<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2nd</td>
<td>(Wednesday) PM</td>
<td>America Reborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii Chapter of the American College of Surgeons Annual Meeting Dinner Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 3rd</td>
<td>(Thursday) 7:00 PM</td>
<td>Energy Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii Economic Association Annual Meeting Dinner Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7th</td>
<td>(Monday) PM</td>
<td>America Reborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester Chamber of Commerce Annual Dinner Rochester, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATO-Energy Conference Jackson, Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 22nd</td>
<td>(Tuesday) 8:00 PM</td>
<td>Watergate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tulane University New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24th</td>
<td>(Thursday) PM</td>
<td>Honoring George Hearn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cathedral Club of Brooklyn 74th Annual Dinner Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2nd</td>
<td>(Saturday) 7:30 PM Chamber of Commerce Annual Dinner Snyder, Texas</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 5th</td>
<td>(Tuesday) 2:00 PM Senate Youth Program Senate Office Bldg., Room 1202 Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>(DKI ill--Senator Biden replaced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 6th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) PM The Catholic Club Norwalk, Connecticut</td>
<td>(DKI ill--cancelled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 22nd</td>
<td>(Friday) 9:50 PM Mayor's Symphony Ball - reading of &quot;A Lincoln Portrait&quot;) Sheraton Waikiki Ballroom Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 23rd</td>
<td>(Saturday) 8:30 PM Benedictine College Annual Governor's Scholarship Ball Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15th</td>
<td>(Friday) 8:15 PM Chamber of Commerce Orchid Isle Hotel Hilo, Hawaii</td>
<td>Foreign Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22nd</td>
<td>(Friday) 8:15 PM Universal Oil Products Company International Division Reps. Embassy Row Hotel Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2nd</td>
<td>(Tuesday) 1:30 PM Washington Workshops Students Room 5110, NSOB Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5th</td>
<td>(Friday) 12:00 Noon Esquire Magazine Round Table Esquire Exhibit Hall New York City</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9th</td>
<td>(Tuesday) 12:30 PM Air Transport Association D.C. Representatives Room S-138, The Capitol</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15th</td>
<td>(Monday) 8:00 PM Congressman Charles H. Wilson of California Annual Fund Raising Dinner Beverly Wilshire Hotel Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>Effects of Foreign Invest., Watergate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19th</td>
<td>(Friday) 8:30 AM Sears Roebuck and Company Employees Political Awareness Kahului, Maui</td>
<td>Spontaneous(no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19th</td>
<td>(Friday) 12:30 PM Lahaina Restoration Foundation Annual Meeting Luncheon Maui Surf Hotel Kahului, Maui</td>
<td>Lahaina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20th</td>
<td>(Saturday) 7:00 PM Pacific Region YMCA Biennial Conference Princess Kaiulani Hotel Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) 12:30 PM EX-SOBs Club Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11th</td>
<td>(Saturday) PM DATO Travel Conference Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Travel Toward a Better America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) 7:00 PM National Secretaries Association, Hawaii Chapter Membership Meeting Princess Kaiulani Hotel, R. L. Stevenson Room Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14th</td>
<td>International Procurement Seminar</td>
<td>Business Opportunities in Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16th</td>
<td>(Thursday) 8:00 PM Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization Annual Convention Hilton Hawaiian Village, Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Foreign, Direct and Portfolio Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17th</td>
<td>(Friday) 11:15 AM Washington Intermediate School Students 7th Grade Convention Coral Ballroom, Hawaiian Village Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>IAm Proud To Live in a Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18th</td>
<td>Hawaii State Democratic Convention Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>1954 Hawaii Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19th</td>
<td>(Sunday) 2:00 PM Leeward Community College Commencement Performing Arts Theatre on Campus Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20th</td>
<td>National Association of Credit Management</td>
<td>Legislative---Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78th Annual Conference</td>
<td>Imbalance of Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilton Hawaiian Village Coral Ballroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30th</td>
<td>(Thursday) 8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kauai Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Quarterly Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton Kauai Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poipu , Kauai, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31st</td>
<td>(Friday) 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League of Women Voters of Kauai County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lihue Plantation Office Building</td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31st</td>
<td>(Friday) 7:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kapaa High and Intermediate School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commencement Exercises</td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kapaa, Kauai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1st</td>
<td>(Saturday) 7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pahoa High and Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commencement Exercises</td>
<td>Fear of Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pahoa, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2nd</td>
<td>(Sunday) 7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiser High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commencement Exercises</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikiki Shell, Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3rd</td>
<td>(Monday) 7:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilo High School</td>
<td>Viet Nam Vets--Our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commencement Exercises</td>
<td>Unfinished Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilo Civic Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilo, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4th</td>
<td>(Tuesday) 7:30 PM Konawaena High and Intermediate School Gym on Campus Kona, Hawaii</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) 8:00 PM ACLU of Hawaii Annual Membership Meeting Paradise Park, Polynesian Restaurant Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>&quot;Privacy&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6th</td>
<td>(Thursday) 5:00 PM Iolani School Commencement Exercises On Campus Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Case for Conditional Amnesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7th</td>
<td>(Friday) 9:00 AM Industrial Traffic Association of Hawaii Seminar-Ilikai Hotel, Pacific Ballroom Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>S. 1566--Strike Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7th</td>
<td>(Friday) 7:00 PM Hawaii Baptist Academy Commencement Exercises Kawaiahao Church Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Energy Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8th</td>
<td>(Saturday) PM American Society of Women Accountants Western Regional Convention Sheraton Waikiki Hotel Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Rethinking Foreign Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10th</td>
<td>(Monday) 11:00 AM American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees 20th International Convention Hawaiian Village---Coral Ballroom</td>
<td>Public Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20th</td>
<td>Trade Tourism Conference Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>Trade/Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22nd</td>
<td>(Saturday) PM DAV-Oahu Chapter No. 1 Department 23rd Annual State Convention Queen Kapiolani Hotel Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27th</td>
<td>Rostenkowski Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>George Dunne Testimonial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2nd</td>
<td>College of Health Sciences University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3rd</td>
<td>Rotary Club of Kona Luncheon Kona, Hawaii</td>
<td>Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3rd</td>
<td>Hilo AJA Hilo, Hawaii</td>
<td>200th Birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7th</td>
<td>(Sunday) PM Fund Raising Dinner for Mayor Norman Mineta (Running for U.S. House to fill Gubser seat) San Jose, California</td>
<td>Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25th</td>
<td>(Thursday) PM National Japanese American Citizens League 23rd Biennial Convention Sheraton Hotel Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>U.S.-Japan Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3rd</td>
<td>(Saturday) PM Ed Edmundson (running vs. Senator Bartlett) Fund Raiser Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13th</td>
<td>(Tuesday) 9:00 AM National Lawyers Wives Installation of Officers Breakfast (Part of ABA National Convention) Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>200 Birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) 12:00 Noon Young Lawyers Section of American Bar Association Annual Meeting Hawaiian Regent Hotel Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Watergate Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16th</td>
<td>(Friday) Kona Coffee Festival Kickoff Keauhou Beach Hotel Kona, Hawaii</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) 1:15PM American Assn. of Retired Persons - Chapter 60 of Hawaii Weekly Meeting at Makua Alii Auditorium, 1541 Kalakaua Ave. Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Off the cuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 11th</td>
<td>(Wednesday) 8:00 PM</td>
<td>Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38th Annual Meeting-Pacific Ballroom, Ilikai Hotel</td>
<td>Presidential Pardon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12th</td>
<td>(Thursday) 10:00 AM</td>
<td>International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64th Annual Convention</td>
<td>Nene Goose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton-Waikiki Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12th</td>
<td>(Thursday) 12:00 Noon</td>
<td>&quot;Forty Plus of Hawaii&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly Meeting</td>
<td>Talking Straight on Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander and Baldwin Board Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 13th</td>
<td>(Friday) 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Pacific Coast Gas Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81st Convention</td>
<td>Energy Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton-Waikiki Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 14th</td>
<td>(Saturday) 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Samoa Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ala Moana Park Baseball Field</td>
<td>S. 1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 17th</td>
<td>(Tuesday) 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Constitution-Citizenship Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by U.S. Civil Service Commission</td>
<td>200th Birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Service Commission Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 29th</td>
<td>(Sunday) 12:00 Noon</td>
<td>M.C. at Cultural Exchange Fashion Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR Iolani Sportswear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton-Waikiki Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1974 SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATE</strong></th>
<th><strong>PLACE</strong></th>
<th><strong>TITLE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Oct. 1st | (Tuesday) 9:00 AM  
National Assn. of Printers and Lithographers  
Trade Convention  
L. A. Convention Center  
Los Angeles, California | Events which will affect our future |
| October 4th | (Friday) 2:00 PM  
Airlines Employees District 141  
International Assn. of Machinists and Aerospace Workers  
27th Annual Convention  
Surfrider Hotel  
Honolulu, Hawaii | |
| Oct. 7th | (Monday) 10:00 AM  
Financial Executives Institute  
43rd International Conference  
Sheraton-Waikiki Hotel  
Honolulu, Hawaii | Events which will affect our future |
| October 19th | (Saturday) 8:00 PM  
Upshur County, West Virginia  
Democratic Rally and Dinner  
Buckhannon, West Virginia | Spontaneous (no text) |
| Oct. 26th | (Saturday) 8:00 PM  
Hawaii PTA  
48th Annual State Convention  
Coral Ballroom, Hilton Hawaiian Village  
Honolulu, Hawaii | Human Values |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 28th</td>
<td>National Assn. of Convenience Stores</td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coral Ballroom, Hilton Hawaiian Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 29th</td>
<td>Kamiloiki Elementary School Students</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th and 6th grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 31st</td>
<td>National Wholesale Druggists' Association</td>
<td>Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convention Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton-Waikiki Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1st</td>
<td>Hawaii Chapter CPCU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton-Waikiki Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4th</td>
<td>Sears Roebuck and Company Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good Citizenship Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ala Moana Center Sears Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4th</td>
<td>Aiea High School Students of Public Speaking and Hawaiian History</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aiea, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4th</td>
<td>Castle High School Student Body and Political Science Students</td>
<td>Spontaneous (no text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaneohe, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4th</td>
<td>(Monday) 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Senior Citizens of Pohai Nani Retirement Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18th</td>
<td>(Monday) 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Retirement Ceremony for Judge Martin Pence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Despite the fact that most of you will go to the polls in ten days to cast your vote either for or against me, I am not here tonight to tell you how often I have fought for improved educational aid to the State of Hawaii. I will not talk about Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I will not discuss my views on busing or the teachers' right to strike. My address is more concerned with questions about human values.

About twenty years ago tonight, a PTA audience was listening to an address by a prominent Hawaii speaker when a note was passed to him, momentarily interrupting his talk. The note said, "Call the Police Department." The man, although a bit flustered, kept his composure and finished his address entitled "The Relationship of Parent to Child."

After leaving the podium, he called the police and learned that his son had just been arrested, along with a few other youths, for burglary. The boy had been caught in a supermarket after closing hours. His father was astonished. He couldn't understand why his son, who had been given every material comfort he had ever asked for, should stoop to burglary.

I learned of this incident when I was a volunteer worker at Oahu prison during the mid-1950s. My duties entailed discussing legal rights with new prisoners. I met the speaker's son - a soft spoken, intelligent and alert young man of about 19 - who came up to me after one of my classes to ask a question. He certainly fit no one's conception of a criminal, so I asked him why he was there. "I'm here because I was a burglar."

We became friends of a sort as I took an interest in him. He told me of his parents, who were both successful educators. They lived the good life, had a lovely home, and the material trappings of financial stability.
I visited his mother and father and found them to be gracious, articulate and — on the surface — model parents. They told me of their confusion over their son's actions. They said they had always assumed they had a close relationship with him and that he was happy.

I, too, was confused, until one day the young man told me why he got himself into trouble. He said he wanted friends and the boys he was with the night he was arrested offered him friendship. He said he would have preferred his parents to be his friends but they didn't have time. Their careers seemed more important to them and he felt he was less important. They never had time to listen to his concerns or to applaud his successes or to give him affection and love. They were not aware of his problems because they were not aware of him. He said he was glad in a way that he had been caught by the police because it made his parents take notice of him for a change.

Unfortunately, this sad story is not unique. In many homes the fast pace of life now includes both parents. The increase in working wives and mothers has been significant in the past decade. The demanding work schedules bring both parents home at the end of the day — tired and often irritable. There is little time left for the children. Too often, others have been given the responsibility for raising children including the schools and day-care centers.

The fight to maintain a high standard of living or to improve one's material well-being, especially in the face of ever-increasing inflation, has put intense pressure on parents. The American dream has become a bit of a nightmare for too many who in the search for worldly possessions lose sight of important moral values. Too many times the family becomes less important than the job. Worries about life at one's place of work obscures sensitivity to life at home.

President Ford, in his first speech before the Congress a few days after he took office stated, "If we can make effective an earlier use of the moral and ethical wisdom of the centuries in today's complex society, we will prevent more crime and corruption than all the policemen and prosecutors ... can ever deter. This is a job that must begin at home, not in Washington."

The President couldn't be more correct. Children, by their nature, take whatever moral and ethical wisdom — both personal and professional — from the example set by parents. Morals and ethics — like charity — must begin at home. Our educational institutions cannot do the job alone and by the time any child reaches a correctional institution it may be too late to begin. Unfortunately, this simple truth is too easily forgotten and ignored in our hectic society. Parents oftentimes under
the pressure of events outside the family feel inadequate to the job of moral training or assume it is the responsibility of others.

For example, some have called on government to be responsible for religious instruction. The call for prayers in the schools in effect is a call for government to impose religious training. In my youth I learned that religion was a personal and private thing. Prayer was a very private time for individual contemplation. Perhaps I am mistaken, but I believe that daily spoken non-denominational prayer imposed on children by a teacher would have little or possibly a negative religious value.

Religious faith must be nurtured in the home. It must have a firm foundation in the daily example set by parents, if children are expected to practice religion throughout their young lives. Organized religion has been in a period of decline over the past decade. Yet we have seen thousands of our young men and women, obviously in a serious search for religious faith and understanding, turn to questionable religious gurus. The Maharajji - a 17 year old guru, Reverend Moon - the Korean self-proclaimed Christ, and other spiritual "superstars" have gathered followers to them. This phenomena has occurred while followers of more orthodox religions have dwindled. It is a testament to the continual need for spiritual sustenance on the part of our young people. It is also a testament to the failure of many parents in passing on their religious beliefs to their own children.

The rise in crime is another serious and disturbing phenomenon. It is occurring in communities - large and small, rich and poor. There are many explanations for this - all of them with elements of truth. But there can be little question that the dissolution of the family must share the blame.

In the past 30 years, there has been a frightening change in values. In the early part of this century, crime was not a significant factor, even in the ghettos and poorer neighborhoods where economic want was always a ready motivation. Today shoplifting in suburban stores by children of affluent parents and even by parents often occurs. It happens even when the shoplifter has more than sufficient funds in his or her pocket to pay for the item quietly slipped into another pocket.

Cheating has become a way of life for too many of our citizens, even though it may be petty and minimal in its intention and effect. In some houses strict honesty is required of the children, but rejected by the parents. When parents ignore the speed limit, ignore no-parking signs, run through yellow and even red lights, or heap verbal abuse on other drivers while transporting their children around town, they are training their children not only to be dangerous drivers, but law violators as well.
When parents pad the damage estimates for an auto accident to get a little more out of the insurance company, or call in sick to the office to slip in an extra morning of golf or shopping, they are teaching their children that lying is acceptable.

As a politician who gained some prominence in the wake of the Watergate scandals, even though my role was on the side of the search for truth, I am especially concerned over the impact of those scandals on young people growing up to be future citizens. The involvement of the President of the United States in criminal activities and the subsequent pardon of that President even for well-intentioned reasons does not teach a fitting moral lesson to our youngsters. The apparent lesson is that there is a double standard of justice - one for the rich and powerful and one for the poor and powerless. Although we cannot erase the sequence of Watergate events, we need not encourage our children to accept public corruption as inevitable.

We must honestly explain the imperfections as well as the perfections of our governmental institutions and the human factor acting within those institutions for ill or good.

Throughout the Watergate affair I have been disturbed to hear it said that these things are done by all politicians. I know that is not true. Any parent who expresses that opinion to a child will be teaching an erroneous and dangerous moral lesson. If the child grows to believe that two wrongs do make a right, he or she may learn a sad lesson in future years when a boss or a policeman reject that excuse for wrongdoing.

Parents should honestly explain what they believe to have gone wrong in our country during recent years at the highest levels of government. I believe that President Ford made a serious mistake in pardoning Richard Nixon when he did. I also believe it was an honest mistake that had not been carefully thought through. This is the explanation I have given my son. It is an explanation that he will come to accept I hope. It is important that our children realize that our President and other leaders, just like their parents, can make honest mistakes. It is equally important for them to learn that elected officials' mistakes have been dishonest on occasion.

We cannot excuse official wrongdoing on the grounds that hidden evil forces in our system force decisions that are dishonest but unavoidable. We must teach our children to develop their own high code of conduct and to live by it.
If our children do not successfully learn to act honestly and ethically, can we blame the teacher? Is it really objectionable television programs that are to blame?

We must recognize that our children will have friends who have differing moral codes than we try to impart. They will see others ignore or defy the law. There will be social pressures on our children to ignore or defy the laws that governments impose and that we as parents impose. Whether or not they withstand these pressures will to a large degree depend on how often they have observed us - their parents - withstand similar pressures. For parents will influence and guide the moral and ethical development of a child to a greater degree than all other forces.

Obviously, none of us are perfect. I make no pretension to moral purity. As humans, our foibles sometimes get the better of us. I do believe, however, that the sincerity of our attempts to lead ethical lives is recognized by our children. Hypocrisy on our part is also quickly recognized.

It does little good to criticize your children for smoking pot, if you are a heavy drinker. Reciting a good night prayer at a child's bedside may have little impact on a child who sees a parent act without charity or compassion toward other humans.

I do not mean to sound preachy. I do mean to raise in each of our minds questions as to how can we best carry out our responsibilities as parents. I am well aware of the demands of time that a busy career makes on a parent. I am proud to be a United States Senator. My work is very rewarding and satisfying on a personal level. My career does, however, keep me away from my wife and son far more often than is my preference. Still, I have learned that it is the quality and the intensity of the time a parent spends with a child, rather than just the quantity. Being a busy professional and a good parent are not mutually exclusive undertakings. It is hard work to combine the two, but the rewards are extraordinary.

Your attendance tonight is a manifestation of your concern for your children's intellectual progress. May I wish you all success in your efforts to bring up educated, responsible and honorable children. The responsibility that has been placed on us in bringing children into an imperfect world to teach them to strive for moral and spiritual perfection is indeed a heavy one. The reward of watching a child grow toward maturity with soundness of character can make it all worthwhile.
On Sunday morning, September 8th, President Gerald R. Ford extended "a full, free and absolute pardon unto Richard Nixon for all offenses against the United States which he, Richard Nixon, has committed or may have committed or taken part in during the period from January 20, 1969 through August 9, 1974." Needless to say this action was unprecedented.

President Ford stated that he took this step because he felt, in his words, that "Richard Nixon and his loved ones have suffered enough, and will continued to suffer no matter what I do". He indicated further that the goal of domestic tranquility outweighed his concern for equal justice under law.

It was obvious and understandable that President Ford wanted very much to write the final chapter to the Watergate tragedy. However, instead of finally putting Watergate to rest the President may have opened a new and disturbing chapter of national controversy and division.

When advised of the President's announcement of the pardon action my initial reaction was one of stunned surprise. I couldn't believe my ears. After taking a deep breath, I responded to the reporter's inquiry that I thought the President's action was unfortunate and unwise.

I felt so for a number of reasons: First, a pardon is normally granted to an individual after his conviction. The act of pardon is to spare the defendant the pain and suffering imposed by the conviction.

Learned constitutional lawyers have suggested that the President's pardon powers are very broad indeed and that these include the power to grant a pardon for a criminal act immediately after commission of such act and before any indictment. Accepting that premise, President
Ford's pardon still leaves us with an unresolved question as to what crime or crimes President Nixon has or may have committed.

