

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 3

FEBRUARY 9, 1970, TO FEBRUARY 19, 1970  
(PAGES 2777 TO 4246)

and record this new discovery. Taxes flow to our schools and to our State and National governments. Our Nation is economically strengthened. Of even more fundamental importance, our National Security is strengthened. In our mobile and highly technical society, oil provides 75 per cent of our Nation's energy. Oil is not a matter of choice with us; it is a matter of survival. There is no security in foreign oil. Our experience with frequently hostile, and always profit-motivated, foreign oil suppliers has taught us how quickly the tap can be closed. We must also recognize that large purchases of foreign oil will add tremendously to our already dangerous balance of payment deficit, weakening our dollar and drawing gold from our very limited reserves.

The domestic oil industry stands at the crossroads. The decisions on oil import quotas or oil tariffs point their deadly edge at the vital heart of the American oil industry. Just how important is this to the average American businessman? First of all, 32 of our 50 states (64 per cent) produce oil and gas. In 1968, the last year in which we have complete figures, the total value of all crude oil produced in the United States was 9.8 billion dollars. When the value of natural gas and natural gas liquids is included, the total value of all petroleum production in 1968 amounted to slightly more than 14 billion dollars. Even by the standards of Washington politicians, this is a tremendous amount of money. The production of crude oil in the United States in 1968 averaged 9,095,000 barrels per day. This is an increase of 36 per cent during the past ten years. The consumption during 1968 was at an all-time high and amounted to 13,081,000 barrels per day or 44 per cent higher than just ten years earlier in 1958. The ever-increasing demand requires a more dynamic domestic oil industry if our Nation's needs are to be met and if National Security is to be served.

We all drive a good deal. During 1968, highway travel in the United States exceeded one trillion vehicle miles, the equivalent of more than two million round trips to the moon. America is a nation on wheels. We must be assured of a secure source of oil energy to keep the wheels of national progress turning.

I have been privileged to serve as a Regent at New Mexico State University. I am keenly aware of the crying needs of education to meet the skyrocketing demands of increasingly heavy student loads of today. Education in New Mexico is one of the principal beneficiaries of the New Mexico oil industry. Our schools would be bankrupted by a drop in crude oil prices for New Mexico. The domestic oil industry gives direct income to our State of from 80 to 100 million dollars annually. When this is compared with current State appropriations of approximately 225 million dollars annually, it is easy to see just how important the production of oil and gas is to the State of New Mexico. Every citizen of our State has a vested interest in a healthy petroleum industry. The education of our children is seriously threatened. Our teachers and school administrators would be among the first to feel the impact of any drop in the value of crude oil. Chaos in the financial affairs of our State would follow any downward adjustment of crude prices. It would then be necessary to turn to our hard-pressed taxpayers to make up such lost revenue. The tax climate for industrial development in New Mexico would put us low on any list as a site for new plant development.

The Editor of the Wall Street Journal expresses some of the foggy thinking in regard to the oil business. He classes domestic producers as inefficient and claims that our industry will find it hard to persuade the public that it should pay subsidies to keep such firms in business. The average producers and refiners receive 12 to 13 cents per gallon

for high grade gasoline. In a high risk search for oil, I suggest that such a price for gasoline could hardly be classed as a subsidy.

Bottled drinking water costs 40 cents per gallon while crude oil brings the oil man about 8 cents or less per gallon. If oil were valued the same as drinking water, a barrel of oil would be worth \$16.80.

Our newspapers are filled with alarming stories about imminent gas shortages. This threat is fact and not fiction. Yet, drilling for oil is an integral part of finding gas reserves necessary to meet these soaring demands. A drop in crude oil prices would seriously impair discovery of much needed gas reserves.

Oil has participated to a minimum amount in the spiralling prices that face our consumers. Oil is subject to an alarming increase in cost of doing business. New England politicians, the same who demand the destruction of the domestic oil industry, cry for protective import legislation to protect shoes and textiles. All United States business is guilty of running up the cost of our products through paying the highest labor scale and making possible the highest living standard of any nation in the world. If the consumer must be protected by rolling back prices, then let such an adjustment be across the board. Let all United States industries adjust not only their prices, but their costs, downward through some national price and wage controls. I think we will all agree that we can make the old shoes or the old suit last, but none of us can get along without gasoline, natural gas, or lubricants.

