

or small number, all of whom have, in truth, directly participated in the stand expressed. In other instances and most frequently, he speaks in a representative capacity where in truth there are only a relatively few people who have really dug in depth into the issue and have taken a particular stand.

Now, can you tell me any more from the data which has been handed to you as to where we stand on this particular statement, Mr. Igarashi?

Reverend IGARASHI. There are several levels at which we need to answer your question. The 42 million members of NCC is a deceptive figure and all 42 million people quite obviously are not behind us. If we were, as the church, speaking, we would have had this bill passed a long time ago, or any bill for that matter.

The fact is, the whole question of representative government is being asked. When we speak of the National Council of Churches, it is important to remember that it is not the staff of NCC to which we refer but it is the constituent denominations: 34 of whom are represented by a longstanding process by which people are elected. The whole question of "visible" elected minority who speak for the church raises the equally valid question of who speaks for any church, whether it be local, regional or national. At any church's jurisdictional level, who does indeed speak for the church or any group in which a representative or participatory democracy is evident?

Mr. Boutilier, the executive director of the National Campaign for Agricultural Democracy, just reminded me that the action of the general board on December 3, 1966, in fact had 110 people for and none against; and one abstention. This is a rather substantial support, and represents a considerable number of people.

Supporting this action by the NCC general board, there are over 10,000 volunteers and countless numbers of people who, in the church, have considered this matter of the extension of the rights of the agricultural migrant and the specific bills which refer to these rights. Earlier in this hearing I was asked whether the testimony supported this particular bill or not, my answer then was, "in a general way." This cautious reply indicates our desire for more study. We have not had a chance to really look at this particular bill, but we have studied other bills on the extension of collective bargaining rights with infinite care and I can assure you with quite a considerable number of people who represent Protestant churches across America. And these are indeed represented by the 110 general board vote figure.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Please understand I am not quarreling with the position of the paper. I am just fully aware of the representative nature in the Presbyterian Church where we go from the congregation to the individual church, to the presbytery, to the synod to the general assembly; and in the final analysis the man who speaks in behalf of our denomination may very well not have talked with many people below him and it finally ends up, in large part, although he is chosen as the representative, he speaks for himself on the particular point involved.

This is really what I was intending, to at least have the record clear, that we are not here really getting the views of 42 million persons and you have said this, but we are getting it in a different way.