During the Senate Watergate hearings and during the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiry several allegations or suggestions of criminal actions were made. But he has never been indicted nor has he ever admitted to the commission of any crime. Technically, we have a situation where a pardon has been extended to one who has committed no crime but to one who just may have committed a criminal offense.

The pardon would seem to obviate further fruitful inquiry. Neither is there any requirement of a public confession and we are not likely to get one. The country will likely now never know the facts concerning Presidential involvement and the act of pardon will further encourage those who will seek to promulgate the theory that Richard M. Nixon was an innocent man hounded from office by a vicious press and partisan detractors.

That thought leads to a second consideration—equal justice under the law. There are a number of top lieutenants in President Nixon's Administration who are currently awaiting trial for alleged involvement in criminal activities relating to Watergate. Some have already served their sentence in jail. Others are now languishing in jail for their part in this sorry affair. Without question most, if not all, found themselves in trouble due to their intense loyalty to President Nixon or from having acted under what they construed to be a Presidential order.

Former President Nixon is not the only one who has suffered because of involvement in Watergate if suffering is to be equated with punishment. One defendant not only faces possible prison and disbarment but has already lost his wife. A number have lost their license to henceforth practice their profession. Some have been without employment all have had to face not only the bright lights of public hearings and constant questions from reporters but the cross examination of prosecutor and grand juror as well. All have suffered the loss of prestige which had accrued to them from their position near the pinnacle of power. The trauma for family and loved ones is no less real because the prospects of indictment, trial and conviction receive somewhat less public attention.

I realize that under our system, "equal justice under law" is a subjective goal. Judge, jury and prosecutor are all human beings each with their own individual human weaknesses and differences resulting in differing verdicts and sentences. Notwithstanding such admitted imperfections under our abstract sense of equal justice, it would seem elemental that if the principal in a criminal conspiracy is to be pardoned so should be his subordinates. And if the subordinates are now to go without further punishment what about the thousands who await trial for relatively minor offenses.
As one of my constituents noted, "This pardon opens a messy can of worms."

President Ford seems to have resurrected by this one act the very concept which got his predecessor into so much trouble—the assumption that there is an arbitrary distinction between the application of the law as it applies to those who hold or have held the highest office of the land and that which is applicable to all other Americans.

My third concern involves credibility. After suffering through the pain of Watergate Americans will long remember that one of the most important words in the Watergate vocabulary was "credibility". The test of who had credibility became a key factor in making judgments.

In the transcript of the hearings of the Senate Rules Committee into the question of confirmation of Vice President-designate Gerald Ford the following exchange appears:

Chairman Howard Cannon: If a President resigned his office before his term expired, would his successor have the power to prevent or terminate any investigation or criminal prosecution charges against the former President?

Mr. Ford: Would he have the authority?

Chairman Cannon: Yes, would he have the power?

Mr. Ford: I do not think the public would stand for it. I think—and whether he has the technical authority or not, I cannot give you a categorical answer.

On August 28th in his first news conference as President Mr. Ford responded to the very first question by Helen Thomas of UPI as follows:

Question: Mr. President...do you agree with the bar association that the law applies equally to all men, or do you agree with Governor Rockefeller that former President Nixon should have immunity from prosecution? And specifically would you use your pardon authority, if necessary?
The President: Well let me say at the outset that I made a statement in this room a few moments after the swearing in. On that occasion I said the following: that I had hoped that our former President who had brought peace to millions, would find it for himself.

Now, the expression made by Governor Rockefeller, I think, coincides with the general view and the point of view of the American people. I subscribe to that point of view, but let me add, in the last 10 days or 2 weeks I have asked for prayers for guidance on this very important point.

In this situation, I am the final authority. There have been charges made, there has been no action by the courts, there has been no action by any jury. And until any legal process has been undertaken, I think it is unwise and untimely for me to make any commitment.

And later from another report:

Question: May I just follow up on Helen's question. Are your saying, sir, that the option of a pardon for former President Nixon is still an option that you will consider, depending on what the courts will do?

The President: Of course, I make the final decision. And until it gets to me, I make no commitment one way or the other. But I do have the right to make that decision.

The above exchange was widely reported in the press as a statement that President Ford would reserve the right to pardon but that he would not make a decision regarding a pardon before any legal process had taken place. The impression we all received was that President Ford would not intervene before the judicial process had worked its will. From what we can now determine the President was even then already considering an early and full pardon.

These conflicting statements and actions unfortunately create a credibility gap. I say unfortunate because after the political trauma of Watergate the American people very much want candor from a Mr. Clean in the Oval Office and President Ford in his first month seemed to be giving us that openness and candor—that image of a man whose integrity was above question and beyond reproach that we desired so much.

While President Ford must have had reasons which he felt fully justified the pardon action at this time, unfortunately in the minds of many, this act again creates a cloud over the White House and over our government in Washington.
My fourth concern relates to the word "deal". This was a term often heard during the Senate and House hearings of the past eighteen months and it was a term which invoked an instant and most negative response. Because of the unanswered questions now surrounding this action there are many who are suggesting that the pardon action was part of a deal. I pray that President Ford will be able to further enlighten us as to his reasons. Otherwise the charge of a deal may persist and, if unjustified, such a persistent suspicion is certainly not in the best interest of our nation.

If there were reasons which have not been made public which led to his precipitous action, then I pray that President Ford will come forth and publicly state those reasons. I believe the American people are compassionate, understanding and reasonable people who will support hard decisions when fully explained and publicly made.

President Ford, in his announced effort to secure domestic tranquility, has succeeded rather in shattering it. He has demonstrated how fragile is the public trust and confidence. The almost universal good will which met his assumption of office has evaporated. He has demonstrated once again how essential it is that the people share fully in all of the reasons for the decisions made in that oval office if they are to support those decisions as reasonable, just and fair.
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I was saddened--but not surprised--to learn that more than one-third of Vietnam veterans who were interviewed during a recent opinion poll said that, so disheartened are they by their country's indifference to their sacrifice, they would prefer to live in another country. One need only remember the welcome that veterans of other wars, especially those of World War II, received upon returning home to understand this anguished indictment by soldiers who risked their lives in the jungles of Southeast Asia on our behalf.

When I returned with my combat buddies to Hawaii following World War II, we were greeted by special holidays and parades. Proclamations were made by the territorial governor, legislators, and other elected officials. Every big shot wanted to shake our hands. Massive celebrations in Honolulu were repeated on a smaller scale in every village and town. Banquets, luaus, speeches, and medals were given to honor us. Simply stated: We were greeted as warrior heroes. It was heady stuff that helped us to forget the pain and terror of war.

Of special importance to our later lives were the generous G.I. benefits which were enacted by the federal, State, and local governments. Hawaii gave to each veteran with even the slightest disability a $300 bonus. The U.S. G.I. bill gave every veteran the opportunity to attend the college of his choice. Our tuition was paid by the Veterans Administration and we received a monthly stipend to cover our living costs.

As lawmakers tried to outdo each other in helping out our war heroes, some benefits were enacted that were less than essential. For example, leg amputees were provided with free automobiles specially designed for their use. Free cars, however, also were made available to blind veterans with no concern as to who would drive them. Hospitalization, medical care, vocational rehabilitation, mustering out pay and reemployment programs all flourished. Employers in a booming economy were eager to hire veterans. G.I.'s were quickly given responsible positions in government and business.
Seven million World War II veterans benefited from the G.I. bill. The lives of each of us were changed by the opportunity provided to us. I do not believe I would be in the United States Senate today without having been a beneficiary of the bill. There are 19 other Senators and 65 Congressmen who also went to school under the G.I. bill, and who feel as I do about its effect on them.

The G.I. bill transformed our entire educational system. Before World War II, a college education was available primarily to the sons and daughters of the wealthy. As G.I. bill dollars enabled public colleges and universities to expand their facilities, academic resources, and to develop highly trained faculties, a college education became possible for the average American.

The Vietnam war was unlike World War II. Vietnam was a conflict that the American people did not understand and eventually grew to despise. When we finally withdrew our forces a little more than a year ago, we tried to forget that we had ever been there. Only those millions of combat soldiers who lived the agony of Vietnam remember daily, and we have also forgotten them.

Over 50,000 Americans died in Vietnam. More than 340,000 men returned disabled--having lost arms, eyes, ears, legs, faces, genitals, and brains. Thousands of those who returned without having been physically harmed came back with severe psychological problems. And even those millions who arrived home physically and mentally whole left a few years of their lives behind on Asian soil.

Five hundred P.O.W.s also returned. They received special VIP treatment--they were greeted with Presidential White House dinners, mass media exposure, gifts from automobile makers, local receptions, and special gratitude for their sacrifices. Of course, the P.O.W.s deserved these accolades. But what about the 7 million other Vietnam veterans--where are their parades, their holidays, their luaus?

The fact that Americans disagreed over the purpose and methods of our involvement in Vietnam is no reason for us to penalize the soldiers who fought that war for us. Many of them did not want to go to Vietnam, but when they were drafted, they accepted their duty. Many of them found that the war they had to wage did not fit their vision of a moral crusade against communism; still they served as well as they could.

Now they are home and what do they find? Employers, apparently accepting the myth that every G.I. in Vietnam used drugs, ask the veteran, "Are you an addict?". Their family and friends avoid discussing the subject of Vietnam entirely. Their President proclaims great concern for their plight, then vetoes, impounds, or opposes Congressionally approved benefits. The Veterans Administration loses their benefit checks.
V.A. hospitals are unable to provide necessary medical and psychological care. Unemployment remains a special plague, as a stagnant economy provides no place for the veteran without an education. G.I. education benefits are inadequate to permit the veteran—particularly if he is poor or married—to get the education he needs to find a job. And finally, Congressmen and Senators who never hesitated to vote money for bullets and bombs, spend months bickering over how much money we can afford to help the veteran find his way back to a useful and healthy role in our society.

It is no wonder that the veterans shout and curse. It is also not surprising that many of them no longer feel attached to this country as their home. They have not forsaken us; they feel that we have forsaken them.

I want to add my voice to their shouts and curses. The Vietnam war cannot be over for us until we redeem our commitment to the men who accepted the risks of war. This unfinished business tops the agenda for public action.

The first priority is to bring veterans' benefits up to the level of those received by the veterans of World War II and Korea. Due to the rate of inflation and increases in tuition and other educationally related expenses, a single Vietnam veteran receives more than $1,800 per year less, in inflation-adjusted dollars, in educational benefits compared to the World War II veteran. I have authored legislation that will end this discrimination. The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported out a new G.I. bill which includes the bulk of my recommendations. After the Senate approves this legislation—which I am confident it will—the House and the President must act.

Opposition from both is anticipated. I do not believe that that opposition is justified. I hope that you will agree with me and will let the President and the Congress know your feelings.

The next priority is to find a suitable replacement for Donald Johnson, director for the Veterans Administration, who has announced his intended retirement in the face of a barrage of criticism. The V.A. is undeniably suffering from both a vacuum of leadership at the top and inadequate staffing in many local level offices and V.A. hospitals. The Nixon Administration, in placing 13 former employees of the Committee to Re-elect the President in major positions in the V.A., has politicized an agency that must serve all veterans, irrespective of politics.

The V.A. needs a shake-up of major proportions. I think that there is a man who can shake up and shape up the V.A., so that, once again, it will serve the needs of the veteran and not the dictates of the White House. That man is well known in Hawaii as a friend of the serviceman. He is retiring Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Elmo Zumwalt.
Finally, every American—no matter how he or she feels about our involvement in Vietnam—should search his or her soul and conscience to come to grips with our own feelings and responsibilities toward the young veterans who served us all. Vietnam was the war that nobody wanted, nobody won, and everybody wants to forget.

I owe much to this great country of ours. I would serve again if the need arose. But I would hope that my military service would neither be forgotten nor held against me.

When we meet a Vietnam veteran, he does not want to be treated differently. Too often, he is treated as some kind of curiosity—a possible drug addict, potentially violent, probably disturbed. The veteran wants to be treated like every other American veteran who went to war before him; that is, as a citizen who accepted his responsibility, not because he was different, but because it seemed the right thing to do. Let us give him the respect that he is due, and let us display our gratitude for the sacrifices that he made.

Of course "war is hell," and it seems that the Vietnam war was somewhat more hellish for those who fought without the traditional homefront support of previous wars.

Peace has become hell for hundreds of thousands of Vietnam veterans. We can change that if we will only pledge not to forget those brave men and to commit ourselves to welcoming them into our places of work, our homes, and our society, as full-fledged Americans with a special claim on our love and gratitude.
OIL

OIL IS THE SUBJECT OF WORLD-WIDE CONCERN. WE ALL KNOW WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE PRICE OF GASOLINE AND THE PROFITS OF OIL COMPANIES IN THIS COUNTRY.

BUT THIS IS JUST THE MOST OBVIOUS PART OF THE PROBLEM. THE STAGGERING AMOUNT OF MONEY BEING TRANSFERRED TO THE TREASURIES OF THE PERSIAN GULF OIL PRODUCERS IS CREATING A POTENTIALLY ENORMOUS ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL THREAT THAT IS NOT NOW GENERALLY RECOGNIZED.
THIS YEAR THE OIL EXPORTING COUNTRIES WILL RECEIVE $105 BILLION IN TOTAL OIL INCOME, OR $80 BILLION MORE THAN LAST YEAR. MORE THAN HALF OF THIS MONEY WILL GO TO SPARSELY-POPULATED SAUDI ARABIA, A SEMI-FEUDAL NATION WHICH ABOLISHED SLAVERY ONLY IN 1962.
OF THIS TOTAL, THE OIL STATES WILL HAVE $60 BILLION OVER AND ABOVE WHAT THEY WILL BE ABLE TO ABSORB INTERNALLY, EVEN WITH MASSIVE EXPENDITURES ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAMS AND ULTRA-MODERN WEAPONRY. BY 1980, IT IS ESTIMATED THAT THIS LIQUID SURPLUS CAPITAL WILL SWELL TO AT LEAST $400 BILLION, LEAVING THE OIL PRODUCING STATES HOLDING APPROXIMATELY 70 PERCENT OF THE WORLD'S TOTAL MONETARY RESERVES JUST SIX YEARS FROM NOW.
To provide some sense of scale, it is worth noting that world reserves as of March, 1974 came to $186 billion of which the U.S. share was $14.6 billion, or 7.84 percent. In 1949, at the height of American post-World War II economic predominance, we held 56.5 percent of world reserves.
EVEN MORE STARTLING IS THE FACT THAT, AS JOSEPH ALSOP HAS POINTED OUT:

"THE OIL PRODUCING COUNTRIES WILL HAVE TO FIND WAYS TO PLACE AN AMOUNT OF MONEY, IN JUST ONE YEAR, EQUIVALENT TO ABOUT TWO-THIRDS OF THE TOTAL VALUE OF ALL THE OVERSEAS INVESTMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE LAST THREE-QUARTERS OF A CENTURY."
TO ILLUSTRATE GRAPHICALLY
JUST WHAT $60 BILLION COULD
BUY AT TODAY'S STOCK MARKET
PRICES, THE TABLE BELOW SHOWS
THE COST OF ACQUIRING A
CONTROLLING INTEREST 51
PERCENT OF VOTING STOCK IN
ELEVEN MAJOR U.S. CORPORATIONS:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.T.&amp;T.</td>
<td>13,046,980,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>192,782,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Chemical</td>
<td>3,164,314,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Dynamics</td>
<td>128,755,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Motors</td>
<td>7,205,900,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.M.</td>
<td>15,953,274,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.T.T.</td>
<td>946,199,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed</td>
<td>26,068,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Airlines</td>
<td>275,425,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Steel</td>
<td>1,184,464,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox</td>
<td>4,704,334,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46,828,500,125.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM THESE FIGURES, IT IS OBVIOUS THAT NOT ONLY WILL THE PERSIAN GULF OIL STATES SOON BE IN A POSITION TO EXERT DECISIVE CONTROL OVER THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM AND FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AROUND THE WORLD, BUT THEY MAY ALSO (SHOULD THEY CHOOSE TO DO SO AND SHOULD WE ALLOW IT) DEVELOP MASSIVE ECONOMIC LEVERAGE INSIDE OUR OWN ECONOMY.
DAVID ROCKEFELLER, head of Chase Manhattan Bank, has warned that this gigantic flow of money, in and of itself, could lead to "economic and political chaos" marked by "disruptive domestic unemployment and depression."
ANOTHER RAMIFICATION BECAME EVIDENT RECENTLY. NEWS REPORTS QUOTED THE SHAH OF IRAN AS SAYING HE PLANS TO DEVELOP NUCLEAR WEAPONS, PRESUMABLY WITH THE HELP OF TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT PURCHASED FROM FRANCE, A NATION WHICH DID NOT SIGN THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY. THE IRANIAN DECISION BRINGS TO MIND THE UNSTABLE POLITICS OF THIS AREA.
THE VAST WEALTH AND ECONOMIC POWER OF THE REGION IS HELD BY GOVERNMENTS WHICH ARE, IN THE MAIN, POLITICALLY AND MILITARILY WEAK.
CLEARLY, THE AREA IS A TEMPTING TARGET FOR ALL MANNER OF INTERESTS, FROM STATES WISHING TO EXPAND THEIR INFLUENCE TO POLITICAL GROUPINGS OF THE MOST VARIED PERSUASIONS. AND A POLITICAL UPHEAVAL IN A MAJOR OIL-PRODUCING NATION COULD RESULT OVERNIGHT IN A GREAT POWER CONFRONTATION -- A POSSIBILITY WHICH MAKES THE SITUATION EVEN MORE DANGEROUS.
AT THIS POINT, IT IS CLEAR THAT THE OIL-PRODUCING NATIONS ARE INCREASING THEIR DIRECT INVESTMENT IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, BUT THEIR LONG-RUN INTENTIONS ARE NOT AS YET CLEAR. THE KUWAIT INVESTMENT COMPANY, FOR EXAMPLE, HAS REAL ESTATE INTERESTS IN NASHVILLE, ST. LOUIS AND SOUTH CAROLINA. IRAN IS AN INVESTOR IN NEW YORK CITY REAL ESTATE AND HAS INTERESTS IN BLUE CHIP STOCKS. IRAN HAS ALSO
TAKEN THE LEAD IN
"DOWNSTREAM" INVESTMENTS
IN THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY--
ACQUIRING CONTROL OVER
PETROCHEMICALS AND
DISTRIBUTION AS WELL AS
PRODUCTION. AND, SAUDI
ARABIA SEEMS TO BE MOVING
IN A SIMILAR DIRECTION.
THESE ARE NOT PARTICULARLY
OBJECTIONABLE MOVES, BUT
THEY COULD BE THE OPENING
WEDGE FOR A MORE THREATENING
SERIES OF ACQUISITIONS IN
THE FUTURE.
NO ONE KNOWS ALL THE
IMPLICATIONS OF THIS
ENORMOUS TRANSFER OF WEALTH
TO THE PERSIAN GULF OIL
STATES. BUT WE SHOULD BE
AWARE THAT IT IS HAPPENING,
AND WE SHOULD BE PREPARED
TO DEAL WITH THE CONSEQUENCES.
THE ECONOMY

AS WE ALL KNOW, THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE PROMISED THERE WILL BE "NO RECESSION" THIS YEAR. YET, ECONOMIC FORECASTS FROM A WIDE VARIETY OF SOURCES ARE UNIFORMLY BLEAK.
NOTED ECONOMISTS AGREE THAT OUR ECONOMY IS IN SERIOUS TROUBLE. WALTER HELLER RECENTLY WROTE IN THE WASHINGTON POST THAT WE ARE SLIDING TOWARD A RECESSION. ARTHUR OKUN HAS PREDICTED THAT HISTORY WILL RECORD 1974 AS THE SIXTH POST-WORLD WAR II RECESSION. THE PRESIDENT'S OWN COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS CONCEDES THAT ITS EARLIER PREDICTIONS FOR THE YEAR WERE TOO OPTIMISTIC.
THE SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR MAY BE BETTER THAN THE FIRST HALF. BUT THE ECONOMIC CONSENSUS IS THAT WHEN 1974'S TOTALS ARE IN, WE WILL HAVE SUFFERED DAMAGING LOSSES.