Don't let the politician fool you with his sleight-of-tongue antics pointed at the consumer vote. Every citizen in these United States has far more to lose than he has to gain through reducing the price of crude oil. It is already one of our greatest bargains! The domestic oil industry is mandatory for not only our economic health, but for our National Security.

I earnestly recommend that you contact the President, the Cabinet Task Force, and your congressional delegation regarding this vital matter.

Sincerely yours,

R. R. ASTON.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in further support of what I and Mr. Aston and many others have been saying about the dangers of becoming dependent on insecure and unreliable foreign sources of cheaply produced crude oil products, the current issue of the Oil and Gas Journal carried an excellent editorial entitled "Arab militants No. 1 exhibit for strong U.S. oil industry."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**ARAB MILITANTS NO. 1 EXHIBIT FOR STRONG U.S. OIL INDUSTRY**

Leaders of Arab states meeting in Cairo unwittingly have done the U.S. domestic oil industry a service.

Timing of their militant threats to "liquidate" vital U.S. oil investments in the Middle East was unbelievable. The threats came on the same day the White House acknowledged the President officially has received the controversial and often revised task force report on a new oil-import policy.

The Arab threat should do more than all the sophisticated arguments oilmen can marshal to show the President the danger of putting this nation at the mercy of foreign oil.

The Arab gathering, it's true, includes the heads of only five Middle East countries—Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and Sudan.

These are the most violently resentful of

U.S. ties to Israel, the ones promoting war, and the ones with the least to lose. Only Iraq has a sizeable oil industry. Egypt has a growing one. Syria has some oil. Jordan and Sudan have none.

The major oil-producing Arab nations where U.S. companies have vast interests—Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Libya—were not represented at Cairo. Their absence is significant. They know that without oil production and ready markets in the West, their economies would be a shambles. They aren't apt willingly to disturb such a profitable arrangement. That's partly why Saudi Arabia and Kuwait are willing to pay out \$252 million in aid each year to keep the economies of Egypt and Jordan from collapsing and spreading a revolutionary virus across their own borders.

There still is real danger, though, from the Cairo threats. They are another disturbing force in a politically unstable area.

Terrorists, inspired by the declaration, easily could play havoc with key oil pipelines, terminals, and producing facilities—even in nations tied to the West by profitable oil markets.

Cairo-inspired revolutions also could upset friendly governments. The oil could be denied to the West even against the best interests of all concerned.

The Cairo declaration, thus, holds double meaning for this country.

It emphasizes the necessity for President Nixon to continue his efforts to stabilize the Israeli-Arab shooting and strive for an ultimate settlement. Humanitarian as well as the economic considerations force a peacemaking role on the U.S.

It also illustrates the folly of any new import policy that cripples this country's oil industry and makes America dependent on unreliable foreign sources for such a basic and vital commodity.

The importance of secure oil surely cannot be lost on President Nixon as he ponders import recommendations of the cabinet task force.

**THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY**

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of interest expressed in S. 3137, a bill which I introduced with wide bipartisan cosponsorship, to make it possible to lower tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Naturally, the Great Lakes ports favor such legislation. I placed a very challenging editorial from the Duluth News Tribune of November 14 in the RECORD of November 21, 1969. I have received a number of communications from Great Lakes ports and associations in support of this bill. As an example, I call to the attention of my colleagues a letter from the Maritime Council of the Port of Milwaukee.

I am pleased to report that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in a November 29, 1969, editorial, endorsed the Seaway bill. This editorial, entitled "To Unchain the Seaway," underscores my belief that help for the seaway is not merely a regional matter. And it need not hurt any other region of the country. As the Post-Dispatch noted:

After all, the \$120,000,000 was invested for what it promised to do for the United States in shipping and trade, and the possibilities in those respects dwarf the capital outlays. Canada has made use of the Seaway to become the world's biggest grain exporting nation. . . .

