

the Congress has provided for these programs.

In addition to the overwhelming need to fund fully the grant provisions of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, I believe that there is an equally compelling need for full funding of the direct loan program under title III of the act. While the interest subsidy procedure, provided for under the HEFA amendments of 1968 and for which the administration has requested \$22 million, is feasible for many institutions, there are many others which find it virtually impossible to obtain loans in the private market, even with an interest subsidy. It is especially for these institutions, where the need for the construction money certainly is no less urgent, that it is essential that the direct loan program be funded and protected as a continuing alternative to the program of interest subsidies.

Regarding this, one educator recently made the following comments in a letter to me:

The replacement of direct loans by interest subsidies for private loans under Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act is even more serious in its detrimental effect on replacing old or adding new facilities to the campus. Most small colleges, or even medium-sized institutions, would find it difficult to obtain loans on today's markets at less than seven or eight percent interest rates. Government programs in the past have not subsidized interest rates at these levels. In the past, 90 to 95 percent of the Title I and II Higher Education Facilities Act Program Construction grants have required Title III loans to finance facilities construction. Should many institutions have difficulty securing loans under the interest subsidy program, the net effect would be to stop or delay facilities construction in a large segment of higher education throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this statement needs no elaboration.

It should be a cause of some embarrassment to Members that historically we have never provided the full amount of funds for these construction programs that we have authorized. However, we have not sought to put higher education back into the stone age as the administration's budget requests for these programs would. For, while we have not provided all the funds needed, we have consistently increased Federal participation in these construction programs. Without the increased aid which we have provided, crowded conditions which now exist at the Nation's colleges and universities would be even worse than they are. Therefore, it is with a good deal of consternation that I look upon the administration's budget requests for these programs and wonder how such action is possible in view of the express intent of the Congress that the amounts appropriated for these programs should be increased as much as possible and the administration's pledge to be second to none in its concern for higher education.

In States such as my home State of Pennsylvania, where a concerted effort is being made to develop a higher education system which gives nothing away to State systems elsewhere in the Nation, these cuts proposed by the administration come at an extremely crucial time. If the Congress does not act to

increase the appropriations on which these programs will operate for the next fiscal year, valuable years of planning will have gone down the drain, never to be reclaimed. Developing a delivery system which will make a good higher education available to all families with a minimum of difficulty will have to be postponed indefinitely and perhaps forgotten.

Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to heed the warnings of educators, in their own congressional districts, and throughout the Nation. We all must act in concert to prevent the calamity which the administration would have us be parties to by approving their pennywise and pound-foolish recommendations for funding of the higher education facilities construction programs. The human cost involved in acquiescing to the devil-may-care approach which the administration has taken in attempting to meet the needs of our colleges and universities for academic facilities just is not worth it.

#### REGIONAL INDEED

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, after five postponements, Attorney General Mitchell confirmed my fears in his testimony before the House Judiciary Committee. The administration's position on the Voting Rights Act and its proposed extension is disgraceful. The Attorney General laid forth the recommendations to dilute the Voting Rights Act—and reiterated its position that there is no justification for "regional" voting rights legislation.

As long as this administration continues to serve the South—it is rightfully protecting the supremacy of its supporters by insisting there is no need for opening these Southern polls to black people. President Nixon continues to seek the means by which to honor political debts to the South—and revision of this act would provide the clearest indictment of his prejudice for those who have vainly sought some defense for his past actions.

I shall address myself to this subject further, but at this point, I call to the attention of my colleagues this editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 20, 1969:

#### REGIONAL, INDEED

Evidently the Congressional Republicans most knowledgeable about civil rights are opposed to the Nixon Administration's position regarding extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and they have reason to be.

The law expires next year and should be extended. It establishes special procedures for encouraging registration and voting by minority groups, and prohibits the use of literacy tests and similar devices to discourage such voting. The law has vastly increased the number of Negroes voting in the South, though its work still needs to go on.

Attorney General Mitchell, however, is said to have told the Republicans that the law applies only to the South and is "regional legislation" and should be broadened, be-

cause President Nixon campaigned against regional legislation. The response of the Congressmen was that the GOP helped push the act, that they had the votes for simple extension of it, and that any revision could only delay extension.

In our view the law needs absolutely no "broadening." Of course it was aimed at the South; that is where Negroes were denied voting rights. The law would apply anywhere else there was voting discrimination, but we hardly expect North Dakota or Michigan to adopt literacy tests. Mr. Mitchell's position seems to be one of risking an effective law in behalf of the campaign promises of the Nixon "Southern strategy." Civil rights for political hocus-pokus? The GOP Congressmen are right to stand firm against it.

#### THE NEW LEFT AND THE OLD GRAPES OF WRATH

### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, John Steinbeck, the renowned author, was born and lived in my hometown of Salinas, Calif. I have read many of his books, the locale of which was often in our county of Monterey. He was one of the world's best portrayals of the ugly and sordid characters and aspects of life. Many present-day social counselors and critics, who have never seen a grape being picked, believe that Steinbeck's 30-year-old novel "Grapes of Wrath" portrays the social and economic conditions of today in the table grape-producing industry. It did not then, and does not now.

An accurate appraisal of Cesar Chavez and his abortive grape pickers "strike" and the boycott is accurately described by John R. Coyne, Jr., an able writer and careful reporter in the July 1, 1969, issue of the National Review. For those who have never seen or known a table grape picker, I urge the reading of this short, but comprehensive, report.

For those who are interested in obtaining a better perspective of the table grape boycott, I commend Mr. Coyne's article and insert it at this place in the RECORD:

#### THE GRAPES OF WRATH

(By John R. Coyne, Jr.)

The California table-grape boycott has become fashionable. Recently George Plimpton (*The Paper Lion*) threw a fund-raising party for César Chavez' United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, and the New York press featured pictures of Plimpton's stable of décolleté dollies sipping champagne and pouting at the cameras. Old liberals such as James Wechsler have embraced the cause with lachrymose ardor, and new-breed liberal mutants—Jimmy Breslin, for instance—find in the boycott opportunity to show that they are just as warm-hearted and fuzzy-headed as any of the old timers.

Few Easterners have any real knowledge of the facts of the boycott. It is enough that emotions can be aroused and played on. The typical view is presented by Breslin in one of his *New York Post* columns. "John Steinbeck wrote *The Grapes of Wrath* almost thirty years ago and it is one of the few truly meaningful novels ever written in America, and in California they still grow grapes of wrath." Now there is a lot wrong