IN MORE HUMAN TERMS, OUR ECONOMIC SITUATION IS EVEN MORE DEPRESSING:

--- IN 1969, 2.7 MILLION PEOPLE WERE OUT OF WORK, REPRESENTING 3.3 PERCENT OF THE LABOR FORCE;
---LAST MONTH 4.7 MILLION WERE UNEMPLOYED, EQUAL TO 5.2 PERCENT OF THE LABOR FORCE;
--- BY THE END OF THE YEAR UNEMPLOYMENT IS EXPECTED TO REACH 6 PERCENT AND PROJECTIONS CALL FOR CONTINUED HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT NEXT YEAR.
NO EASY SOLUTION AT HAND

THE AGONY OF THE SITUATION IS THAT NO ONE IS CERTAIN WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT. THE CONVENTIONAL ECONOMIC WISDOM IS BEWILDERED. THERE IS A BURGEONING REALIZATION THAT A CREATIVE, NEW APPROACH TO ECONOMIC POLICY MAKING MAY BE NECESSARY.
THE PRESIDENT OF BANK OF AMERICA, MR. A. W. CLAUSEN, SUGGESTED IN A RECENT ARTICLE THAT ECONOMISTS REALLY CANNOT UNDERSTAND MUCH OF WHAT GOES ON TODAY. AS HE PUTS IT,

"THE ECONOMY IS DIFFERENT FROM WHAT WE UNDERSTOOD IT TO BE IN THE MID-30'S OR AT THE START OF THIS CENTURY. WE HAVE REACHED A POINT IN POLICY MAKING WHERE PURE ECONOMICS
AND PURPOSE POLITICAL
SCIENCE DON'T QUITE
MESH."

FOR THIS REASON HE SUG-
GESTED THE CREATION OF A
NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSION
TO SEEK A WAY OUT OF THE
CURRENT ECONOMIC DILEMMA.

MANY YEARS AGO THE
NATIONAL MONETARY COMMISSION, CREATED IN THE WAKE OF THE
FINANCIAL PANIC OF 1907,
GAVE BIRTH TO THE FEDERAL
RESERVE SYSTEM THAT HAS SERVED
THIS COUNTRY WELL FOR SO LONG.
NOW MAY BE THE TIME FOR A SIMILAR SEARCHING RE-EXAMINATION OF OUR METHODS OF ECONOMIC POLICY MAKING. PERHAPS THAT SUGGESTION SHOULD BE GIVEN SERIOUS CONSIDERATION. IF NOT THAT, THEN WE NEED TO EXPLORE OTHER STEPS TO PROVIDE OUR COUNTRY WITH A Viable ECONOMIC POLICY.
THE GROWING FOOD CRISIS IS DISTORTING OUR ECONOMY AND, INDEED, THAT OF THE ENTIRE WORLD.

ALREADY, FAMINE EXISTS IN THE SAHEL REGION OF AFRICA (A BELT EXTENDING ACROSS THE CONTINENT BELOW THE SPREADING SAHARA DESERT, INCLUDING SUCH COUNTRIES AS NIGER, CHAD, MAURITANIA, MALI AND ETHIOPIA). A POOR WHEAT HARVEST THREATENS DISASTER IN SOUTH ASIA.
AT THE SAME TIME, COMMODITY RESERVES, OUR OWN INCLUDED, ARE NEARLY EXHAUSTED AFTER FIVE SUCCESSIVE YEARS IN WHICH WORLD FOOD CONSUMPTION HAS EXCEEDED PRODUCTION.

AS AMBASSADOR MARTIN, SECRETARY OF STATE KISSINGER'S DELEGATE TO THE UPCOMING WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE SAID AT LAST WEEK'S SENATE HEARINGS ON NATIONAL NUTRITION POLICY:
"The margin of safety in the race against world famine grows narrower day by day as U. S. stock-piles of grain are exhausted. The world food reserve is now measured in weeks rather than months."

The stark fact about world food supplies is that a single crop failure in even one major food producing area could require the wealthy countries to accept food rationing to avert mass starvation in the poorer countries.
AND HUMANITARIAN CONSIDERATIONS ASIDE, THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS COULD HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT IMPACT ON OUR NATIONAL SECURITY. FOOD SHORTAGES COULD BRING DOWN FRIENDLY GOVERNMENTS AROUND THE WORLD, AND THE POSSIBILITY THAT NUCLEAR ARMED NATIONS, SUCH AS INDIA AND CHINA, MAY BE UNABLE TO FEED THEIR OWN PEOPLE IS FRIGHTENING.
HERE AT HOME THE AMERICAN FAMILY SUFFERED A 22 PERCENT INCREASE IN FOOD PRICES LAST YEAR. EVEN THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION CONCEDES FOOD PRICES WILL RISE AT LEAST ANOTHER 15 PERCENT THIS YEAR. THE PRICE SPIRAL AFFLICTS ALL AMERICANS. EVEN THE WELL-TO-DO ARE BEING FORCED TO TIGHTEN THEIR BELTS. THE POOR AND THE ELDERLY ARE HURT THE WORST, OF COURSE.
FOR THOSE FAMILIES, 
ACCORDING TO TESTIMONY 
BEFORE THE SENATE LAST 
WEEK, ESCALATING PRICES 
REQUIRED SOME FAMILY MENUS 
TO INCLUDE DOG FOOD. 
SHOPLIFTING HAS INCREASED 
DRASTICALLY IN THE FOOD 
STORES, POACHING IS UP IN 
THE NATIONAL FORESTS AND 
ZOO ANIMALS HAVE EVEN 
BEEN SLAUGHTERED FOR MEAT.
FOR THOSE WHO ARE NOT DESTITUTE, -- MOST AMERICANS -- THE DRAIN ON THE POCKETBOOK IS SEVERE.

A FAMILY OF FOUR EARNING $10,000 A YEAR THAT PAID 25 PERCENT OF ITS INCOME FOR FOOD IN 1972 MAY BE FORCED TO PAY 40 PERCENT BY THE END OF 1974.
This means these families have less to lay out for non-food purchases, thus lowering their overall living standard and simultaneously sapping consumer demand for other goods and services. All too obviously, this could lead to economic contraction, with a consequent loss of jobs and income throughout the economy.
In my judgement, conditional amnesty for American draft evaders and deserters is the only reasonable solution to this critical problem. The granting of conditional amnesty would effect a balance between two extremes. Some have proposed that no form of amnesty should be granted to Vietnam war resisters, while others have suggested that all offenders be granted amnesty on an unconditional absolute basis. I think the compromise of conditional amnesty could bridge the gap between these two positions and thereby create a national climate where the strong emotions and tensions which now prevail could be reduced. In my view, conditional amnesty should be predicated on the principle of good faith. Those who have conscientiously and in good faith opposed the Vietnam conflict should be given the option of performing some type of alternative national service.

Some draft evaders might be offered the opportunity to redeem themselves by performing alternative service with civic and/or volunteer associations, or with government organizations. These persons, for example, might be given the opportunity to work with the underprivileged and impoverished in an American ghetto, while others might be more useful in ministering to the needs of patients in a health facility. Other persons might not be allowed such opportunities because the circumstances in their individual cases may not warrant alternative service. A few draft evaders may wish to enter the military as a result of reappraising their personal situations. However, I am not suggesting here that the military services graciously accept into their ranks those whom they do not want or those who have demonstrated an unwillingness to accept the restrictions and discipline necessary for the proper and orderly functioning of a military society. Some military deserters might be allowed to return to their units without being marked for life by the stigma of a court-martial or dishonorable discharge. Others might not be allowed this opportunity because, similar to some charged with draft evasion, the circumstances in their cases may not warrant a return to duty. Such persons might be allowed to return to civilian life and also be given the opportunity to perform national service.

The key in resolving each individual case would lie in a determination of the motives associated with each. Is it fair to declare that all of those currently charged with draft evasion are cowards? Or, it is fair to believe that all of those persons currently charged with military desertion possessed treasonous motives? Could it not be that some of those charged with draft evasion rejected the military and refused to serve because of honest and sincere convictions that the Vietnam War was patently wrong and immoral? In the same manner, did not some of those charged with desertion do so because of what they deemed to be valid political reasons for turning their back on their services?
Of the unknown thousands charged with draft evasion who are scattered in various parts of the world, many may have sincerely felt that they possessed valid moral or political reasons for rejecting the military and thus the conflict. Others may have avoided the draft, and consequently the conflict, out of a deep fear of the unknown. And still others may have been unwilling to enter the military because they did not wish to engage in combat per se, but did not question the political/ideological reasons for the war. Further, some of those charged with military desertion may have fled their units because of unresolved personal problems, disassociated from ideology, but conflicts, nevertheless, that may have appeared insurmountable at the time. To such individuals, escape from their existing environment may have seemed to be the best solution at the moment. Such persons could have been burdened with real or imaginary family, financial or other problems, unrelated to the rights or wrongs of American combat involvement in a distant land. Others, though, may have deserted for purely political reasons similar in vein to some of those charged with draft evasion. While I realize that many of these singular motives are speculative, what I wish to make unmistakably clear is that each draft evader or deserter is an individual and may have possessed a motive for his conduct somewhat different from all the others.

In many cases during the Vietnam conflict, draft resistance represented a form of civil disobedience. It followed the pattern of civil disobedience by civil rights groups in the 1960's. These groups and individuals by their courage and foresight actually helped to bring greater equality and fair treatment to America's black minority. Civil disobedience has an honorable history. We praise it in others as we did recently in the case of the brilliant Russian writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

The principles of personal responsibility and individual conscience have been widely discussed and accepted--especially since the Nuremberg principles established following World War II. It was during these trials that American judges and lawyers held many former enemies guilty of carrying out inexcusable orders holding they should have refused and followed their conscience. Every American military man is schooled and reschooled in these principles.
JUST LAST WEEK, DR. JEAN MAYER, THE COORDINATOR OF THE SENATE'S NUTRITION POLICY CONFERENCE, SUMMED UP THE OMINOUS PROSPECTS:

"...AS THE PROBLEMS OF THE WORLD COMMUNITY BECOMES INCREASINGLY CRUCIAL TO OUR OWN HEALTH AS A NATION, THE NEED FOR RESPONSIBLE FOOD AND NUTRITION POLICIES CAN ONLY GROW IN URGENCY IN THE MONTHS AND YEARS AHEAD."
Yet, the administration has not even begun to respond seriously to the growing crisis. Secretary of Agriculture, Butz, has taken a rather cavalier attitude toward starvation abroad and malnourishment at home. The secretary seems mainly concerned with the balance of payments benefits we derive from our agricultural exports.
AN IMPORTANT CONCERN, TO BE SURE, BUT IT FAILS TO COME TO GRIPS WITH THE BASIC REALITY: THAT FOOD IS NOT JUST A COMMODITY -- THAT IT IS ESSENTIAL TO LIFE ITSELF.

AS THE LAST AND PERHAPS THE ONLY HOPE OF MANKIND IN THE AREA OF FOOD PRODUCTION AREA, WE HAVE A HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND TO THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD TO DEVELOP A RATIONAL FOOD POLICY.
THIS POLICY MUST INSURE FAIR PRICES TO THE FARMER AND ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT REASONABLE PRICES TO THE CONSUMER IN AMERICA. IT MUST TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE NEEDS OF OUR FRIENDS AND ALLIES, AND IT MUST PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE RESERVE TO CUSHION AGAINST WORLD CATASTROPHE.

NOTHING LESS WILL FULFILL AMERICA’S OBLIGATION TO ITSELF AND THE WORLD.
FOR RELEASE Speech by Senator Daniel K. Inouye
September 15, 1973 at 3:30 PM, Hawaii State
Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, 5th Biennial
Convention, Honolulu, Hawaii
IN DEFENSE OF CONGRESS

As a member of the United States Senate, I welcome the President's newly expressed sense of concern for our nation's problems. In his press conference last week, in his radio speech last Sunday and in his 2nd State of the Union message to the Congress on Monday of this week, the President not only expressed his concern but also recognized the many problems confronting the American people. I share that view and his sense of urgency.

I regret, however, the President's initial effort to place the blame for the many unmet problems on the back of the Congress and to suggest that we are "wallowing in Watergate" rather than getting on with "the people's business". The facts do not support that contention.

This first eight months of the 93rd Congress have been exceedingly busy ones. As of the end of July some 106 bills and proclamations had been signed into law. The Senate had passed 412 bills, the House 410. We had been in session more hours, had more roll call votes, introduced more legislation and held more hours of hearings--excluding Watergate--than we did during a similar period in the 92nd Congress or in most other Congresses in recent history.

As the respected and non-partisan Congressional Quarterly wrote recently, "In terms of sheer volume of work including committee reports, roll call votes and number of important bills enacted or approved by either or both houses the legislative record thus far was at least on a par with most past first session Congresses, and it was ahead of many."

For the record, it should be noted that out of the 535 members of Congress, only 7 are serving on the Watergate Committee. It should be further noted that these seven Watergate Committee members, although required to spend long hours in public hearings, have continued to carry out their usual Senate responsibilities. For example, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have completed my hearings and am now ready to report my bill to the full Senate. As Chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Foreign Commerce, I have held many hours of hearings on several trade bills. These bills are now ready for action. In addition, we
have kept up to date with our constituency requests and problems. Watergate has meant a longer work day for members—hearings during our lunch hours, early morning or in the evenings. We have not been "wallowing in Watergate", and we have not wasted "precious time".

A look at the Record makes it evident that it is not the Congress which has been immobilized by Watergate. Neither was it the Congress which created Watergate, nor have we had any surplus of cooperation from the White House in our effort to get to the bottom of that matter and to "put Watergate behind us".

Please remember that we did not invent or manufacture the burglary of Dr. Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office or the New York indictments in the Vesco case, or the California indictments in the Dr. Fielding burglary case, or the Florida indictment of Donald Segretti, or the testimony of John Dean, Jeb Magruder, John Mitchell, Bob Haldeman, or John Ehrlichman.

It appears that President Nixon is attempting to find a scapegoat to "run against the Congress" as a means of diverting the public attention from the failures of his Administration, both Watergate and non-Watergate related.

To listen to the President, our problems are someone else's fault. The Nixon Administration is not responsible for inflation; the Nixon Administration is not responsible for permitting the fuel crisis to reach such proportions; the Nixon Administration is not responsible for the food shortage.

Well, I want you to know that Watergate is not responsible for inflation of unprecedented proportions in modern times. Watergate has nothing to do with the threatened fuel shortage. Watergate is not responsible for the meat shortage or the highest interest rates in history.

Certainly, the Administration is also not responsible for all our problems. Some are clearly beyond administrative or legislative control. Others have proven most difficult to alleviate by any administration and any government.
The increased world demand for food and fiber has increased the price of the food on our table and the clothes on our backs. Severe droughts which have afflicted much of the world have had an effect in the American market place. The Soviet wheat deal and other actions of commission or omission have, however, seriously aggravated the harmful effect of these uncontrollable forces for the average American. We can only shake our heads at the lack of business wisdom displayed by the President's business experts on that deal.

But what of our Record in Congress? What have we done in this Congress that is important to the American people? I would like to report to you briefly.

The Senate has passed a spending ceiling. While the Administration has castigated us for adding fuel to the fires of inflation we have made net reductions in spending from the Administration's budgetary requests each year of these first four years of the Nixon presidency. Those cuts amounted to a grant total of $20 billion. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am confident that we will cut his request again this year. My Subcommittee--the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations--received requests for $4.3 billion from the Administration, and I pledge that figure will be slashed by more than one-fourth in the Senate.

The Senate has provided for reductions in defense spending. I am confident that we can make such reductions without weakening America's defenses.

The Senate has passed an Alaska Pipeline bill and that is now in conference. We have passed an important Mandatory Petroleum Allocation bill. The President has refused to give his support to Senator Jackson's Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Programs Act of which I am also a sponsor. He has had no coherent energy policy to date and we are now facing a winter of anticipated very real fuel shortages. These will severely injure the people of most of our fifty states if the coming winter includes any period of more than normal severity. Last winter we were most fortunate to experience a very mild winter, but we have no guarantee from the weatherman of an encore.
We have passed a new Farm Act which recognizes that we have moved from two decades of farm surpluses to a period of food shortages. While it won't recover the wheat we sold to the Soviet Union at $1.32 per bushel return to the American farmer, it will encourage increased production to bring down the price of wheat which is now selling at over $5.00 per bushel.

We have passed a new Highway and Mass Transit Act which recognizes for the first time that highway users have an interest in adequate and efficient mass transit as we seek to avoid turning our cities and countryside into almost solid ribbons of concrete.

We have passed a Land Use bill in the hope that the rest of our nation will follow Hawaii's lead and recognize the need for long-range planning for the wise use of our vital and limited land resources.

We have passed a Health bill to encourage the establishment of Health Maintenance Organizations, a field in which Hawaii has been such an outstanding leader.

We have passed and had signed into law the Law Enforcement Assistance Act in our continuing fight on crime which still exacts far too great a toll in dollars and in human tragedy.

We have passed a Campaign Finance Act and a Voter Registration Act in the Senate with strong help from Labor, and I might say without much help from the Administration. Despite its unprecedented problems in this area the Administration has shown itself unwilling to go beyond recommending another Commission as its gesture to the public demand that we reform our political processes.

We have passed a Cambodia Bombing Cutoff and a War Powers measure. The latter is now in conference as we seek to assure that a President will not again get our country involved in wars which lack a clear mandate of support from the American people through their elected representatives.
We have passed an increase in Social Security benefits that our elderly, who are victimized more than any other group by the ravages of inflation, may live with some dignity after almost a lifetime of work.

We have passed a minimum wage law which the President unfortunately vetoed as his grand gesture in the fight to halt inflation. That act and the postponement of the pending salary increase for government employees for several months seems to be the main-spring of the Administration's anti-inflation drive.

While he worries about the effects of a Minimum Wage bill, a measure which would increase the nation's wage bill by less than 1/2 of one percent, the total profits of manufacturing industries are up 32 percent in the first six months of this year over last year's.

While President Nixon refused to implement a mandatory petroleum allocation program, the profits of Exxon are up more than 48 percent over last year's for the third highest net income of any U.S. corporation. Oil profits are up 38 percent for the industry as a whole.

While interest rates have skyrocketed and money for home mortgages have become unobtainable, the profits of Weyerhauser Lumber Company are running more than 17 percent on sales and net income of that corporation is up more than 170 percent over the previous year's profits.

IBM's profits are running at 13.9 percent of sales, AT&T's at 12.6 percent of sales. It is apparent that not all are being asked to join in the fight to halt inflation.

You who have seen the price of eggs and potatoes in Hawaii increase by more than fifty percent in the past year and the price of bacon increase by 70 percent without any substantial increase in take-home pay have reason to be angry. With flour at more than 20 cents per pound and pork chops at $2 per pound it is no wonder that inflation is the people's number one concern.
It is no wonder that you are restive.

It is no wonder that you are looking for someone to blame for your steadily shrinking real income.

And I can't blame you too much if you feel that your government has failed in its responsibilities. I can't blame you too much if you think something is rotten in Washington.

We in the Congress stand ready to work with the President--as equal partners--not rubber stamps. But, we should not be asked to shoulder the blame for those excesses of his Administration which have cost us so dearly--in our pocketbooks, in our faith in the institutions of our government, or in our confidence in the system by which we choose those who have the ultimate responsibility for the destiny of our great nation.
When my father was a young man at the turn of the century, the opportunities presented to him were limited. If he worked well in the cane fields, he could look forward to being promoted to section leader or supervisor.

My father was aware of this and wanted something better than being section leader or supervisor.

He thus convinced his parents of his desire for schooling and began his education at an age when most of us would have finished our eighth grade. His ambition was simple: with his newly acquired education, he could serve in the prestigious position of store clerk.