The Wall Street Journal of December 12, also contained a very interesting analysis which points up both the seaway's

potential and its problems. In an article entitled "Dire Straits" the Journal cited a case where a shipment of power transformers from Oil City, Pa., to Le Havre, France, cost the shipper \$1,387 through Cleveland, compared with \$2,232 by rail to New York and then to France.

There are numerous instances where this kind of economy may be the difference between making an overseas sale or losing it to a foreign supplier whose delivered prices is lower. But there are forces at work to deny the seaway its potential. As the Journal also noted—

It costs nine times as much per mile . . . to ship steel silos by train from Kankakee, Illinois, to Chicago than from Kankakee, Illinois to New York.

This kind of discriminatory rate structure, inexplicably sanctioned by the Interstate Commerce Commission, artificially raises the cost of certain goods which could otherwise be shipped at very attractive costs via the seaway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter, editorial and article referred to above be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARITIME COUNCIL,

Milwaukee, Wis., December 17, 1969.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Maritime Council of the Port of Milwaukee is composed of about 40 companies and individuals, engaged in various aspects of foreign trade or maritime activities, and all related to shipping and commerce via the St. Lawrence Seaway trade route. The economic success of our members, and of the Port of Milwaukee, is related, of course, to the degree of success achieved in moving large volumes of trade via the Seaway.

We therefore commend you and your 14 colleagues in the Senate for the introduction of S-3137 "St. Lawrence Seaway Amendments of 1969." We support this legislation as facing realistically the fiscal problems of the Seaway, in the light of the rigid demands of the 1954 Seaway enabling Act.

At its last meeting, the Maritime Council acted to support S-3137. In addition, the Council declares its support for Amendments to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 including (a) defining the Great Lakes as a seacoast within the meaning of Section 809 of the Act and (b) removing ambiguities of language which can be interpreted to preclude ships in the Great Lakes—overseas trade from eligibility for operating differential subsidies.

We are also communicating these judgments by our Council to the Secretary of Transportation, and to the Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, for consideration in the preparation of future plans and programs.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS T. PFEIL,  
President, Maritime Council,  
Port of Milwaukee.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,  
Nov. 29, 1969]

TO UNCHAIN THE SEAWAY

Senator Mondale of Minnesota is proposing to allow the St. Lawrence Seaway Corp. to write off the United States' capital investment of \$120,000,000 in developing the Seaway, and he advances some cogent arguments on grounds of fairness and optimum usefulness. He points out that the Government made capital outlays of \$56,000,000 in

the Gulf Intercoastal Waterway, \$62,000,000 in the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet, and \$33,000,000 in the Houston Ship Channel without requiring any one of them to repay the investment. To treat the St. Lawrence Seaway otherwise, as Congress has done, he maintains is discriminatory.

The Seaway Corp. has paid the U.S. Government \$33,000,000 in interest since it began operations 10 years ago but is \$12,500,000 in arrears on interest charges alone, short of repayment on principal. The reason is that tolls, which were expected to sustain repayment with interest, have been smaller than anticipated, while operating expenses have been larger.

If tolls were ever to repay the investment the Seaway Corp. would have to increase them 30 to 60 per cent, Senator Mondale argues. But that hope is illusory, he says, because traffic would be driven off to Eastern railroads and Atlantic ports. These interests have all along fought to prevent maximum use of the Seaway.

The Eisenhower Administration, which can claim credit for finally developing a United States share of the Seaway, was parsimonious toward natural resources in general, and that attitude diluted its accomplishment on the St. Lawrence. Our country shared too little of the cost in comparison with Canada and laid burdens on the operating corporation so heavy they are proving insuperable.

After all, the \$120,000,000 was invested for what it promised to do for the United States in shipping and trade, and the possibilities in those respects dwarf the capital outlay. Canada has made use of the Seaway to become the world's biggest grain exporting nation; the United States has taken so little advantage of the new opportunities that it has lost even more inter-lake traffic than Canada has gained.

