our food-for-peace programs for export subsidies, and for our food stamp, school lunch and special milk programs to bolster farm prices and incomes.

Sixth. Decisions on the 1967 wheat programs also are criticized. But they fail to mention that a year ago when these decisions were made there was widespread concern that the world was running out of food. Most of the news relating to current food production was unfavorable. The monsoons in India were failing for the second successive year. Short grain crops in the Communist countries had forced them to make large purchases from Western exporters. Disappearance

of excess stocks in this country and a relatively unfavorable wheat yield outlook contributed to the uncertainty.

Since our wheat program was announced a year ago conditions changed vastly. We have had an unexpected development of bumper crops almost everywhere in the world. This was something that the experts, the people in Congress in the farm organizations and the commodity group leaders could not foresee.

The Johnson administration has responded by reducing the 1968 wheat allotments by 13 percent. We can look forward to better wheat prices in 1968 because of the acreage adjustments permitted under the diversion features of the Agricultural Act of 1965. This Act of 1965, which was sponsored by the Democratic administration and passed by the Congress, will expire in 1969. This means that at that time action must be taken by the Congress to extend or amend the program.

Instead of shedding crocodile tears, our friends across the aisle might well review their party's farm voting record. They would find that the Republican Party has voted consistently for the last 6 years against every farm program—right up to and including the Purcell strategic reserve bill which was defeated in subcommittee just a few weeks ago. Here was legislation which could have raised the price of every bushel of corn, grain sorghum, wheat, and soybeans for every farmer in this country. But true to their tradition the Republicans voted down the Purcell bill which could have added as much as 7 cents to the farm price of wheat.

If there is a moral to be gained from this sorry example of neanderthal thinking and stubborn partisan opposition it is that people who live in glass houses should not cast stones. When a political party deliberately sets out to scuttle a program which would have added thousands of dollars to the pocketbooks of distressed wheat farmers, it is in no position to utter charges such as I have just refuted—particularly when they are completely unsubstantiated and without foundation in fact.

### Credit Union Magazine Calls for Annual Rate Disclosure on Revolving Credit Under Truth-in-Lending Legislation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, between now and the time when the House of Representatives takes up H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which includes truth-in-lending provisions as its title I, the Members of the House will undoubtedly be subjected to great pressures from lobbying organizations in the retail field, and from officials of the large department stores and chain retailers in their districts, urging exemption of revolving credit from the annual rate disclosure requirements of the legislation.

Ever since former Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, proposed truth-in-lending legislation 7 years ago, large stores and chains using revolving credit have fought tenaciously and, I might add, successfully, either to block the legislation entirely or to write in a special exemption covering their type of credit. They won this battle in the Senate on S. 5, and they are determined to win it also in the House on H.R. 11601, as they did in the House Committee on Banking and Currency last Wednesday.

EVERYBODY'S MONEY MAGAZINE CALLS FOR ANNUAL RATE DISCLOSURE

The consumer's side of this issue has been reported in clear and direct fashion in the winter 1967-68 issue of Everybody's Money magazine published by CUNA International, Inc., of Madison, Wis., a magazine devoted to the interests of members of credit unions.

The article referred to reported on the proceedings of "Consumer Assembly 1967" which was held in Washington early last month. Expressing the conviction that, from the consumer standpoint, "things are sure to improve after Consumer Assembly 1967," the article tells of the strong support voiced by President Johnson at the meeting for an effective truth-in-lending bill. It urged credit union members to "take pen in hand" and write to their Members of Congress in behalf of "such matters as truth in lending with revolving credit" subject to the same regulation as other types of consumer credit; that is, requiring disclosure on an annual percentage rate basis.

I am certainly pleased by the manner in which CUNA International has presented this issue to credit union members. I am sure other Members of Congress will be interested in reading this article, which I include as part of my remarks, as follows:

THINGS ARE SURE TO IMPROVE AFTER CONSUMER ASSEMBLY 1967: A MEETING IN WASHINGTON THAT'S BOUND TO MAKE HISTORY—AND HELP BUYERS

Things have to get better for America's consumers.

If the launching of the Consumer Federation of America in Washington November 2 at the Consumer Assembly '67 is taken seriously by you, your family, and your neighbors, things are sure to improve.

The price of credit, the quality and prices of a host of products and services from electric power to aspirin pills and back again through auto insurance and medical costs—all these will be easier to understand and cope with in today's razzle-dazzle marketplace, with the aid of the CFA.

The Consumer Federation of America spelled out these purposes: to promote the rights of all consumers; to get moving on programs in areas such as product pricing, quality, servicing, and guarantees; credit and insurance; house and home improvement; cost of food, drugs and medical care.

The CFA also will be a clearing house for exchanging the latest knowledge about products and services with state and local consumer organizations.

The new national consumer group, organized by a committee of national, state and local consumer association leaders, began to take shape at a gathering in Washington in December 1966. That was a follow-up to the successful first Consumer Assembly '66, which was sponsored by 33 national organizations, including CUNA International, Inc. repre-

senting the credit union movement. (A number of credit union state leagues support state consumer associations.)