And at the time of his retirement, he served as manager of an important department within one of our major companies. Today, our State of Hawaii has as major sources of income, the vast tourist, pineapple, and sugar industries. These account for some 27.5 per cent of gross State income. There are other budding industries -- primarily in the service areas -- to service tourism. Additional ancillary industries, such as those geared to the manufacturing of Hawaiian attire, depend in large part on the tourism market. And there is the usual amount of business-type activity, such as corporate and banking enterprises.

It wasn't too long ago that many young people were content to look for gainful employment in the fields of our State, cutting cane or picking pineapple, or in local hotels, waiting on tables or entertaining tourists.

I do not wish to suggest that these are unimportant in the Hawaiian Islands. All jobs are important. All work effort is important. They are necessary to keep society moving. However, with the expansion of educational opportunities, with the opening of new career vistas, with the enticement
of science and commerce, we cannot be content with yesterday's usual job openings.

We must commence executive training in order to assure our graduates of fine job opportunities in local industries. Some will always be attracted to new opportunities abroad, and for many years, we have sadly noted the out-migration of some of our brightest young people. But, these new graduates represent our most important resource. It is one that we should seek to conserve.

Too often, our best and brightest have been attracted by the opportunities of the great research centers of our land. There they engage in scientific endeavors including research into the deepest recesses of the ocean floor or at the limits of outer space.

Attracted by the opportunities provided by international finance and commerce, we also have sadly observed that most have remained away. Few have returned to our Islands.

In order to reverse this trend, it is essential that Hawaii provide attractive opportunities to keep our brightest and most promising at home. We must address ourselves to the key question: how do we provide these attractions? How do we keep more of our able and adventuresome youth in Hawaii?

On the federal level, we have tried our best to attract to our State federal activities which take advantage of our unique location and topography. Hawaii is becoming an important scientific study center. Consider, for example, the observatory on Haleakala and the new joint U.S.-French-Canadian effort on Mauna Kea. On Kauai, the federal government has established a major undersea center involving anti-submarine warfare research. While such installations may not provide many jobs, they afford exciting opportunities to those inclined to explore this endeavor.

The foregoing are simply examples, but I hope that you have noticed one element of significance to all Neighbor Islanders: these federal centers have been established on various Neighbor Islands.
Just as we are saddened by the out-migration of young talent to the Mainland, those on the Neighbor Islands have been equally saddened by the out-flow of the young and ambitious to Honolulu. To the Neighbor Island high school graduate, Honolulu looms as the city of opportunities, bright lights, and promises.

But to the more discerning eye, this bustling center of Hawaii Nei is plagued by such by-products of growth and progress as overcrowding, crime, pollution, and bumper-to-bumper automobile traffic.

Permit me to cite some statistics:

In 1940, 258,000 persons of a total State population of 423,000 lived on Oahu--or 65 per cent.

In 1960, that had jumped to 500,000 persons among a total State population of 633,000 -- or 79 per cent.

And in 1972, an estimated 688,000 persons of a total population of 850,000 lived on Oahu -- that is 81 per cent.

I note that the population density on Oahu rose from 596 persons per square mile in 1950 to 1,144 persons per square mile in 1973. Oahu's density has almost doubled.

At the same time, the Neighbor Island population has declined -- a result of lack of opportunity that has led to further loss of potential for our young people.

I am certain that all of us view the out-migration of our youth with some alarm. I have cited several examples of what the federal government can do. On the other hand, there is much that the State government can do with relatively little effort.

I wish to discuss with you a proposal which while it has not been met with universal acclaim, ought to receive our most serious consideration.
At the outset, it is essential to note that Hawaii is one of the few States in the Union which has as its capital its most populous city, that is, Honolulu. California chose not to locate its capital in Los Angeles or San Francisco, but rather, Sacramento. New York selected Albany over New York City. And in Louisiana, Baton Rouge -- not New Orleans -- is the center of State government.

None of these States has a massive concentration of governmental offices in one city. But in our State of Hawaii, the major branches of government, executive, judicial and legislative, are all located in Honolulu.

There has been only one previous attempt to decentralize State governmental activity. This, of course, was the proposal to relocate Oahu Prison to Maui. In that particular case, the employees of the prison were unhappy about the move, while the people of Oahu were pleased. On the Valley Isle, reaction to the proposal was mixed, with many opposed to the move. While we all agree on the need for prisons, few wish to have them located in their backyards.

In looking at other State agencies, I see no apparently compelling reason to maintain them all on Oahu. Although Oahu is not our primary agricultural Island, the Department of Agriculture nonetheless is located there. The Agriculture Department could move its central branch office to either Maui or Hawaii while establishing sub-offices on the other Islands. A move of this sort would provide a shot in the arm for a Neighbor Island. It would attract persons of different interests and talents, and would provide new job opportunities -- administrative, scientific, and technical.

The Department of Labor could relocate its main office to another Island and maintain an important branch office in Honolulu. Perhaps the Department of Social Services and Housing could follow suit. Each major Island could serve as the site of an important State department or function -- agriculture on one, labor on another, social services and housing on another.

Commuting would present no great difficulty. The furthermost Island is less than an hour away by airplane -- a commuting distance perhaps even faster to travel than the drive from Wahiawa into downtown Honolulu during rush hour. By taking such admittedly drastic steps, the State would dramatically demonstrate its desire to bring about a better distribution of population. And through the process of decentralization, the State would act to provide viable employment opportunities for more of our citizens.

I might point out that not all federal activities are located in our nation's Capital. Social Security is located in Baltimore, the Federal Records Center
is in St. Louis, and so on. For too many years, we concentrated federal activities in Washington, D.C., but the trend has been reversed.

Those who argue against the feasibility of such a plan should also be reminded that similar arrangements have proved feasible in other States.

The movement of some governmental agencies would be accompanied by the movement of private enterprise to the Neighbor Islands, such as a law firm specializing in agricultural law which may find it beneficial to be located in the same area as the Department of Agriculture. In this way, major companies could be encouraged to establish main offices or important branch offices on Neighbor Islands.

Granted, such movement will not be sudden and may cost a considerable sum. But in the long term, such migration could produce savings. Decentralization may reduce the high costs of overcrowding while providing an improvement in the quality of life for all Islands.

The dictates of the job market place may compel you to eventually spend your life elsewhere, in San Francisco, Los Angeles, or Honolulu. Yet, I am certain that very many of you may prefer to spend your life on this beautiful Island. I, therefore, cannot overemphasize the underlying responsibility of State and County governments to come together to draft a sensible economic plan for the entire State of Hawaii—a plan that would include programs for dispersing over the State our population and our opportunity.

I propose that a study be conducted as soon as possible into the feasibility of relocating the Department of Agriculture to a Neighbor Island. I further suggest that this study consider the possibilities of relocating to Neighbor Islands other departments as well.

While we can guide government's location of activities, we cannot force businesses to move out of Honolulu to Maui, Hawaii, Kauai, Molokai, or Lanai. But we can provide to private enterprise certain incentives.

These include logistical support in terms of communication and transportation facilities. For example, the Island of Molokai is in the midst of a most distressing economic depression because of the decision by a pineapple company to cease operations on that Island. Transportation problems had much to do with the decision. A task force was created to study Molokai's job situation and suggestions have been made. However, if Molokai is to attract other new enterprises through which its citizens can reap unused agricultural resources, it must be able to provide logistical support, including expanded harbor facilities. I have been told that some wish to develop a refinery on Molokai, but that available power and logistical facilities are currently not sufficient to support it.
For many, the problems of population redistribution in Hawaii may seem almost insurmountable. However, if we are determined in our efforts toward reform, if we are sincere in our desire to make Hawaii a better place in which we and our children will live, then I believe that we will work together to solve this problem. We cannot be content to take a back seat and fail in our solemn duty to preserve what is beautiful and meaningful to our people of Hawaii.

I offer this population dispersal proposal for your consideration. It may alter what may already be a sequence of life experiences for you -- a sequence which may have been dictated by our failure to manage meaningful change.

With opportunities available to all of us here in Hawaii will come broadened career vistas for you far beyond those ever dreamed by our parents. May I wish you success in the years ahead.
"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated." So states the Fourth Amendment. As Judge Gerhard A. Gesell stated recently during the trial of those accused of violating the civil rights of Dr. Lewis Fielding, Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist, the Fourth Amendment's protection of the privacy of citizens "is not theoretical. It lies at the heart of our free society."

The Founding Fathers recognized the right of a homeowner to defend his house against unlawful entry by burglars or governmental agents. In the First Amendment, they recognized the sanctity of a person's individual thoughts and beliefs--for it is only by protecting this inner privacy that our freedoms of speech, religion, and assembly can be protected. The Third Amendment protects us against the quartering of troops in private homes. The Fifth Amendment guarantees that individuals accused of crimes retain the right to keep private, information that might place life and freedom in jeopardy.

The Courts have expanded individual privacy through the Ninth and the Fourteenth Amendments in the areas of family life, childrearing, marriage, procreation, contraception, abortion, etc. Since the first days as a free nation, we have recognized the right to privacy to be among the most basic of our civil liberties.

Yet, despite our historical commitment to the protection of individual privacy, never before have so many people felt less secure about the sanctity of their homes, offices, telephones, and their personal records. As technology has provided the means for private industry and government to accumulate huge quantities of personal information on individuals, and as technology has provided the electronic means to penetrate the private recesses of our residences and places of work, the threat to constitutionally-guaranteed rights has grown apace.
considered potentially dangerous to the President, and the Secret Service computer contains hundreds of thousands of others. The National Drive Register of the National Highway Safety Bureau contains 3.3 million names. And, of course, income tax, social security, and census data exists for almost every American.

Because we have continually asked the government to assume increased responsibility for our health, safety, and economic well-being, the need for information by government policymakers has grown. Most Americans have willingly supplied this information in the interest of informed policy-making.

Private industry, too, has increased its appetite and abilities to collect and store information about the health, credit, and employment records of individuals. We turn over this information to these private agencies in order to secure their health, credit, or employment services.

Yet, each time we give up a bit of information about ourselves, we give up a bit of our freedom. Growing public concern over the ability of government and industry to automate and to share their information files on individuals has increased as instances of abuse of information and invasion of privacy have come to light. This concern is now reflected in Congressional efforts to control the growth and use of personal information on file in government and business data banks.

The dangers inherent in national data bank systems are many. Information which may be stored and used may be inaccurate, incomplete, unjustified, or improperly disseminated. Individuals may be unaware of the information that exists concerning them.

Senator Sam Ervin, who has been compared with the Founding Fathers for his understanding of the Constitution, his concern for the rights of the people, and for his ageless wisdom, is at the forefront of efforts to preserve individual privacy. I have joined together with Senator Ervin and several other colleagues to try to stem the growth of these data bank systems, and to insure that, where they exist, proper safeguards be provided to insure that individuals have the right to find out exactly what information on them exists and the right to have corrected any erroneous data.

Also, we are studying procedures for the dissemination of such information to insure that individuals' rights are protected.
John Dean, James McCord, Donald Segretti, "Fat Jack" Gleason, Tony Ulasewicz, and John Caulfield gave credence to the past paranoia of politicians in Washington, D.C.

Perhaps because of these revelations, campaign rules about the use of volunteer workers have changed. There was a time when the doors were open to everyone, and we could assume that volunteers arrived at campaign headquarters to help—not to spy or sabotage. Watergate will make it less easy for well-intentioned persons to gain acceptance and to get involved in politics. That is a major loss to our political process.

During testimony by John Ehrlichman before the Senate Watergate Committee, he and Senator Talmadge debated the right to privacy. Senator Talmadge asked Ehrlichman whether he remembered discussion in law school of the famous English principle of law that "no matter how humble a man's cottage is, that even the King of England cannot enter without his consent." To that, Ehrlichman replied, "I am afraid that has been considerably eroded over the years." Unfortunately, Mr. Ehrlichman is right about the recent trends away from untrammeled rights to privacy.

The Supreme Court's recent record on protecting citizens against government snooping into private affairs is less than perfect. The most recent wiretapping decision voiding the John Mitchell approach to granting tap warrants shows a wise concern for tightened procedures in this important area. However, the court's refusal to strike down military surveillance of civilian political activities in the Laird v. Tatum case underscores the fact that the Burger Court may not be religious in its adherence to the Fourth Amendment.

The American Civil Liberties Union has done yeoman's work to defend the civil liberties of all Americans. Yet, all of our efforts will come to naught unless we can awaken the consciousness and concern of our citizens about the potential dangers to our cherished liberties.

To quote the great jurist, Learned Hand, "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. When it lies there, it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it."
The assault on privacy began in earnest soon after World War II ended; the early 1950's were an ugly period in American history. An ambitious demagogue was able to sow the seeds of suspicion and distrust throughout our government and society. Senator Joseph McCarthy, an ambitious lawyer without regard for the rules of evidence, a ruthless politician with no sense of decency, and a disturbed and disturbing man with no understanding of the damage he would cause to this country, rose to prominence and power by manipulating the fears of a nation. Those fears stemmed from our lack of experience as the most powerful country on earth: we were unsure in our power; we desired to avoid the pain of any further war; the force of Communism—an ideology alien to our comprehension—was not understood. Its spread across Asia and Eastern Europe threatened to envelope us again in global combat.

The McCarran Internal Security Act, which became law at the height of the anti-Communist scare period over the veto of President Truman, was managed on the floor of the Senate by Richard Nixon. Yet, among those who voted for it were Paul Douglas, Hubert Humphrey, and Warren Magnuson. The Act called for the registration of so-called subversive organizations with the attorney general and for the creation of potential concentration camps. On its face, it conflicted with the constitutional protections of the right to privacy and against self-incrimination, and in its application, it endangered the freedoms of speech, press, and assembly.

The fact that honorable men like Douglas, Humphrey, and Magnuson would support legislation that flew in the face of their civil libertarian traditions shows just how strong the anti-Communist tide flowed during those dark days.

The collection of government data on individuals has spread considerably since those first efforts at registering dissident groups. The central files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation include 70 million fingerprint cards representing 20 million people. Each day, 3,300 new cards are added. The Justice Department has one civil disturbance file with 22,000 names; a file in the organized crime section containing approximately 250,000 names; records on well over 450,000 persons in the FBI's National Crime Information Center; and more than 40 million names in the Immigration and Naturalization Service's master index. The Defense Department has in its industrial security files dossiers on 1.6 million persons. There are some 61,000 names in Secret Service files of persons
Perhaps the most disturbing of all aspects of government data collection is the use of surreptitious surveillance and intelligence operations to collect information on innocent citizens whose political views and activities are opposed to those of the Administration.

Anyone who has worked in Washington, D.C., over the past 10 years has seen daily evidence that many of our nation's elected leaders do not feel "secure" in their offices or homes. A sense of paranoia had begun to pervade our nation's capital even before the sordid revelations of Watergate were made public.

I have seen my Senate colleagues use pay phones rather than their office phones when making personal calls to avoid a possible wiretap. I have sat in on briefings in the United States Senate and watched while the briefing room was swept electronically before sensitive discussions could be conducted. I know that Senate aides often conduct political talks with each other while walking through corridors of the Senate office buildings rather than sitting in their offices because they fear that the opposition may have placed a listening device there. When an expected letter or parcel does not arrive on time, foul play instead of postal delay is often suspected. We are constantly on guard and constantly suspicious of all but those whom we know very well and those with whom we have worked for a long time.

In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in 1971, it was revealed that Army intelligence agents were using spies and electronic surveillance equipment to collect information on non-violent, pacifist organizations and religious groups whose memberships had committed no crimes. Detailed reports about the finances, sexual activities, personal beliefs, and associations of these people were compiled and filed. Even elected members of the Congress were subject to spying. These people were selected for surveillance because they used their constitutional rights to criticize governmental policies with which they disagreed.

The Senate Watergate Committee heard evidence about the wiretapping of press and political opponents, the burglarizing of a doctor's office, the interception of campaign documents, the placing of spies in campaign offices, the tailing of United States Senators by White House gumshoes, the secret investigations of politicians' private lives, and the use of confidential Internal Revenue Service data to harass political enemies.
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Recently the French Finance Minister, Valery Giscard D'Estaing, is quoted to have said, "there is nothing wrong with the present pattern of exchange rates. The only trouble is that the United States will not 'defend' the dollar..." Frankly, I find such remarks irritating. It would be more so were it not for the fact that ever since the inauguration of Charles de Gaulle the French have been trying to bearbait the U.S. on international financial matters.

This is not to say that the U.S. does not have to face up to and overcome large trade imbalances and currency adjustment problems, as do the other major currency nations of the world, including the French.

As the days go by it becomes increasingly apparent that the United States must begin to openly and realistically reappraise its position and role among the nations of the world. There have been some substantial changes that have occurred since the end of World War II, and it is only too clear that many, if not most, of these have not been realistically reflected in the ongoing application of U.S. financial, military and foreign aid policy.

The financial problems are the point of current activity by the concerned finance ministers, and it is up to the U.S. to do whatever is necessary to alleviate our part of the problem.

The position taken by Monsieur D'Estaing that we are solely responsible for this current world-wide dilemma is ridiculous; however, it well illustrates the widely held view in Western Europe and East Asia that whenever there is an international wrong to be righted, it is the United States' duty to come to the rescue at whatever cost to the American taxpayer. For years following World War II we actively sought to cast ourselves in this role. It is now clear that we succeeded only too well and our success is beginning to cost the American citizen dearly - far too dearly. It speaks well of our nation that the average American has agreed for so many years to shoulder more than his share of the costs for helping to revive the destroyed Western and Eastern economies. He did this willingly. He wanted to insure that both former allies and enemies would once again regain economic viability so as to allow future cooperation and international harmony.

Today, the U.S. is no longer the only world superpower. Today, we are just one among many and it no longer makes sense that we should carry such a disproportionate share of the costs of international institutions,
defense and development. The United States spends 8% of its Gross National Product on defense costs. But these monies do not go just to defend the U.S., they are also allocated to shore up the defense of more than fifty other nations. Many of these nations can and should carry a greater share of their own defense costs. Just to select a glaring example, Japan spent only .8% of her GNP in 1970 on national defense. Yet, the U.S. maintained 245 different military installations in Japan and Okinawa alone. Even after every American soldier is returned from Vietnam, there will still be close to one million U.S. military personnel abroad. Now, more than ever, the U.S. needs to reshape her military priorities. The same applies to our foreign assistance program.

The foreign assistance program as we know it today began 26 years ago. It was then considered to be a short term program. Since then it has grown in size and scope, until today, it is considered the permanent and key factor in U.S. relations with many of the nations of the world.

In 1947, the Executive Branch requested an interim appropriation from Congress in order to finance badly needed imports for Italy, France and Austria while the Marshall Plan was being readied. The next year, Congress authorized the Marshall Plan, which was the first major appropriation under the modern American Foreign Assistance program. This plan to assist our Western European Allies in reconstruction and rehabilitation was widely supported by Members of Congress for a variety of reasons. But it should be remembered that the Marshall Plan, as well as the Point Four program which followed in 1949, were very much products of the times. We should recall that Americans were still enjoying the euphoria of victory. Our economy was continuing to boom at the war time level, jobs were plentiful and the dollar was unassailably the strongest currency in the world. Additionally, we were convinced that the creeping spread of communism had to be stopped. What were needed were strong, temporary, support programs and it was America alone that could muster enough resources and fortitude to meet such challenges. As the supreme military and economic superpower, we found it easy to be magnanimous.

Today, times and conditions have drastically changed. I do not suppose that too many of us are enjoying the euphoria of "victory" in Vietnam. With a national debt of over $475 billion, with 4.7 million citizens unemployed and another two million of our own citizens underemployed, the strength of the American economy can no longer be taken for granted. In fact, there are at least 25.6 million Americans at or below the official
poverty level non-farm family income. Thus, at least 12.5% of our own population is under or malnourished. Even medium income families are having great difficulties purchasing needed food and housing. Internationally, the United States has run a trade deficit for almost three years and our dollar has undergone two devaluations within the last 15 months. Few Americans would characterize this period as one of economic boom and international monetary strength. America's role vis-a-vis the other nations in the world over the last 26 years has drastically altered.