The overriding consideration, it seems plain to us, is what measures are necessary to bring about full realization of the potential advantages offered by the Seaway. To that end, we believe Senator Mondale is right in proposing to abandon the requirement of repayment, which is unlikely to occur in any event.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 12,  
1969]

DIRE STRAITS: ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY, COMPLETING 10TH YEAR, IS AWASH IN PROBLEMS—ITS TRAFFIC IS OFF, DEBT IS UP AND IT IS GETTING OBSOLETE; SOME SHIPS CURTAIL RUNS—STEEL SILOS TRAVEL BY RAIL

(By Jim Hyatt)

CLEVELAND.—The last ocean-going vessel leaves the St. Lawrence Seaway this weekend, ending the 2,300-mile water route's 10th season of operation. It has not been a very good year.

For the St. Lawrence Seaway, heralded a decade ago as a "second Mediterranean" or a "fourth seacoast" for the U.S., is a flop at this point. Shippers shun it. Shipbuilders curse it. Ship operators ignore it. It is deeply in debt, in disrepair and almost obsolete. Its traffic this year probably will be the lowest since 1964, and some people worry about its future.

"The seaway won't be shut down," insists one backer of the project. And then he adds, "But it may just go to pot."

The seaway, a joint U.S.-Canadian project that cost \$500 million to build, is an engineering wonder. A channel-and-lock system that bypasses rapids lifts ships 600 feet from the time they enter the seaway at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River in the Atlantic Ocean to the time they reach Lake Superior.

WHAT WENT WRONG?

A big ship can make the trip from the Atlantic to Duluth in eight days, and about the only problem the seaway builders envisioned was one of traffic jams as everybody rushed to use the wondrous new route. They

pictured huge ocean-going vessels docking in such previously landlocked places as Chicago, Milwaukee and Cleveland. They figured seaway ships, with their low rates, would take cargo away from the railroad. They saw vast markets opening up for Midwestern-made goods, and they saw the Midwest being showered with foreign-made manufactures transported cheaply to its doorstep by ship.

But none of these things has come to pass. The main problem, say people who are expert in the affairs of the seaway, is that everybody underestimated the difficulty of persuading shippers to abandon rail transport for moving goods to and from East Coast ports. So insignificant is the seaway's presence here in Cleveland, for example, that the Port of Cleveland handles only 3% of the goods manufactured for export in the area.

"It's like water wearing away rock," complains Richard Shultz, executive director of the Port Authority of Cleveland.

All told, seaway ships carried about 40 million tons of cargo this year, it's estimated, off sharply from the 48 million tons of 1968. Seaway officials attribute part of the decline to a strike of iron-ore workers in Canada, but some observers say the total would have been down even without the strike. The 1968 total was up from 1967 but was below the peak of 49.2 million tons of 1966. The dearth of business is causing some American-flag carriers to cut back on their seaway operations and some have indicated they might pull out of the Great Lakes entirely. "We can't cruise like a taxicab looking for business," asserts one shipping official. "The cargo just isn't there."

BEWARE OF MUD

Scarcity of cargo isn't the shipping lines' only complaint. Until recently, they maintain, many seaway ports weren't dredged to the maximum 27-foot depth of the rest of the seaway. What's more, they say, that 27-foot depth is no longer enough. Many old ships would get stuck in the mud if they came into the seaway fully loaded, and some new ships don't have a chance. New container-ships under construction have 33-foot drafts—and are 10 feet too wide for the 80-foot locks. Estimates of the cost to modernize the seaway to handle these big new ships range up to \$5 billion.

The decline in traffic on the seaway could turn into a vicious cycle. The shipping lines say they want to cut service because the shippers don't have much to ship. And shippers say one reason they don't use the seaway much is that the number of ships available is decreasing, making schedules erratic.