Voiceless until now while the roar of the advertising pitchmen is heard, the consumer will have a lobbyist for his rights when the CFA goes before federal agencies to argue the case for the buyer of such things as food, drugs, utilities, fabrics, and insurance.

No sooner was Consumer Federation of America launched than 14 state and local consumer organizations pledged their early affiliation. By the time this is read some 30 to 40 such groups will be enrolled.

Formation of CFA was announced by the Rev. Robert J. McEwen, S.J., member of the President's Consumer Advisory Council and chairman of the economics department of Boston College. Fr. McEwen was prominent in organizing CFA.

L. B. J. BACKS TRUTH IN LENDING

The consumer's place in the sun is getting brighter from the attention showered on Consumer Assembly '67 by government leaders. Foremost, of course, was the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. He tossed his Texas hat into the ring of the consumer cause in a dramatic way when he appeared as a guest speaker on November 2. More than 1600 people gathered from all parts of the country for a Consumer Rally in the huge ballroom of the Shoreham Hotel in Washington.

The President told a cheering audience that 12 bills in his consumer program were before Congress requiring action. He singled out the truth-in-lending bill as a leading measure requiring much support from the folks back home.

"The truth-in-lending bill would require the money lenders of our society to inform the citizen—to tell the parents who need to borrow for their children's education, or to pay medical bills, or to buy a car or a television set—just how much it will cost to borrow that money," the President said.

"The lender knows the penny how much interest he is charging. We don't think it is too much to ask that he also tell the borrower," the President declared.

PRESIDENT URGES ACTION

The Chief Executive called on the Consumer Assembly to speak up vigorously for "our 200 million consumers."

He made plain his encouragement of consumer action.

"You can only wield the power you have if you're willing to make yourselves heard," the President said. "You have the interest, you have the organization, you have the numbers and the horsepower."

The same note of encouragement was struck by Betty Furness, the President's Special Assistant on Consumer Affairs and by Representatives Leonor K. Sullivan of Missouri and Wright Patman of Texas.

Mrs. Sullivan called on consumers to support her efforts to win a strong truth in lending law—one with teeth in it that requires disclosure of true interest rates in revolving credit. This is the type of credit offered by retail stores and by many bank credit cards. The true interest rate nearly always runs about 18 per cent a year and higher.

Mrs. Sullivan told the Consumer Assembly: "If we lose in this battle, you can all look for an explosion into all credit fields of open-end or revolving credit such as department stores have devised and developed, and soon, more than half of all consumer credit would be outside effective coverage of truth in lending regulation. Without realizing it the public would be paying 18 or 24 per cent interest on a majority of its credit transactions."

Consumer Assembly '67 was sponsored by 63 organizations representing a broad spectrum of millions of members. Panel discussions on auto insurance, utility overcharge, and medical costs pointed up needed improvements for consumers who buy those services.

Delegates heard such prominent consumer spokesmen as Ralph Nader and Professor Jeffrey O'Connell of the University of Illinois. Top government leaders on the program were William H. Stewart, M.D., Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; and Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

But the most important people at Consumer Assembly were the delegates from all over the country. You're going to hear from them in coming months with the message of consumer action.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Tell your Representative in Washington to vote for the truth in lending bill with revolving credit disclosure. Take pen in hand and write letters to legislators. Air your gripe and tell them to put strong consumer protection on the books. Don't wait for a signal from experts—about such matters as truth in lending with revolving credit regulations, about the high prices on drugs, foods, clothing, and about anything else that drains your pay envelope. Speak up.

German Peace Corps Numbers 2,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the November 1967 issue of The Bulletin, a publication of the German Federal Government, I was pleased to learn that the German Peace Corps, based on our own Peace Corps, now numbers 2,000 young Germans and is planning an expansion to twice that number by 1971. The article follows:

Some 2,000 young people, members of the German Volunteer Service, will be lending an active hand by 1971 in the economic and social development of three continents—Asia, Africa and Latin America.

At present, about 1,300 volunteers have joined projects abroad in 22 countries in a spirit of co-operation based on the principle "Aid to Self-Aid". They are training nurses in Brazil, improving irrigation in Kenya, building houses in Tanzania and helping India's craftsmen to rationalise their working methods. These young people, spending two years at a stretch under conditions sometimes very different from those at home, are showing that they want to help for helping's sake.

The majority of Germany's volunteers are themselves trained craftsmen with several years' experience—from nurses and midwives to motor mechanics, bricklayers, farmers and gardeners.

The German Volunteer Service was founded in 1963 and is in general based on the model of the American "Peace Corps". The late President John F. Kennedy, during his visit to Bonn in 1963, attended the ceremony of inauguration.

The Service, with its headquarters in Bad Godesberg, near Bonn, is supported not only (and to the principal degree) by the Federal Government. But also by dozens of private organizations, religious institutions and political associations. Many of these themselves have long years of experience in development work overseas.

Last year, the Service booked DM 17 million (\$4,250,000) in funds. But spokesmen say that about DM 60 million will be needed if the number of volunteers is to be almost doubled by 1971.