Anti-communism was one of the strongest pillars of the modern foreign aid program. The fear of an expansionary, world monolithic, communism caused an economic and military solidarity among the Western allies that served to forge these nations into a single, unified block. This Western bloc had its worse fears realized following the Berlin Blockade and the North Korean invasion into the South early in the 1950's. The fight against Cold War Communism required still more commitment and resources, and a non-ending vigilence throughout the world. And the nations of the world soon came to expect the United States to take and keep the lead. They persist to seek shelter behind our shield even when their own economies and their own military forces recovered and have grown powerful once again.

The United States continues to be the only country to meet its full commitment under the NATO Treaty. If the threat of communism is as great as that suggested by our NATO allies, why aren't they putting up their shares? If the Russian threat is as serious as that suggested by our NATO allies, why are they signing long term trade agreements and establishing factories in Russia, while our trade with the Russians and her Eastern bloc is still severely restricted?

The Post-Vietnam era, I believe, is measurably different from the previous one. With the return of the American prisoners of war and the withdrawal of our fighting forces from Asian soil, it is time that Americans should analyze and respond to this new reality. With our President's grand journey to Peking and Moscow featuring the unbelievable pictures of Chou En Lai toasting our President and Mao Tse Tung smilingly, chatting with Dr. Kissinger, and now the forthcoming visit of Chairman Breshnev, is it unreasonable for our citizens to feel that the Cold War is beginning to thaw? I think not.

Given these developments, I believe you will begin to sense why for many citizens foreign aid is now more unpopular than welfare.
Since 1946, succeeding Administrations and Congresses have appropriated a grand total in excess of $180 billion. However, this grand sum does not include the following cost items:

1) Billions of dollars in debt service costs. It must be remembered that most of the monies appropriated for the foreign assistance programs had to be borrowed.

2) The cost of our military presence overseas, including the costs of building, maintaining and closing overseas bases and costs of shipping and maintaining military equipment to such bases.

During the fiscal year ending in June of 1973, 63 foreign nations will have received military assistance in some form from our country: MAP, Ship Loans, Military Sales (long term, low interest), etc. Much of this military assistance was received by "developing countries" -- countries with much poverty, low per capita income, minimal health services, etc.

For example, Brazil has received more foreign assistance from the United States than any other South American country. Her per capita income is low, her poverty level is high, her health services are minimal at best for the poor. But in 1956, Brazil purchased an aircraft carrier from the British at an approximate cost of $9 million. It cost them approximately $27 million to refurbish the carrier and I understand the annual cost of operation of the carrier is $7 to $10 million. Instead of trying to convince the Brazilians on the unwarranted luxury of this aircraft carrier, we maintain a military complement of 56 officers and enlisted personnel in Brazil, headed by three Generals and Flag Officers. During the period 1946 to 1971, we provided the Brazilians $4,171,000,000 in foreign assistance.

And I will not bore you with tales of graft and corruption -- payments for phantom troops, chateaus in the Riviera, secret bank accounts in Switzerland. The reports of corrupt recipients of American aid monies may not all be substantiated or justified, but I am certain that most Americans believe these reports in the press to be true, and many of them are.
In July of 1972, I was designated Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. My Subcommittee has jurisdiction over the United States Foreign Assistance Programs—military and economic. What is the Foreign Aid picture today?

- - $10 billion obligated but unexpended—in other words, in the pipeline.

- - $8 billion in accounts that are callable by international banks.

- - $1 billion in deposits on purchases made under the program, and;

- - $1 billion unobligated and unexpended in this fiscal year. The Administration has until June 30, 1973 to spend this sum.

As the new Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I do not intend to officiate over the demise of this Subcommittee. Nor should I, for there are many worthwhile and justifiable American foreign assistance programs. In most cases, these programs reach out to fill an acute need or to meet a recent disaster somewhere in the world. Many of these aid programs are far more productive per dollar of input and better managed than many of our federal domestic programs. Foreign aid is not bad. Programs and Agencies such as the United Nations, the Food for Peace Program, the World Health Organization and others have long ago proven their worth and impact. What must be faced today is basically a priority and a policy question. Other nations must now more fully meet their international responsibilities as has the United States in the past. In other words, American foreign aid must undergo major overhaul and surgery.

When I assumed the Chairmanship in 1971, I then stated that I would be applying but one criteria to the foreign aid bill. It is a very simple, but important test. Our conduct of foreign aid must be such that we can answer any question asked by any man on the street about the program.

At this time, it is not possible to give an honest answer to many of the subject matters covered in the foreign aid bill. It is also difficult to
answer questions regarding other forms of U.S. assistance which in the true sense of the meaning constitute foreign assistance, but does not appear in the bill. It should not be this way. I want to assure my colleagues in the Senate as well as the citizens of the U.S. that every effort will be made to present a bill this year by which all of us can explain our actions and rationale to our constituents.

A month ago, in response to the President’s call for austerity, I recommended to the Foreign Operations Subcommittee that we reduce the President’s foreign assistance program request of $4.3 billion for fiscal year 1974 by 28%. My colleagues in the Subcommittee unanimously concurred. Our citizens and taxpayers must be assured that hard earned dollars spent for foreign assistance projects will be spent as directed and will not fill the pockets of unscrupulous recipient officials.

For too long now have we allowed our foreign aid principles to be dictated by Cold War ideology. Any government that declared itself to be fighters for freedom against communism was generally given the keys to the kingdom -- a kingdom well supplied with American dollars and advisors. It seemed to matter little what form this government actually took, and often the label of anti-communist was pasted on a government just to hide an equally reprehensible form of totalitarianism. Instead of opening up the kingdom, the American aid keys permitted the opening up of a Pandora's Box. There are many examples of this, but one that comes to mind is the case of Fulgencio Batista in Cuba.

Given his policies of repression and heavy handedness, how can you defend Fulgencio Batista as a "defender of freedom?" It can reasonably be suggested that by our high level of support of the Batista regime, the United States greatly facilitated the creation of Fidel Castro.

It is now time for the blinders to come off and for us to objectively and rationally survey the conduct of the U.S. foreign aid program. To this end, I would like to propose the following guidelines and recommendations:

1) It is necessary that our aid program be more responsive to the pleas of the needy people of the world, and not the dictators. Our program should be responsive to the
human condition and must reach through the national bureaucracies and red tape to the grass roots level where it is needed and can help. It should directly address the development goals which pertain to the common man -- education, health, employment, dignity, etc. No longer should Congress allow our funds to be siphoned off to support phantom armies, chateaus on the Riviera and private jets.

2) To this end, a new foreign aid principle known as the "Bayanihan Concept" should become one of the building blocks of the U.S. aid program. This Filipino word "Bayanihan" means cooperation and self-help, and conveys the feeling of self-sacrifice in order to improve one's position. This is a fixed cost reimbursable concept whereby the actual transfer of aid funds would occur only after satisfactory completion of a project. It has been recently tried in the Philippines with great success and worked like this. After the devastating floods in Central Luzon last year, the U.S. agreed to help rebuild, among other things, 513 three-classroom public school buildings:

(a) Using this new concept, Philippine and U.S. advisors met before any work was begun and established project elements, timetables and standards as well as the fixed U.S. contribution to the cost of the project.

(b) The Philippines then began construction of the first several hundred schools according to the agreed upon plans.
(c) After a certain level of completion had been reached, the Philippine government requested the first aid reimbursement by the U.S. But as this reimbursement is contingent upon meeting certain minimum standards of construction, the U.S. first surveyed the construction sites and found that several hundred schools were not up to the pre-agreed standards. Therefore, the U.S. refused to reimburse the Philippine government for its cost thus far. The schools had to be rebuilt in order that they met the rigid typhoon resistant (to 140 mph) standards.

(d) When this was done, the U.S. then reimbursed the Philippine government for these schools and construction on the program continued to completion.

3) The U.S. should apply to the foreign aid program the same type of standards that are applied to programs involving federal aid to cities, counties and states. For example, if one of these local units misuses the federal grant funds, the federal government can take steps to terminate the aid and initiate criminal proceedings if such is warranted. While I do not suggest that we go so far as to attempt to bring criminal charges against recipients of foreign aid who misuse these funds, I do advocate immediate termination of programs where misuse is discovered and where the recipient government refuses to halt the corrupt activities. Corruption will no longer be tolerated and the onus is on the recipient country to squarely face and overcome this problem.

Foreign aid programs should be able to withstand the same type of cost-benefit analysis that other federal programs must pass. In this analysis, one unit of input must generate at least one unit of output, and if it doesn't, then it is not justified. In this vein, American willingness
to extend aid should be matched wherever possible by an equally large, if not larger, commitment by the local government. This matching aid can be either in money, manpower or material, and will insure that the recipient has a direct stake in the project. This should end the specter of an American dole.

4) Next, the true reasons for our programs should be made public so long as such disclosures do not hurt national security.

For example: U.S. economic assistance to Malta has been officially stated as aimed at helping her because she is an economically depressed country. The truth of the matter is that the U.S. is in Malta because the U.S. needs to have use of the Naval facilities there for NATO operations and Western European security. With the ever-growing Soviet Naval presence in the Mediterranean, it was feared that if the U.S. did not make use of the Malta base, the Russians were ready to make the necessary payments for a Malta base, thus threatening the delicate balance of power in the region. If you make the case on its own merits to the American taxpayer, I believe that he can more readily appreciate the problem and may agree with U.S. actions.

5) U.S. contribution to international financial institutions has been in the past unequally distributed, running from 20% to 50+% of total international contributions by all parties. But when it comes to the granting of contracts or buying supplies for projects granted to recipient countries by these international institutions, the U.S. is constantly coming out on the short end. I, of course, do not advocate that each dollar invested in the international banks should reap one dollar of business for the U.S., but to have these dollars almost totally disappear into the GNP of other developed nations is also not desirable. In the case of the Asian Development Bank, for example, where the U.S. provides close to 20% of the funds available to be loaned by the bank, most of the countries that receive ADB loans spend the money in Japan. This only further aggravates
the already bad U.S. balance of payments deficit vis-a-vis Japan. It is no longer necessary for the U.S. to subsidize the world markets in this way. Let Japan and Western Europe do more!

This is the 1970's, not the 1940's, and we should adjust our foreign aid program to meet the new realities of this decade. American citizens of all descriptions bear the cost of the aid program, and in providing these funds, they must forego some of their own domestic needs. These domestic needs are now greater than ever before. The United States can no longer afford to play Santa Claus to the increasing affluent world.
SPEECH BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE TO THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GAME, FISH AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS 64th ANNUAL CONVENTION, SHERATON WAIKIKI HOTEL, HONOLULU HAWAII

SEPTEMBER 12, 1974 10:00 A.M.

Today the state bird of Hawaii, the Nene Goose, is no longer on the endangered species list. This fortunate development was the result of the dedicated efforts of many concerned citizens such as yourselves, and to a special appropriations from the United States Congress which amounted to almost one thousand dollars per bird.

I still very vividly remember during a pause in our deliberations, chatting with one of my fellow Senators on the Appropriations Committee who put it to me quite bluntly: "What was so damn important about saving a goose?"

Why should the federal government spend one thousand dollars for a bird that none of his constituents would ever see nor hear? Why should we continue to dole out other precious funds to save the shark, the whale, or a pelican? What good are they really? Could we eat them? Did they provide jobs or shelter? Would anyone really miss them? It saddens me greatly to note that these questions are undoubtedly an accurate reflection of the sentiments of a great many Americans—including some of my colleagues.

As one who sits in the United States Senate, and as one who must pass judgment on these issues, I can assure you that these are the practical day-to-day questions we must face every year. And, to be perfectly frank with you, those of you in this audience who sincerely believe that we must continue our efforts to preserve such endangered species as the "Alala", the "Akepa" or the "Apapane"—unfortunately have not yet come forth with very convincing answer to these very fundamental questions. An unpleasant fact of life is that those funds, which were so necessary to the preservation of the Nene Goose were appropriated because they were important to Governor Burns and the Hawaii Congressional delegation and we were willing to bargain hard for them. In order to save the Nene Goose we had to be willing to support another project that was equally important to one of our colleagues, but which in a similar vein was of little interest to our constituents in Hawaii. This may not sound very nice, but I can assure you that is one of the realities in our political system.
And though the reality may strike many of us as being misguided, it is not a misguidedness afflicting only the legislator of the 1970's. In fact, we would do well to note exactly how singular is an appropriation like that involving the Nene Goose. Although our history seems to offer many instances in which altruistic men—moved by their awe of nature and concern for endangered species—acted to preserve their natural environment, the fact is that their motivations were almost never as pure as we would like to believe. In 1872, when Yellowstone National Park was created, Congress approved the creation not because they wished to save Yellowstone's splendor, but because they saw its long-term potential as a money-making tourist attraction. Similarly, laws passed earlier in this century to protect various birds and animals have more often been born of mercenary than of beneficent motives. Traditionally, the way to get legislation protecting endangered species has been to convince Congress of the gaming or marketing potential of those species.

I offer you these observations so that you may see that truly altruistic bills like the Endangered Species Act of 1973—which protects game and non-game animals alike with nonmaterial gain in mind—are rare and recent inventions. They represent a development which goes against the grain of political history. And if it is to be a sustained development, a great deal of effort must be expended to persuade those traditionalists who can only see the worth of nature in the money that is to be squeezed out of it.

Accordingly, if you want to be truly effective in your efforts to save our precious heritage, you must begin now by making the effort to convince the uninformed and the uninitiated, and not waste your precious efforts with the already baptized. I realize full well that this is no easy task, but it must be done.

Today, I would like to share with you some of my own personal thoughts concerning our steadily declining natural heritage. Every morning, my wife, son and I begin our day out in the back yard feeding the birds and squirrels and noticing what changes have occurred during the night. We walk among the trees, smell the slowly decaying barks, and listen to the sounds of our surroundings. It truly is a beautiful way to start the day.

I hope someday to also be able to stand with my grandson and look once again over Lahaina's blue waters and watch the whales slowly passing by; to hike through Waipio Valley and eat the fresh breadfruit.
This personal involvement with our natural surroundings is one of my most enjoyable links with my cultural and spiritual heritage. It is one of the most meaningful events in my day, and yet, I am very sad to say that for many, these experiences are steadily passing by and may be never again recovered.

Many, if not all, of our society's decisions today are made by very dedicated and very practical minded bureaucrats. These men and women are deeply concerned about how we will provide sufficient jobs, food, and shelter for all members of our society. Their aims are commendable, but I am afraid that in being so task-oriented, so practical minded, that they have lost their appreciation for some of the finer meanings in life. They ask, "How much will this cost? Can we afford this?" And not, "How will we replace the fallen Koatrees?" Their perfectly planned communities will be beautiful to behold and may be even pleasant to live in. Yet, I would suggest perhaps a bit dull. Can you imagine living in an environment with perfectly controlled weather conditions, with no storms or rainfalls to worry about. NO adversity. Fully programmed. What would give meaning to our lives?

How nice it would be if we had been able to preserve several types of dinosaurs on a far out island where man had never set foot. What if we could set anchor a couple of thousand yards off shore and share these creatures with our sons and daughters. Hear their cries, watch them interact, smell them. Perhaps such an island must remain a fantasy forever, but our legends tell that when the great gods created the islands of Hawaii their creations were at least as wondrous and exotic as any we might fantasize today. The seas were filled with fish of all sizes, the air with birds of all colors. These legends have great meaning for many of us who have grown up in Hawaii, and perhaps they help us to respect the whole of Hawaii's natural beauty for its own sake. For us the living bird is worth saving because it is part of that natural beauty and not because it at one time made good eating or good sport.

Of course, it would be a sad thing if concern for Hawaiian species were restricted to only those who have lived here. But fortunately, people can be made to appreciate our blessings through the work of dedicated advocates like you. Naturally, the task requires a vast amount of energy, but the reward will be considerable, for we will be leaving our children a great gift—a way to appreciate their past in their present.

Hopefully, someday we will be able to leave such a heritage to our children, but only if you as concerned experts, those us in the Congress who care, and all of our constituency work together to give to preserving our natural heritage the highest of priorities.
Labor Day Message from U.S. Senator Daniel K. Inouye

Labor Day 1974 falls on historic times. The constitutional guaranty of domestic tranquility has been shattered by the events that transpired in the highest levels of our government. The reverberations of Watergate and the historic resignation of our Chief Executive are still with us. But the democratic process is meeting the severest test of its history. The true interplay of the separation of power doctrine has been demonstrated and confirmed by unprecedented judicial decisions, legislative proceedings and executive actions set in motion by this constitutional doctrine.

Our Nation must now turn to one of the greatest problems of a capitalistic society on this Labor Day, the problem of inflation. The pocketbook of every household has shrunk to heretofore unknown proportions. Our past economic principles have not withstood the challenge of national and international inflation. Labor Day today cannot be commemorated by strident voices for more profits and more wages to meet the high cost of living. Labor Day today should mark a dedication of all Americans, labor and management, to fight galloping inflation which is engulfing us every day.

We have heard of various solutions spanning the spectrum from return to laissez faire economics to economic czars. We have discussed balancing of the budget, cutting federal spending, decreasing taxes and limiting government services. But the fountainhead of inflation is the unsatiable appetite of each and every human being for a quality of life that has reached the zenith of materialism in our country. We have become accustomed to the best and most in material things. We consider luxuries of yore as absolute necessities of life today. This demand for more and more has inundated supply, but demand has continued unabated.
This Labor Day should be a day of resolution for each of us to reflect on the materialism that is stifling our lives. The return to a quality of life based on simpler pleasures, less material needs and less reverence for things which pollute our lives and environment will be difficult for a country which has taken affluence for granted. But economic restraint by our government and our people is to me the only basic answer.
The Carpenters' Union requests that you author a 500-word piece for the forthcoming Labor Day issue of its trade publication.

Topic remains open but editor suggests that piece relate to the meaning of Labor Day considering current national conditions, etc. Scope should be national.

Deadline for copy is August 14. Our contact is Mr. Jean Cote at 847-5761.
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REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE (D-HAWAII)
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LAWYERS' WIVES' ANNUAL INSTALLATION
MEETING, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION NATIONAL
CONVENTION, 10 A.M., TUESDAY, AUGUST 13, 1974,
KAHANA HOTEL
Our country will soon celebrate its 200th birthday--our Bicentennial. A birthday is a celebration, and so it should be. Yet, the birthday celebration of a nation goes beyond blowing out the candles on a cake, for the birthday of America marks not so much a biological event as a spiritual one. Our nation was born when 56 courageous men met in Philadelphia to declare our independence from the rule of Britain. That declaration was also a call to war. The signers did not know how long such a war would last, whether the resources of arms and men existed to assure victory, or whether such a victory could be won under any circumstances.

These dark days were full of forboding for a young country. Yet, the signers of that historic document had a given determination to succeed and a spirit of resolve that have marked America since that time.

Some would assert that the political events of the last few years and the extraordinary disclosures of the past few months have assured the descent of the American soul into the fire of hell. Watergate was a mortal sin, they say, and our country has sunk so low that neither man nor God can raise it again.

Others see in these political events some conspiracy against the American people. They claim that a vocal minority, especially those of the media, are tearing this country apart by bringing out every skeleton from every closet. We have all heard the slogans: "My country, right or wrong;" "America, love it or leave it." These people believe that we should close our eyes to our imperfections--that an objective view of ourselves is akin to treason.

To the contrary, I believe that we should have the courage to withstand such scrutiny and view the results.

If one man; if one hundred men; if one thousand men are charged and convicted of crimes against our country, it still doesn't convince me that this country is doomed, or that new men of strength will not replace those who have fallen, or that new patriots will not take the reins of leadership.
We tend to be somewhat embarrassed in our patriotism. Somehow we fear that it connotes blind faith. But in the truest sense of the word, a patriot is not blind. He does not believe that his country is perfect. A patriot has the courage to keep his eyes open even when the most painful events occur in his midst. He may cry out in distress. But if he closes his eyes to injustice, he is not a patriot—he is a coward.

My country, right or wrong—no. My country, right when it is right and wrong when it is wrong.

It is time that we told our country—individually and collectively—how much we love her. If we don't love our country, we are in effect hating ourselves. And if we hate ourselves, this bright, hopeful world will pass us by. Our chance to grasp it, mold it, change it will be lost forever.

We each have our limitations. We have weaknesses as well as strengths. But please stop telling me that you and I—that our nation—are doomed to eternal damnation or that the sickness which has been with us this past year is proof of our limitations. If it is proof of our limitations, our willingness and ability to do something about it are no less proof of our vital strength as a free people.

If America can regain faith in herself, then we can embark on our third century tempered by our mistakes but enthusiastic about our future. For every tear we shed for America today, we shall one day shout for joy in the America of tomorrow.

Our Constitution lives on. Watergate has brought our nation to the confessional. America may have been scarred, but properly healed, she will be stronger. We may have been ignorant, but we will be wiser.

The spirit of our country will live on, but only if we are patriots with eyes open to see wrong and to love our country enough to change those things which are wrong. If we are true to this mission, then our Bicentennial will mark not so much the end of 200 years as a nation, as the beginning of our third century as a free people in a free nation, with a proud past but an even greater future.

Our 200th birthday can indeed be what it should be: a celebration.
We have just begun to explore the possibilities of using nurse practitioners as the primary providers of care for our children and for our elderly. We have just begun to seriously look at the tasks and functions that our dedicated para-professionals can perform. These will be part of the health system of the future.

I remember that when I was growing up, the public health nurse was my family's main contact with adequate health care. She knew each of us as individuals and cared very much about us. Today, we live in a very complex society. We have passed many laws designed to protect the unwary from quackery and medical irresponsibility. But in doing this, I am afraid that we have also made the practice of medicine the exclusive right of a few. We have been more concerned with protecting the public from occasional abuse than in being responsive to the needs of the many.

It is now time to look once again at the true goals of health care, and to bring the health deliverers of yesterday back into the delivery of health services.

The needs are so pressing and the costs so great that we cannot permit the continued inefficient use of our health resources. And neither can we continue to place the financial burden of increasingly costly major medical bills on solely the ill themselves.
Twenty years ago some 100 new democrats, most of them in their twenties and thirties, offered themselves as candidates for County and territorial positions. They did so largely in response to the enthusiasm generated by a former Honolulu police captain, John A. Burns. The 1954 election is now history, but the lessons of that election are relevant today.

Some have described the results of that 1954 election as a political upheaval. Others as an avalanche. Still others referred to it as a revolution. Whatever the proper description, that election marked for the first time in the history of Hawaii the assumption of control of the legislative bodies throughout our Islands by the representatives of our Democratic Party.

I could spend many minutes here recounting the names of those who participated in that "revolution by ballot". I could spend hours recounting their contributions and subsequent achievements. Some are now judges or in the State House or Senate. One is a mayor and two are members of the United States Congress.

I was one of those privileged to participate in that revolution.

As a group we were full of ideas and filled with idealism. All of us were also very impatient. We wanted to remake society in Hawaii. We wanted to provide for many who had up to then lacked any opportunity to play an equal and meaningful part in the government and life of our Islands a decent chance to share fully in the economic activity and in the political life of Hawaii. In many ways I think we succeeded.
Since 1954, Hawaii has prospered. Government services have improved in both quantity and quality. The educational opportunities for our children have noticeably improved. The University of Hawaii has been lifted from a small and somewhat obscure campus to a first rate and massive educational conglomerate including community colleges throughout our state with a total enrollment of some 52,108 students. The faculty includes many of national and even international renown. It contains a medical school, a law school and other programs which were but distant dreams twenty years ago.

With each success we have, however, been confronted with new problems; problems of congestion, environment, inadequate housing, welfare, inflation, and crime. The problems seem never ending. In this non-utopian world I fear they ever will. But it can be said with honesty that we have tried and to a remarkable degree we have succeeded in solving, what has been, the most pressing problems in our state during these past two decades.

On this twentieth anniversary we honor our truly great leader and in so doing express our eternal gratitude for his leadership for more than two decades. We also note with sadness that after three unprecedented terms as our governor he has decided to step down and retire from the amphitheater of elective governmental leadership.

The forthcoming elections of 1974 will have a sense of emptiness without Jack Burns leading the battle. It is with great sadness that we acknowledge his wish for we know that his qualities of leadership will be much missed. It will be many aeons before Hawaii sees another Jack Burns.

If we are to be worthy of our past we must look and plan to the future, however. I have noted that some look forward to 1974 with expectations of extraordinary success. They feel, I fear, that that the problems of the President and of the opposition party will make this a great year for Democrats. Some are already preparing their victory statements.

As one who has viewed the political scene from more than two decades in politics, let me leave you with a word of caution. This is not destined to be a great year for Democrats, or even a good year for politicians of whatever party. It is the year of frustration and anger and voter disillusionment with politicians. Numerous studies demonstrate that as of the present, the voters of the nation and Hawaii will display that disaffection at the polls.
I, therefore, look to November with some sense of foreboding and concern. I do so, not only because of the popular anger and disgust with much of the national political scene, but also because of certain words I have heard too often by people in describing our Democratic Party here in Hawaii.

One of these words is "arrogant". Another is "unresponsive". Although I do not believe we are deserving of these adjectives there are, I fear, many in Hawaii who do.

I know it would be much more comforting to hear a recounting of our great achievements and our proud history and promises of even greater victories to come. If we are to achieve such future victories we must, however, be very aware of our weaknesses. We must not only be aware of them, we must do something about them.

For starters we must recognize forthrightly that the political infighting, which we seem to wage with such relish, will not help us. A contest for new leadership is a necessary part of the renewal process for our political party, but it must be one based on competing programs, priorities, and records of performance, not on personalities. I just hope that the harsh rhetoric being exchanged on occasion will not reach suicidal proportions.

Second, it will be well for those who seek public office to voluntarily make public disclosure of their political and personal finances. Even though the law may not require it, the people have seen enough to expect and demand it. It will not be enough in 1974 for a man seeking the confidence and support of the voter to declare "I am not a crook". Despite our knowledge to the contrary many people believe politicians are all a bunch of crooks. Voluntary and full disclosure is a healthy first step in regaining that essential voter confidence in government.

I am, therefore, presently preparing for release, not just my tax returns but a full audited account of my assets, liabilities, and net worth.

We must also be willing to disclose the amount and source of all our campaign contributions. As you know, I have been doing that.

Third, and while it has been so often said that it may seem trite to repeat it, we must open our Party to new Democrats for participation at every level—as candidates, as precinct workers and as policy makers. We cannot experience the necessary revitalization and reinvigoration of our party without such new participation.
Fourth, and finally after these twenty years of leadership responsibility I believe it is essential that we recognize the need to once again infuse our party with an idealism worthy of our democratic heritage. If we are to be honest with ourselves we must admit that we have too often become a party emphasizing the personalities of sometimes competing leaders rather than a party dedicated to common ideals and goals.

This twentieth anniversary of our Party's ascension to power and influence is an occasion for rededication to the basic principles upon which our Party was founded.

If we are to be worthy of our past and deserving of the future we must remain faithful to the principle that government of the few and for the few has no place in our Party's platform.

We must assure once again that ours will be neither the party of the self-serving right or the self-righteous left; that it will be a party based upon ideals but with room for diversity of opinion.

We must rededicate ourselves to the maintenance of a living partnership between our elected officials and the people.

We must rededicate ourselves to a party based upon the character of our leadership—not on their charisma.

We must be a Party more concerned with performance than with P.R.

We must be a Party more concerned with ideology than with image.

We must be a Party more concerned with maintaining and improving our own standards than in condemning those of the opposition. We can take no solace from their distress.

1974--our twentieth anniversary--can and will be an important year, not only for Hawaii, but for our Party.

It is my fervent hope and goal that in the few months between now and election day we will be able to prepare ourselves and demonstrate to the people of our state once again that we are worthy of their trust and support. I pledge to you my full effort. I solicit your help.
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Some have described the results of that 1954 election as a political upheaval. Others as an avalanche. Still others referred to it as a revolution. Whatever the proper description, that election marked for the first time in the history of Hawaii the assumption of control of the legislative bodies throughout our Islands by the representatives of our Democratic Party.
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December 27, 1974

Major Roy D. Marchesi
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Major Marchesi:

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my warm personal aloha to you and your friends and family gathered at this luncheon in your honor.

May I take this means to express my appreciation for the years of dedication and selflessness which you have devoted to the well-being of our community. The people of Honolulu owe you their mahalo nui loa.

I hope that your future will provide for a much deserved opportunity for enjoying and relaxing in the warmth of friends and loved ones.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator
Dear [Name]

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my warm personal aloha to you and your friends and family gathered at this luncheon in your honor.

May I take this means to express my appreciation for the years of dedication and selflessness which you have devoted to the well-being of our community. The people of Honolulu owe you their mahalo nui loa.

I hope that your future will provide the opportunity for a much deserved opportunity for enjoying and relaxing in the warmth of friends and loved ones.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator
Labor Day 1974 falls on historic times. The constitutional guaranty of domestic tranquility has been shattered by the events that transpired in the highest levels of our government. The reverberations of Watergate and the historic resignation of our Chief Executive are still with us. But the democratic process is meeting the severest test of its history. The true interplay of the separation of power doctrine has been demonstrated and confirmed by unprecedented judicial decisions, legislative proceedings and executive actions set in motion by this constitutional doctrine.

Our Nation must now turn to one of the greatest problems of a capitalistic society on this Labor Day, the problem of inflation. The pocketbook of every household has shrunk to heretofore unknown proportions. Our past economic principles have not withstood the challenge of national and international inflation. Labor Day today cannot be commemorated by strident voices for more profits and more wages to meet the high cost of living. Labor Day today should mark a dedication of all Americans, labor and management, to fight galloping inflation which is engulfing us every day.

We have heard of various solutions spanning the spectrum from return to laissez faire economies to economic czars. We have discussed balancing of the budget, cutting federal spending, decreasing taxes and limiting government services. But the fountainhead of inflation is the unsatiable appetite of each and every human being for a quality of life that has reached the zenith of materialism in our country. We have become accustomed to the best and most in material things. We consider luxuries of yore as absolute necessities of life today. This demand for more and more has inundated supply, but demand has continued unabated.
This Labor Day should be a day of resolution for each of us to reflect on the materialism that is stifling our lives. The return to a quality of life based on simpler pleasures, less material needs and less reverence for things which pollute our lives and environment will be difficult for a country which has taken affluence for granted. But economic restraint by our government and our people is to me the only basic answer.
I regret that my Washington duties prevent my participation in today's conference with the Asian-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce.

I sincerely appreciate the efforts of the Hawaii International Agency and the Hawaii World Trade Association in cosponsoring this event for the mutual expansion of activities in the Pacific Basin. The attendance by the representatives of the eight countries of APCAC is especially encouraging. The response of the top business executives of our community is also much appreciated.

I am certain that our Hawaii businessmen at the conference will gain fruitful information and guidance in the expansion of economic activities in the Asian-Pacific area. The special emphasis on food producing enterprises is timely and vital for the present world economy. I believe that this conference can be a forerunner of other conferences for stimulation of mutually beneficial economic and social relationships between Hawaii and Asian-Pacific businessmen.

Please accept my very best wishes for a very successful meeting.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator
November 25, 1974

Mr. William Seilow
Vice President
Oceanic Foundation
420 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Dear Mr. Seilow:

I am certain you are aware of my interests in helping to increase Hawaii's exports by sponsoring programs to stimulate Hawaii-based companies to actively expand their activities into the Pacific Basin Area.

On Monday, December 9, 1974, under the cosponsorship of my office, the Hawaii International Services Agency and the Hawaii World Trade Association, we have been fortunate to arrange for a select group of senior Hawaii business executives to meet with representatives from eight countries of the Asian-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce (APCAC). At this informal session, conferees will discuss how best to utilize APCAC's services to encourage and assist Hawaii companies in establishing food producing enterprises in Asian-Pacific countries through consulting services, technical assistance or supply of machinery and equipment.

You will find attached a copy of the agenda for this meeting. A brochure describing APCAC's role in assisting United States businesses overseas will be sent to you under separate cover.

I hope that you and/or your designate who is in charge of your company's international activities will be able to attend this most promising meeting. I would appreciate your response to Ms. Barbara Sakamoto in my Honolulu office (944-1691) by December 2, 1974.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

Enclosure
Tentative
AGENDA

"OPPORTUNITIES FOR HAWAII FIRMS IN FOOD PROCESSING ENTERPRISES IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC"

ILIKAI HOTEL

DECEMBER 9, 1974

9:00 A.M. Introductory Remarks
Remarks by Robert A. Perkins, Chairman
The Asian-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce (APCAC)

9:30 A.M. "APCAC's Role in Assisting Hawaiian Companies in Establishing Food Producing Enterprises in Asian-Pacific Countries"
A Panel Discussion by Representatives of APCAC from:
Australia
Hong Kong
Japan
Korea
Republic of China
Philippines
Vietnam
Asian Council

10:30 A.M. Coffee Break

10:45 A.M. Continued Discussion, Question and Answer Period

11:45 A.M. Adjourn for Lunch

12:00 Noon Luncheon - Ilikai Hotel

1:30 P.M. Adjourn Formal Meeting

1:45 P.M. on as scheduled Individual Conferences with APCAC Delegates and Interested Hawaii Companies
ADCAC Delegates:

Robert A. Perkins, Chairman, APCAC
Director, Chrysler, Far East and Africa

Paul Gibson, Vice Chairman, APCAC
President, Envirotech, Asia Pacific

Andy R. Meyer, Managing Director
Williams Brothers Engineering Pty. Ltd.

Hong Kong:

W. Preston Tollinger, Resident Partner
Coudert Brothers

One additional delegate

Japan:

A. Lewis Burridge, APCAC Vice Chairman
President, Sterling International

Edwin W. Beeby, AMCHAM President
Vice President, Westinghouse Electric SA

John E. Courtright
United Air Lines

William H. Kyle, Jr., President
Kyle International Associates

Korea:

Victor J. Reizman, President
Chase Manhattan Bank

Philippines:

Richard M. Henry, Executive Advisor
American Chamber of Commerce, Philippines

One additional delegate

Republic of China:

Paul J. Penrose
Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

Vietnam:

Larry R. Lippstreu, Managing Director
Foremost Diaries
Robert Chatterton, Sr. V. P., First Hawaiian Bank
(morning session only)

C. E. S. Burns (Frank) Jr., Sr. V. P., Administration, AMPAC Inc.

John Parkes, Vice President, International Banking Department,
Bank of Hawaii

Joseph A. Pelletier, Executive V. P., Pacific Resources

Dr. Philip Helfrich, Associate Director, Hawaii Institute of
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Lawrence S. Pricher, President, Alexander & Baldwin

William Yort, Director, Diversified Agriculture, C. Brewer and Co.

Dr. H. Steinbach, President, Oceanic Foundation (morning session only)

Dr. Colin E. Nash, Director and V. P. (morning session only)

Malcolm MacNaughton, Chairman of the Board, Castle and Cooke

D. J. Kirchhoff, President (may also attend)

Representative from Theo H. Davies

Edwin L. Carter, Executive Vice President, Dillingham Corporation
(morning session only)

Norman Blomberg, Plantation Superintendent, Del Monte Corporation
SHORT SPEECH RE: JUDGE PENCE RETIREMENT

IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT THE MAKEUP OF OUR HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION REFLECTS THE POPULATION MIX OF HAWAII, ETHNICALLY AND GEOGRAPHICALLY. PRACTICALLY EVERY STATE OF OUR UNION CAN CLAIM A MEMBER OF THE BAR IN HAWAII BY BIRTH OR EDUCATION. BUT THE MAN WE HONOR TODAY, I CAN SAFELY SAY WITHOUT DISSENT, IS THE ONLY SON OF STERLING, KANSAS TO LEAVE HIS IMPRINT ON HAWAII'S LEGAL HISTORY.

CHIEF JUDGE MARTIN PENCE'S JOURNEY FROM STERLING TO BOALT HALL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, AND EVENTUALLY TO HONOLULU VIA Hilo HAS BEEN AN ILLUSTRIous ONE. OUR STATE HAS BEEN THE FORTUNATE BENEFICIARY OF HIS LEGAL SKILLS AND JUDICIAL KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPED OVER A PERIOD OF OVER 40 YEARS AS A STUDENT OF THE LAW.

I CAN PERSONALLY ATTEST TO THE LOVE FOR HAWAII AND ITS PEOPLE THAT MARTIN PENCE HAS SHOWN THROUGHOUT HIS CAREER AS A LAWYER AND A JUDGE. THIS TRUE SON OF HAWAII, VIA STERLING, KANSAS, DECLINED NOMINATION TO THE UNITED STATES NINTH CIRCUIT COURT AND ITS HIGHER EMOLUMENTS IN ORDER TO CONTINUE HIS JUDICIAL SERVICE IN HAWAII. I MIGHT ADD, SOTTO VOCE, THAT JUDGE PENCE HAD HIS CAKE AND ATE IT TOO, SINCE HE HAS NONETHELESS SAT AS AN APPELLATE JUDGE IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT MORE OFTEN THAN
ANY OTHER DISTRICT JUDGE. HIS DECISION TO REMAIN WITH US WAS HAWAII'S GAIN AND THE WESTERN REGION'S LOSS. IT ALSO ENABLES ME, ON THIS OCCASION, TO EXPRESS TO HIM OUR MAHALO FOR HIS DILIGENT AND OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII AND OUR BEST WISHES FOR HIS CONTINUED AND ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW AND LAWYERS FOR MANY MORE YEARS TO COME.

ALOHA,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
UNITED STATES SENATOR
A few weeks ago, I was invited to a function in Washington which was scheduled for today. Naturally, I declined, explaining my commitment to participate in this Kona coffee festival. My explanation was received with skepticism. I was asked why I would travel this long distance to speak on a product that ranks at the bottom of our cash crops. My friends suggested that a speech on sugar or pineapple would be understandable, but coffee? Unfortunately, I did not have time to explain why I find this festival important enough to spend more than 24 hours in travel time to be with you.

The U.S. coffee industry may be relatively small, but it is very important. It provides jobs -- precious jobs. It provides dollars that would otherwise be lost to foreign sources. Although most Americans are unaware, Kona coffee is the only commercially grown coffee in the United States. We produce only one per cent of the coffee consumed by the American consumer. Yet, because of this fact, the United States sits as a member of the International Coffee Council -- as a producer nation. This places us in an influential policy position where we can have a real impact on the quality and supply of coffee.

So to those of you who patiently plant the seeds, cultivate the plants and pick the ripened berry -- keep in mind, your activity has a positive impact upon a small, but significant segment of our foreign policy.

Today, there is a tendency for Americans to think big. Small has meant inefficient to too many people. Hugh manufacturing plants,
corporate farms of great magnitudes have been built and have been looked to as the answer for our economic and agricultural problems. This tendency has had a discouraging effect on the family farmer, causing small farms to close for fear of the inability of competing with the agribusiness giants. Accordingly, some in Hawaii suggest that we withdraw from the coffee growing industry and replace it with another cash crop. I remember your attempts with passion fruit. I note that most of you have returned to coffee.

Despite the difficulties the Kona coffee growers have endured, they have persisted in their efforts. It has been a profitable persistence for the most part. Although you have not become millionaires, remember that the percentage of millionaires in our population is small indeed. I congratulate you on your persistence and success. I pledge my support to you and to the important role you play in our State's economy and our nation's foreign policy.
One of the more moving and memorable moments in the lengthy Watergate hearings, which so dominated the media last summer, was the response of a young man, Gordon Strachan, to a question from Senator Montoya. When asked for his advice to young people based upon his experience in government, Mr. Strachan replied, "My advice is to stay away."

One can sympathize with this young man's response. Not yet 30 years old, he had held a position of considerable influence and power as an assistant to the White House Chief of Staff, Mr. H. R. Haldeman. He was Mr. Haldeman's liaison with the Committee to Re-elect the President.

To have risen to such heights and then suddenly to have been faced with the prospect of prison for himself and for many with whom he had worked must have been a most traumatic experience for a young man.

Despite our sympathy for Mr. Strachan's plight, his advice merits no serious support. For a representative government to be worthy of that name requires the participation of every person - young and old. For representative government to flourish, participation by the young is of particular and crucial importance. Such participation is an essential element of such government - a vital and critical necessity during a time of crisis.

The British philosopher-statesman, Edmund Burke, writing just more than two hundred years ago in an essay entitled, "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents," had this advice: "It is not enough...that a man means well to his country; it is not enough that...He never did an evil act, but always voted according to his conscience, and even harangued against every design which he apprehended to be prejudicial to the interests of his country. This...falls miserably short of the mark of public duty. That duty demands and requires, that what is right should not only be made known, but made prevalent; that what is evil should not only be detected, but defeated. When the public man omits to put himself in a situation of doing his duty with effect, it is an omission that frustrates the purposes of his trust almost as much as if he had formally betrayed it. It is surely no very rational
account of a man's life, that he has always acted right; but... in such manner that his endeavors could not possibly be productive of any consequence."

In the light of the image of our federal government in Washington, D.C., which has been thrust upon you incessantly via television, radio, and the printed media this past year, it is understandable that many are disillusioned. A reading of the partial and edited transcripts of certain conversations in the White House can hardly have increased the stature of government or the attraction of government service for young people.

The resignation of a Vice President in a plea to avoid criminal prosecution, the indictment of former members of the President's Cabinet, a plea of guilty to a criminal charge by a former attorney general, and the conviction of former White House personnel for perjury and other high crimes can do little to increase the appeal of political or governmental service to the young people of our country. Somehow, it seems that many of those in government had lost their "ethical compass," as Jeb Magruder told Judge Sirica as he was being sentenced the other day.

In light of all that has transpired, I can understand that the desire "to stay away" would be present and strong in your midst. It is understandable that "politics" and "politician" have become dirty words. It is even understandable that increasing numbers, seeing the extent of the disclosures as we wash our dirty linen in public and as our newspapers and television and radio newscasters headline each new revelation, join in that all-too-common belief that politicians are all a bunch of crooks.

However, if we have concern for the continuation of democratic government, if we believe in representative government, to join in that chorus is the worst we can do. It has often been said, but it is no less true, that the quality of government in a democracy is dependent upon the people; that, in a democracy, you get the kind of government you deserve.

If government corruption concerns you, you won't clean it up by staying away. "All that is necessary for evil men to rule is that good men do nothing."

Reform comes through active effort and involvement by those who seek reform -- not through passive acceptance of the imperfections of those who govern or refusal to accept the challenge. The least that you must do in a democracy is to care enough to inform yourself and be able to cast an intelligently informed vote on election day. That is the very least, and yet, one out of every three Americans fails to cast a vote in a presidential general election. The ratio is even higher among young people.
But you can do much more than vote.

You can make your voice heard before election time by participating in activities of your party or through organized citizen pressure groups. You can gain influence through direct communication with your political leaders or by writing Letters to the Editor. You can demand that the public's business be conducted in public. You can demand that your political candidates make public their financial statements and their campaign contributors in return for your support. By your effort you can make a difference.

Government is too important to leave it to the politicians. Government is more than taxes, politicians, and bureaucrats. Government sets your minimum wage and maximum work week. It determines not only how much you make and get to keep, but also, to a great extent, how much your money will buy. It also determines what you may buy - or at least what you may not buy. Most important, government determines whether you or your son or loved one will have to serve in the military - and for some, whether you will live or die.

Yes, and closer to home, government determines the adequacy of your schools and highways; your safety at home and on the city streets; the quality of the water you drink and the very air you breathe; parks and playgrounds and public transportation or the lack thereof; the very quality of your life.

So, get to know your legislators, your mayor, your city or county councilmen, your governor, your Congressmen, and your Senators. They are important because what they do or fail to do is important to you. Let them know what you think of the job that they are doing. And let them know what you would like to have done.

And if you don't like what they are doing, go to work to replace them. If the spirit moves you, run against them. Most of you are old enough; if not in this election, you will be by the next one.

Increasing numbers of young people are taking such active roles. I was reading a story last week of the accomplishments of a young mayor of a city of more than 50,000 people. He is just 23 years old.

The next Congress will be younger than the present one. I know of a Congressional district where the oldest candidate is 30 years old. The candidate of the opposition party is only 28 years old.
Since the very beginning of civilization, man has made efforts to improve his institutions of government. Many of his efforts have been rather short-lived. Each, in turn, at some point collapses and is replaced, often out of turmoil and violence. When we look to history we find that, preceding such collapse, we frequently find a period of citizen apathy - of disassociation by the masses from participation in government.

Our government is one of the oldest in the world today. As we approach the bicentennial anniversary of our existence as a free and independent nation, it is suitable that we take stock. It is further appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to the principles of participatory democracy practiced by our founding fathers. And it is worth remembering that our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution were not the work of old men. Madison, Hamilton, Jefferson, Adams and other leaders in that effort were young in years but wise in their concern for the government of man.

"What government is best? That which teaches us to govern ourselves," wrote Goethe, the German poet-philosopher.

Twenty years ago, I was one of that band of young people who decided that it was time to do something to bring change to the government of our Islands. Today, you have the opportunity to join in doing something to bring change to government throughout our nation.

I hope you will accept the challenge.
Since 1970, something almost unnoticed -- yet basic and universal -- has occurred in the world. Mankind has slipped out of the Era of Plenty into the Era of Scarcity. This change represents the most profound alteration in the society of man since the Renaissance. It affects each and every one of us to some degree today. In the not too distant future, it will dominate the lives of two-thirds of mankind; later, it will overpower the hopes and dreams of four-fifths of the world.

Strangely, very few of us are aware of what has happened. However, these world issues are of such enormous scale that sensible people can no longer ignore them.

United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim stressed this when he recently said, "The pursuit of short-term national interests by any nation or group of nations can no longer provide even a brief reprieve from the inevitable results of the present trends." In an April 15th address before the U.N., Secretary of State Henry Kissinger called it, "the challenge of interdependence." Secretary Kissinger stated, "We are part of a single international economic system," and he somberly challenged the assembly and the world "to come to terms with the fact of our interdependence."

Like a runaway engine with numerous attached cars, there are six major interconnected problems that we must face and somehow master if the collision and tragedy that confront us all are to be avoided. These problems are: poverty, population, food shortages, inflation, energy shortages, and weapons control.

Each inescapable element has its own properties and problems. When they are combined, as they now are rapidly combining, they, like the various elements of a nuclear bomb, may trigger an explosive chain reaction of massive forces -- social, economic, and political. Some are now already quite evident.
Poverty grips more than two-thirds of the world's people. Some of the world's poverty-stricken are here in America, where 19 million adults over the age of 16 years are functionally illiterate and 24 million of our citizens are officially malnourished. However, this represents only a small fraction of the abject and inhumane poverty that exists abroad. While one-third of mankind lives in relative abundance -- and some in superabundance -- the rest of the world's population remains entrapped in a web of hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, unemployment, and corrosive poverty. The gap between the rich and the poor widens daily in an almost insurmountable chasm.

Last year, average income in developed countries was approximately $2,400 per capita. The comparable income in the nondeveloped countries was $180. Within 10 years, the industrialized and developed nations will raise their per capita income by $1,200 to $3,600 per person. Three-quarters of the rest of the world will be fortunate to add $100 each raising their per capita income to $280. Imagine that: by 1980, the numbers will be $3,600 to $280 -- a 13.1 ratio!

Each year, 80 per cent of the increase will go to those countries where per capita income already averages more than $1,000. These countries contain only one-quarter of the world's population. A mere 6 per cent of the gain will go to countries with per capita incomes averaging $200 or less -- countries which nevertheless contain more than 60 per cent of the world's people.

There are many types of poverty. Poverty is a relative term. Poverty as experienced in America's Appalachia would represent a reasonably comfortable middle-class existence to the poor of the Sahel or Bangladesh.

The poorest of the poor -- or roughly 40 per cent of the developing countries -- have shared almost no growth and live in conditions of deprivation that fall below any rational definition of human decency. In more than twenty countries, the very poor earn less than $80 a year or less than 30¢ a day. In India alone, more than 210 million people -- the approximate population of the United States -- live on less than $40 a year.

Unless governments can reverse the present trend, the income share of the poorest 60 per cent will further decrease while that of the richest 5 per cent will continue to increase. There has been virtually no "trickle down" of resources and income. Here development efforts have almost completely failed.
The population problem is undoubtedly the greatest single obstacle to world economic and social improvement. While it took our planet approximately two million years for the human population to reach three billion, it will require only 35 years at present rates to add an additional three billion people. By the year 2000, the earth's population will increase by more than one billion persons every eight years.

What does this really mean? Let us try to visualize it. If you became a parent today and your child lived into his seventies, he would know a world of approximately 15 billion people. Today's population is just over four billion. Assuming this rate of increase continues, his grandchild would share a world of more than 60 billion. Obviously, some links in the chain of life would break before then.

The United States and other industrialized nations have allocated considerable resources and talent to their own population control problems. At present, the developed world has achieved a stable population with very little numerical growth.

When India announced a year and one half ago that she had achieved a decrease in her growth rate, it was hoped that the populations of less developed countries might be eventually controlled. Now we know that, not only did India not achieve the announced reduction, but her population, like much of the rest of the Third World, is actually hopelessly out of control. By the year 2000, the number of inhabitants of the developed and industrialized countries will scarcely change, but the populations of the developing and less developed nations will at least double. Approximately 20 per cent of the world's population will then live in the developed countries. By the year 2040, this will drop to just 10 per cent and continue to decrease unless we can effect rather massive change in the world.

Of the six international and intranational trends being discussed today, food and food shortages are perhaps the most well known and pathetic.

Last year saw food shortages in India, Sahel, Bangladesh and other areas of the world. That was before the oil crisis. Now there will be far less energy available to run tractors, irrigate marginal land, and produce vital fertilizer. Due to lack of fertilizer alone, it is estimated that India's wheat crop will be reduced by at least one-third this year. Throughout most of Asia, crop production will be down sharply and with a 2 to 3 per cent yearly population increase certain, a huge food deficit threatens.
For weeks, alarming reports have been circulated predicting poor harvests in India, Afghanistan, New Guinea, Kenya, Ethiopia, and other Third World nations. At present, across the Sahel region of North Africa, a full-scale starvation grips entire nations. In spite of massive international humanitarian relief efforts, an ever-increasing number are dying, and unless other methods are utilized, millions more will starve and additional millions will be debilated and retarded.

In the developing countries, close to one billion persons presently suffer from severe malnutrition or starvation. Twenty to 25 per cent of all children die before their fifth birthday. The life expectancy is 20 to 30 years less than it is here in America. With the developed population now stable and the developing nations rapidly gaining additional inhabitants, this chaotic situation will worsen.

A profound moral and political test awaits the United States and other developed nations on the issue of food.

Recently a well-known nutritionist at Harvard got to the heart of this problem. He stated, "The same amount of food that is feeding 210 million Americans would feed 1.5 billion Chinese on an average Chinese diet."

The older developed nations and numerous newly-developed nations are constantly improving their diets. As the food supply in the world during any given year is relatively finite and fixed, this dietary improvement is often achieved at the expense of marginal diets elsewhere. Americans ate 50 pounds of beef per capita in 1950. In 1973, it was 119 pounds per person. Presently an American consumes 2,200 pounds of grain -- most of it to fatten his animals. A Chinese needs only 400 pounds to live on an average Chinese diet.

Simply averting our attention will not deny the linkage between the level of food production and consumption in the U.S. and other developed nations, and the ever-widening ripple of starvation throughout the world. In order to merely maintain the present inadequate diets, food production must double by the year 2000 to keep up with population increases. At present, world food reserves are down from the 69-day supply in 1970 to less than a 30-day supply in 1974 -- the lowest level since the holocaust of World War II.

While time does not permit me to dwell on it at length in this discussion, the interrelated problems of worldwide inflation and the energy crisis are pertinent. If oil prices, which are now approximately four times 1972 prices, stay at present levels, it will cost the developing countries some $15 billion more for essential
imports in 1975 than it did in 1974. This increase is equivalent to nearly five
times the total net U.S. development assistance in 1972 and almost double the total
amount of development assistance for all developing countries from all sources that
year.

This year, all nations must face increased oil prices as well as higher prices
for essential food, fertilizer, raw materials and/or finished products. The rate of
inflation ranged from some 7 per cent to 25 per cent for developed countries this
past year. However, the rate was much higher in the nonindustrialized countries
where it ranged from 20 per cent to 200 per cent.

Some developing countries will be able to partially offset increased prices
and inflation with exports of raw materials. For the poorest 40 countries, there is
little relief available. In the near future, they will need at least an additional
$5 billion in aid merely to maintain this stability and survive.

Perhaps the greatest paradox in the entire aid picture centers on weapon
development and procurement. For whatever it is worth to America, we are the
world's largest supplier of weapons and military material to the developing nations:
Planes and advisors to Bolivia, F-14 jets to Iran, tanks to India and Pakistan,
carbulnes, helicopters and transports to the Philippines. The shopping list is endless
and the customers read like a list of the Who's Who in the United Nations.

Over the past decade alone, the United States sold or gave away more than
$21 billion in weapons to more than 60 countries. This accounts for more than one-
half of the total international trade in arms. Even more unsettling is the fact that
our military exports have doubled in the past four years and jumped again this year --
to more than $5.4 billion.

We supply not only arms and material, but also war technology and advisors.
Many thousands of police and military have been trained with U.S. foreign assistance
and weapons development encouraged. You may have noticed that a few weeks ago,
India, one of the largest and poorest nations on the earth, exploded a nuclear device
underground. At a time when her millions are literally starving, India has invested
millions of dollars and valuable technology in the preliminary production of a
uclear capability.

Last year, I called for our government to curtail this senseless policy of
weapons distribution and sales. I urged at that time that the Administration attempt
to bring about a meaningful international agreement on conventional (non-nuclear) arms
distribution, especially in the developing world.
Americans are the most generous and humanitarian people in the world. Since World War II, the United States has provided more than $183 billion to the world in international assistance. In a recent public poll, 84 per cent believed to be in the best interest of the United States to help other countries. Almost 70 per cent favored the United States providing direct and multilateral assistance to the developing world. Yet, foreign aid is the most unpopular program within the Congress and in the nation.

As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I can assure you that there are many valid reasons that Americans react this way.

Whereas most Americans believe that foreign aid means "helping other countries and people by sending money and food," military items and police training represent a larger percentage of our total foreign aid than does economic and humanitarian assistance.

Our priorities in the way aid is distributed also need reordering. What is the Administration's sense of values -- what is the grasp of the real problems facing humanity -- when, this year, the Administration proposes to spend ten times as much on South Viet Nam with a population of 19 million persons, as on India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh with a total population of 711 million?

Clearly, drastic reforms are called for. Foreign aid, throughout the 1950's and 1960's, was closely associated with our overall foreign policy objectives of gaining political advantage in the Cold War. Today, the overall goals of the foreign assistance programs of the United States must not be primarily to halt the flow of communism and aggression. Detente and improved relations with the Soviet Union and China have removed much of that menace. Today, if our aid is to continue to be supported by Congress and the American people, it must speak to the real social and economic problems found in the less-developed world.

In addition, the entire U.S. assistance apparatus -- which is the most top-heavy and expensive of all governmental agencies -- must reduce its administrative cost and redirect its efforts.

The military component must be taken out of the foreign aid bill. In the past, it was argued that the military aspects helped to justify the economic and humanitarian aspects. I believe this is no longer the case. The world urgency of development -- energy, food, and social -- will easily absorb all the funds that we can make available for assistance. Continuing to pour American tax dollars and
technology into bolstering the police and military forces of more than sixty nations can no longer be justified. In most cases, it compounds -- rather than eases -- the problem. Assistance should and does begin at home. We find ourselves in a rising price spiral, which demands that the expenditures of our tax dollars must be fully justified. Poverty, illiteracy, and hunger still exist within our land and our first priority must be to assist our own citizens.

Whatever funds the United States can make available for foreign assistance must be directed to reach and to assist the poorest people elsewhere in the world -- not the richest, as has too often been the case in the past.

A complete foreign aid reassessment is essential. In the past, aid from rich to poor nations has had only a limited success in fostering development. Given the scope of the problems now forming throughout the world, our aid philosophy and methodology are antiquated and doomed to fail. The dangers of unbalanced economic and social world growth cannot be ignored. The adjustments must begin now.
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Now that America's long tortuous struggle in Southeast Asia has
become history, it is time for this nation to display wisdom and
understanding in examining an issue that personally affects thousands
of our youthful citizens. In competition with the momentous issue of
presidential impeachment, the subject of amnesty for the draft evaders
and military deserters of the Vietnamese conflict seems to have been
forgotten or at least temporarily laid aside. It is a subject that
has frequently been brought to the awareness of the public, but one
that appears to fall short of the lasting impact needed to keep it alive.
Today, I wish to revive this emotional, thought-provoking question
by offering my personal views and define my position.

Briefly defined, amnesty is the official act of overlooking or
forgetting a crime which has been committed by an individual or group
of individuals. Amnesty is similar to pardon, in concept, in that both
release the offender from the penalty imposed for a violation of the law.
Whereas pardon may be extended to any type of offender and is usually
granted after punishment has begun, amnesty has normally been granted
to political offenders before the commencement of criminal proceedings
or punishment.

Amnesty is usually divided into two categories. One is general amnesty,
which covers all classes of offenders, and the other is particular amnesty,
which is limited to special groups and sometimes with specific exceptions.
Within the scope of either of these two categories, amnesty can be absolute,
which imposes no conditions, or it can be conditional, which requires
the fulfillment of certain conditions before the offender becomes eligible
for its benefits.
The history of amnesty in the Western world has been varied. The governments of European nations granted amnesty long before the United States first applied the concept. In both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, French warriors and rioters were granted amnesty. In addition, grants of amnesty were extended in France on at least three occasions in the early and latter parts of the nineteenth century. Significant amnesties in England were extended in 1651 after the English Civil War and in 1660 after the reign of Charles II had been restored. Other instances of European amnesty from the mid-seventeenth century to the early nineteenth century involved the nations of Sweden, Poland, Germany, Austria, Russia, and Turkey. Among them were France, Italy, Belgium, and Canada. In addition, France, Norway, Germany, Belgium, Japan and the Netherlands granted amnesties or pardons to persons who had been involved in "compromising activities" during World War II. More recently, after the ending of the Algerian conflict in 1962, France extended general amnesty to most of those who had illegally resisted the government's war policies.

Historically speaking, amnesty in the United States has usually been granted by the executive branch of government. Of thirty-five cases of American amnesty between 1795 and 1952, only seven were a result of Congressional initiative. Among American examples of amnesty or pardon are: (1) the full pardon by George Washington of participants in the 1794 Whiskey Rebellion; (2) the full pardon given by Thomas Jefferson to all deserters from the Army of the United States if they would surrender themselves within a stipulated period of time; (3) the full pardon offered by President James Madison to deserters during the War of 1812; (4) the conditional pardon extended in 1830 by Andrew Jackson to those charged with peacetime desertion; (5) the 1862 conditional release of many political prisoners by Abraham Lincoln at the outset of the Civil War. Also, in 1863 Lincoln conditionally pardoned military deserters who agreed to return to their regiments within a given period of time, and in 1864 he directed the War Department to reduce the sentences of some deserters from death to imprisonment and to return to duty those whose continuing service was deemed beneficial to the country. Further, as a result of Lincoln's Proclamation of March 11, 1863, the War Department on July 3, 1866, offered conditional amnesty to all regular army deserters who surrendered before August 15, 1866; (6) the issuing of full pardons.
by President Andrew Johnson to former Confederate soldiers in 1865, and to other persons in 1867 and 1868; (7) the pardon by Woodrow Wilson in 1917 of approximately 5,000 persons in certain judicial categories unrelated to World War I, for which no general amnesty was declared; (8) the granting of amnesty by President Calvin Coolidge in 1924 to approximately 100 peacetime deserters; (9) the amnesty granted by Franklin Roosevelt in 1933 to violators of draft and espionage acts who had completed their sentences; and finally, (10) the individual pardons granted by President Truman in 1947 to 1,523 persons out of a total of 15,805 cases of those who had evaded or violated the Selective Service Act during World War II. These pardons were the result of recommendations of an Amnesty Review Board, established by the President in an executive order issued in December, 1946.

I believe that these illustrations of amnesty down through our history, conspicuously demonstrate that the American people have a tradition of providing amnesty or pardon both during and after periods of great national stress and upheaval. These cases show clearly that we are a nation with a forgiving and compassionate spirit -- willing to show mercy so that others may be given a chance to redeem themselves.

Abraham Lincoln displayed both wisdom and humanity in offering amnesties and pardons, especially at a troubled time when the nation was literally being torn apart by the fiery passions and hatred of the Civil War. Also, in granting over 1,500 pardons following World War II, President Truman typified the American spirit of fairness and understanding in carrying out the recommendations of an independent governmental panel. Thus, the question some of us ask at this time is: when will our present leadership also manifest such wisdom, fairness and compassion in dealing with an admittedly difficult, but human problem? Will our leaders bury their heads in the sand and wish the problem away, or will they act in the American tradition by recommending that some form of amnesty be granted, one which would free the nation of the bitterness and strife which was engendered by the Vietnam War.
In my judgement, conditional amnesty for American draft evaders and deserters is the only reasonable solution to this critical problem. The granting of conditional amnesty would effect a balance between two extremes. Some have proposed that no form of amnesty should be granted to Vietnam war resisters, while others have suggested that all offenders be granted amnesty on an unconditional absolute basis. I think the compromise of conditional amnesty could bridge the gap between these two positions and thereby create a national climate where the strong emotions and tensions which now prevail could be reduced. In my view, conditional amnesty should be predicated on the principle of good faith. Those who have conscientiously and in good faith opposed the Vietnam conflict should be given the option of performing some type of alternative national service.

Some draft evaders might be offered the opportunity to redeem themselves by performing alternative service with civic and/or volunteer associations, or with government organizations. These persons, for example, might be given the opportunity to work with the underprivileged and impoverished in an American ghetto, while others might be more useful in ministering to the needs of patients in a health facility. Other persons might not be allowed such opportunities because the circumstances in their individual cases may not warrant alternative service. A few draft evaders may wish to enter the military as a result of reappraising their personal situations. However, I am not suggesting here that the military services graciously accept into their ranks those whom they do not want or those who have demonstrated an unwillingness to accept the restrictions and discipline necessary for the proper and orderly functioning of a military society. Some military deserters might be allowed to return to their units without being marked for life by the stigma of a court-martial or dishonorable discharge. Others might not be allowed this opportunity because, similar to some charged with draft evasion, the circumstances in their cases may not warrant a return to duty. Such persons might be allowed to return to civilian life and also be given the opportunity to perform national service.

The key in resolving each individual case would lie in a determination of the motives associated with each. Is it fair to declare that all of those currently charged with draft evasion are cowards? Or, is it fair to believe that all of those persons currently charged with military desertion possessed treasonous motives? Could it not be that some of those charged with draft evasion rejected the military and refused to serve because of honest and sincere convictions that the Vietnam War was patently wrong and immoral? In the same manner, did not some of those charged with desertion do so because of what they deemed to be valid political reasons for turning their backs on their services?
Of the unknown thousands charged with draft evasion who are scattered in various parts of the world, many may have sincerely felt that they possessed valid moral or political reasons for rejecting the military and thus the conflict. Others may have avoided the draft, and consequently the conflict, out of a deep fear of the unknown. And still others may have been unwilling to enter the military because they did not wish to engage in combat per se, but did not question the political/ideological reasons for the war. Further, some of those charged with military desertion may have fled their units because of unresolved personal problems, disassociated from ideology, but conflicts, nevertheless, that may have appeared insurmountable at the time. To such individuals, escape from their existing environment may have seemed to be the best solution at the moment. Such persons could have been burdened with real or imaginary family, financial or other problems, unrelated to the rights or wrongs of American combat involvement in a distant land. Others, though, may have deserted for purely political reasons similar in vein to some of those charged with draft evasion. While I realize that many of these singular motives are speculative, what I wish to make unmistakably clear is that each draft evader or deserter is an individual and may have possessed a motive for his conduct somewhat different from all the others.

In many cases during the Vietnam conflict, draft resistance represented a form of civil disobedience. It followed the pattern of civil disobedience by civil rights groups in the 1960's. These groups and individuals by their courage and foresight actually helped to bring greater equality and fair treatment to America's black minority. Civil disobedience has an honorable history. We praise it in others as we did recently in the case of the brilliant Russian writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

The principles of personal responsibility and individual conscience have been widely discussed and accepted—especially since the Nuremberg principles established following World War II. It was during these trials that American judges and lawyers held many former enemies guilty of carrying out inexcusable orders holding they should have refused and followed their conscience. Every American military man is schooled and reschooled in these principles.
Throughout the Vietnam conflict the media widely publicized crimes and atrocities by both sides. An average person might reasonably question the legality of certain operations which occurred in Vietnam and refuse to become implicated on the grounds of the Nuremberg principles. That today the man who was convicted of the murder of at least 22 old men, women and babies had his life sentence reduced to only a few years only further substantiates this point. That no officer higher than this lieutenant has ever been found guilty of the responsibility for this massacre further underscores this doubt. Even more recently, the Administration decided not to prosecute those former POW's who openly and knowingly assisted their North Vietnamese captors in propaganda and other efforts.

Some in Congress recently initiated proceedings to make the brilliant Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn an honorary citizen of the United States. The Halls of Congress rang with praise of his personal courage and dedication to values in conflict with laws of his country. His civil disobedience and adherence to his own beliefs stand as an example for the world. Do our sons deserve any less understanding and tolerance?

I am recommending a policy of conditional amnesty be applied, not with a broad brush, but on a case-by-case basis. This would require the establishment of an independent amnesty board to weigh the circumstances in each individual case. Although I will agree that such a procedure would be time-consuming and somewhat burdensome for those involved, it seems to me to be in the best interests of all concerned, this divided country, and those of ours who are still alienated by the War.

Those charged with draft evasion and desertion did not go so collectively, so we may question why their cases should be handled this way. Conditional amnesty should be handled on a case-by-case basis because individual actions are very often best understood in the light of individual scrutiny. But I will not deny that draft evaders and deserters have broken laws and regulations of our society. Nor do I declare that all of the reasons behind their conduct were either honorable or dishonorable. Laws and regulations of our nation should not be obeyed or disobeyed selectively, but must apply to all in order that equity and impartiality remain basic to our judicial process. However, I do think that many of the considerations and extenuating circumstances that are often allowed other violators of the law should also be provided to those charged with draft evasion and desertion.

In conclusion, I do not believe that all of the draft evaders and deserters of the Vietnam conflict are heroes any more than I believe that all of them are of a criminal mind or intent. Those that are still outside our system
of justice have not yet been found guilty in any type of judicial proceedings, either civil or military, of breaking laws or regulations. This important point we need to remember. But the granting of conditional amnesty to those charged would alleviate in great measure the division, discord, accusations and recriminations that remain as an aftermath of Vietnam. The guilt, innocence, excuses, or lack of excuses of those charged with draft evasion or military desertion are not the real issues at this moment in our history. Of greater importance is the demonstration to all that America is a kind and forgiving nation and one that never loses sight of the pressing need to strive for a better world, free of distrust, anger and division. It is time that we give the question of amnesty to those who sought to avoid the Vietnam conflict our sincere consideration that we may further close that unfortunate chapter in our nation's history.
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In the midst of a crisis, there is often an attempt by some to fix the blame--
to charge others with responsibility for our difficulties.

The energy crisis has been no exception. Such charges to blame "the other
guy" for our problems have generated ill-feeling throughout the land. Some
place responsibility on the President. Others blame the Congress. Some
say the crisis was caused by our support for Israel, while others blame
the environmentalists. Receiving more blame than any others have been
the big oil companies with their high profits.

At the time of the oil embargo by OPEC (the Organization of Petroleum
Exporting Countries), many people in this country viewed reductions in
crude oil supplies as a temporary inconvenience, and certainly as a
manageable problem. We noted that only between 7-1/2 and 8-1/2 per cent
of all of our oil needs was supplied by the Arab nations. We saw that our
relationship with OPEC was in no way comparable to OPEC's relationship
with industrialized European countries or Japan: their dependency on the
Arab states for oil was much greater.

But then something happened. The energy situation got worse. It became
a "crisis" affecting more and more the daily lives of our citizens. It
became manifest in longer and longer gas lines at local service stations,
and in fuel tanks that became increasingly empty. Soon the energy crisis
had become our worst economic crisis in a decade.
Our historic national dependence on a plentiful supply of low-cost energy made our crisis much worse. Although just over 6 per cent of the world's total population lives in the United States, we are responsible for 35 per cent of the total worldwide energy consumption. We use more energy for air conditioning in the United States than does the People's Republic of China with four times our population for all its purposes.

For aesthetic purposes, New York City's World Trade Building is lit 24 hours a day. This single building uses more electricity than the entire city of Syracuse, New York.

For far too long, America has been a land populated by energy wastrels. One reflection of status and success in this energy-plundering nation has been the mystique of the big car -- the gas-guzzlers in which comfort is literally button away. We have buttons to move the seat, open and close the windows, adjust the steering wheel, and lock and unlock doors.

For many years, no one seemed to look twice when the Odometer showed an average of 8 miles per gallon for these huge machines. Nobody complained. Fuel was abundant and relatively inexpensive. In America, the going rate for gasoline was about 40 cents per gallon, although in other countries, people were paying $1.00 for a gallon of gasoline. Our economy depended on automobiles and these, in turn, demanded plenty of cheap gasoline.

There is no single cause for the energy crisis. Neither is there a single scapegoat. Our "energy wastrel ideology," however, must bear a degree of the responsibility. Americans simply believed that energy reserves were boundless and we consumed accordingly. In fact, before the oil embargo, our consumption was growing at a rate of 4 per cent per annum -- a rate which, had it been allowed to continue, would have doubled our energy requirements by the year 1990.

Certainly the U.S. media, in making the energy crisis one of their major concerns, focused much attention on this issue. I do not fault them for such emphasis -- but I question some of the coverage which selected to highlight negative citizen response to our situation.
For example, a single incident in Hawaii during which a man used a shotgun to press his claim for service in a gas line received widespread attention by the U.S. news services.

In addition, the numerous public statements by various government energy administrators, oil executives, and politicians only seemed to contradict the others' analysis of the situation to confuse matters.

Adding to the sense of crisis was our lack of a leader to direct our efforts toward resolving this critical energy shortage. Sadly, as a result of Watergate, our President's authority and his acceptance as a leader have diminished to an unprecedentedly low level. During this time of uncertainty, we needed that leader to secure compliance with newly-adjusted energy supplies and allocations. We have not had such guidance.

With the lifting of the oil embargo, fuel supplies seem to have loosened. But we must realize that we have by no means solved our long-term energy problems.

The bulk of current fuel reserves are not in huge oil company tanks, but in the gasoline tanks of the more than 100 million automobiles on the road. Before the energy crisis, the average American car had 4-1/2 gallons of gasoline in its tank. Today, because of panic buying brought on by long gas lines and closed stations, the average is now 10 gallons per tank, which, multiplied by the number of cars on the highway, amounts to an incredible 1 billion-plus gallons of gasoline.

Our country's business enterprises have responded to tightened fuel supplies by stockpiling massive amounts of energy. Recently, on a return flight to Washington, D.C., I sat next to the president of a large national corporation. This man informed me that he had had supplies of diesel fuel stockpiled as a precaution against the possibility that electricity supplies for his computer systems might run short or be cut off completely. I asked as to the number of hours of operation this reserve would provide and he answered that he had diesel fuel to last not 10 for hours -- but for weeks.
Panic buying has clearly been a primary contributor to the scope of our problem. It is nothing new to us in Hawaii. Whenever there is a whisper of a possible shipping strike, many people empty the shelves at the grocery stores. I have seen homes containing more than 10 bags of rice, each bag holding 100 pounds. Panic reactions such as these are very difficult to rationally discourage.

Certainly we should not attempt to explain away the energy crisis by blaming the environmentalists. Rather, than blame them, we ought to be thanking them for having had the foresight to advise and encourage us to make a few changes in our life style -- to make the transformation from energy wastrels and environment polluters to energy conservers and environment preservers.

The current move to relax clean air standards and permit noxious sulfur to be released into the atmosphere through the burning of sulfur coal, should be challenged. We should protest against unreasonable retreat from such standards. We must not sacrifice the environmental advancements which we have made, for the more we relax clean air standards, the greater we endanger our health.

It also might be convenient to attack the government as the source of our energy woes. But as far back as 1970, measures were introduced in Congress to establish a special commission on fuels and energy. A few of us in Congress tried to raise our voices to debate and draw attention to the directions of America's energy needs and consumption. Beginning in May, 1971, extensive hearings have been conducted on energy conservation, oil import policy, fuel shortages, federal leasing programs, energy research programs, and deep-water ports to accommodate the super-tanker. Last year, I voted in favor of the Alaskan Pipeline bill -- a bill which will bring much-needed resources to the Pacific Basin. I also voted for the Emergency Energy Act of 1973 -- a bill responding to our energy shortages which was eventually vetoed by the President.
Blaming someone else for the crisis ill serves our need to make reasoned and intelligent decisions. Rather than devoting time to placing the blame for the energy crisis on others, I hope that each of us can consider how we might transform our individual life styles to head off an even more critical period. I would hope that each of us has learned a lesson from the energy crisis. We must be prepared to make adjustments in our daily life. We must realize that that big car is not necessary. We can no longer squander electricity and other scarce resources as though their supply will never end. We all must develop greater self-discipline in conserving energy and make that extra effort to turn off the unneeded light and forego the unneeded weekend ride in our car. I hope that we are prepared and willing to make such changes. I fear for our future if we insist upon returning to our old wastrel ways.

The weeks, months, and years ahead will soon show us how significant our efforts have been.
I have now been involved in the political arena for more than two decades. Throughout that period, the question of health care and how its ever-increasing costs shall be met has been a major political issue. I wish to share with you today, therefore, some of my thoughts on the growing consensus in the Congress concerning National Health Insurance.

To many, health is a problem primarily of the elderly or those few unfortunates who are involved in accidents or suffer catastrophic illnesses. You may, therefore, ask: why do I speak to you? Any family that has experienced the need for major medical care knows that the financial burden is great and that the effects of that burden are felt far beyond the immediate patient. That burden is one which is being shared increasingly by every working member of our society—every taxpayer. And that trend will continue.

It seems like generations ago—but in fact was as recently as 1965—the Congress passed Titles 18 and 19 of the Social Security Act, better known as the Medicaid and Medicare programs. The enactment of this legislation was of far-reaching significance. It came after a decade of intense, soul-searching debate. At the time of passage, many expressed concern that we had embarked on a course which would only result in socialized medicine; in doctors who no longer worked for their patients, but instead filled our papers for the government; in decreased quality of care; in our brightest youth no longer seeking careers in medicine.

Others expressed precisely the opposite viewpoint; that this legislation would be a panacea for all of our ills; that our elderly and our poor would no longer have to worry about acquiring quality health care; that the long waiting lines in hospital emergency rooms would disappear; that there would no longer be a markedly higher infant mortality rate among the poor and the blacks; and that families would no longer have to worry about having their entire life savings wiped out because of an unexpected illness. Fortunately—or perhaps unfortunately—most of these concerns and hopes have turned out to be unfounded.
In adopting Medicare and Medicaid, our nation has formally declared that, like education, adequate health care is the right of every citizen. We have taken the position that no one shall be denied treatment because of his or her race, age, socioeconomic status, or place of residence. This was indeed a giant step forward—but it was only a step.

I am pleased to note that since this monumental legislation was enacted, the Congress has passed a number of amendments which have expanded the basic benefits. However, we have not reassessed the total package. As a result, I am sad to report that, despite the adoption of Medicare, average annual out-of-pocket costs for our elderly citizens have actually increased from $237 to $311. During the late 1960's, we took a giant step forward—now it is time to take yet another.

During the past several months, a number of my colleagues in the Congress have introduced major national health insurance proposals. Foremost among this legislation are the Long-Ribicoff "Catastrophic Health Insurance and Medical Assistance Reform Act" and the Kennedy-Mills "Comprehensive National Health Insurance Act of 1974."

In a political sense, it is highly significant that the primary sponsors of these two bills are also the chairmen of the respective House and Senate committees which have jurisdiction over these areas. Each of these men has indicated that he is confident that the Congress will pass some form of National Health Insurance this session or early in the next Congress. Chairman Mills has actually begun holding formal hearings.

But support for National Health Insurance does not lie solely with members of the Congress. Almost every major labor union has made National Health Insurance one of its top priorities. The American Medical Association is actively lobbying for their Medicare Proposal. And President Nixon has made his "Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan" (CHIP) the subject of a nationwide radio address. Politics does indeed make for strange bedfellows.

As I review the various proposals, many significant differences soon become evident and important questions arise. Should National Health Insurance be voluntary or compulsory? How should it be funded? What, if any, is the appropriate role for insurance companies? What basic benefits should be included? To some of you, these questions may seem minor or purely academic. However, I wish to assure you that when we are talking about a $94.1 billion industry, the answers to questions such as these will have a major impact on each of us.

There are, moreover, three common themes that seem to reappear throughout our deliberations. I am confident that each of these will be an integral part of final form of our National Health Insurance legislation.
The first is that there must be protection for all of us from the devastating effect of unexpected catastrophic illness. Last year, approximately one million families were saddled with health ills and health bills of a catastrophic nature; yet, more than one-half of the insurance policies sold in the U.S. contained payment ceilings of $10,000. Further, some 38 million Americans--or 20% of those of us under 65--actually have no private health insurance at all. All too often, our insurance policy runs out just when we need it, or that policy includes a rider which leaves us uninsured for our most likely needs.

Last week, one of my staff was telling me about his relatives who had worked all of their lives, seven days a week, to build up a family grocery store. They had two children whom they loved dearly. The week before their younger daughter was to return to college, she suddenly came down with an unknown virus. She slipped into a coma and never came out of it. Because of doctor and hospital bills, the family's entire life savings were completely wiped out. Yet, if she had gotten sick only one week later, her student health plan would have completely covered her. Think about it: one week, and because of the difference, more than twenty years of her parents' sweat and tears were wiped out.

The second area of agreement holds that coverage must be truly comprehensive and should emphasize preventive services. The recent action by our own Hawaii State Legislature to mandate and to provide adequate funding for the development of children's mental health services is an extremely progressive step.

It saddens me deeply to think that more than 22,000 of our youth here in our beautiful State, are unable to obtain the mental health services that they so desperately need. May I disagree a bit by noting that we politicians are quick to put our arms around the pleasantly disabled, but who among us is really willing to put his arms around the chronic schizophrenic? How many in this academy have volunteered their time to assist at Waimano Home? How many of us are willing to really work with the truly disabled--those without pleasant-looking injuries?

The third, and final, recurring theme is the growing awareness that we are not really using our health resources as effectively as we might. In the past 2-3/4 years, our overall health care costs have increased by more than 20 per cent. The present Administration placed severe economic controls on the health industry--but to no avail. I am confident that, as sure as I am standing here in front of you today, our health care costs will continue to rise. They will continue to rise because there are now more of us than ever before demanding the best and the most expensive care. We want private rooms with color television sets; we want electric-powered beds; we want every conceivable diagnostic test available. We can get these services, but we must pay for them.

In this light, I wish to suggest to you that if we could truly utilize our health personnel to their fullest capacities, we would be able to provide a better quality of health care to more people at considerably less cost.