In mid-October, for instance, Lubrizol Corp. of Cleveland needed quick shipment to Liverpool, England, of 150 drums of a petroleum additive. But the next possible sailing from Cleveland was three weeks off, and even then a ship would call here only if enough cargo were available to make a stop worthwhile. So the company spent an added \$1,000 to ship the drums by rail to New York, where they were loaded on a ship scheduled to arrive in Liverpool two days before the earliest date any ship might show up in Cleveland.

Anchor Hocking Corp. of Lancaster, Ohio, says it has halved its seaway tonnage in recent years because of the haphazard sailing schedules.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN 2009?

The less tonnage hauled, the more the seaway falls in debt. The seaway is committed to repaying the U.S. and Canada its capital costs as well as to meeting its operating expenses. Legislation requires this capital to be repaid by the year 2009, but based on current traffic projections and present tolls the seaway will instead be \$821 million in debt by then, according to Sen. Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota.

Sen. Mondale thinks the seaway's only problem is its commitment to repay its capital costs. "The financial framework of the seaway is unfair and unreasonable and discriminates against the nation's fourth seacoast," he states. At the moment, the seaway is \$20 million behind in debt payments, and one congressman says it is "dangerously close to going bankrupt."

Sen. Mondale and some other members of Congress think that the U.S. should cancel the existing debt and that the seaway should simply be required to turn over to the Treasury any money it takes in beyond its operating costs. Such a proposal doesn't sit well with everyone. "Holy hell will break loose" if pro-seaway members try to eliminate the debt, asserts one source who favors the Eastern ports.

Another solution, of course, would be to increase tolls, and Sen. Mondale fears possible 30% to 60% rises. But Leonard Goodsell, executive director of the Great Lakes Commission, an association of officials of Midwestern states, says an increase of only 10% would "knock us out of a lot of world markets."

It's questionable, however, how many markets there are to be knocked out of. In an appraisal of the seaway, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce says: "Neither the fear that the seaway would allow foreign manufacturers to flood the markets of the St. Lawrence Basin nor the hope that it would enable producers there to greatly expand their markets has been realized."

At the moment, the seaway tolls do provide some real bargains. One example: A recent shipment of power transformers from Oil City, Pa., to LeHavre, France, cost the shipper \$1,387 a ton through Cleveland, compared with \$2,232 a ton had the transformers been shipped by rail to New York and then to France. Rail rates for some goods, however, are designed to encourage use of East Coast ports, as seaway backers see it. It costs nine times as much per mile, for instance, to ship steel silos by train from Kankakee, Ill., to Chicago than from Kankakee to New York.

Seaway officials cite the high rail rates to Great Lakes port as just one of the problems they are fighting. They also complain that Congress has blocked the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. from using any funds for advertising and promotion. This ban means the seaway is "operating with its hands tied behind its back," asserts H. D. Doan, president of Dow Chemical Co. and chairman of the seaway's 10th anniversary observance.

### THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, on November 14, 1969, my good friend and honored colleague, Judge Harry T. Alexander, delivered a forceful and moving address before the Phi Alpha Delta International Law Fraternity.

Judge Alexander traced the history of legitimate and responsible dissent in this country—from the Declaration of Independence, through the Constitution and the various amendments thereto, through the abolitionists' crusade and the Supreme Court decisions which sought to affirm, once and for all, the rights of all Americans. He noted, rightly and sadly, that we still have a long way to go. But he urged that, like our forefathers, we have the courage to act—in education, in housing, in recreation—in all the areas where men are not yet quite equal or quite free.

This remarkable speech has a message for all of us. It is a call to action within the law. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous

consent that the full text be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### REMARKS OF JUDGE HARRY T. ALEXANDER

Mr. Justice, officers, members and brothers of Phi Alpha Delta International, let me say at the outset, I am humbly proud of my recently conferred honorary membership in this great organization. It is a wonderful feeling to join with such national and international talent in order to foster the precepts of our fraternity: to serve the student, to serve the law school, and to serve the profession. It was this feeling, coupled with the Supreme Court's decision of October 29, 1969, in *Beatrice Alexander, et al. v. Holmes County Board of Education, et al.*, that dictated the acceptance of Mr. Justice Bogg's request to participate tonight in the inns of court program, and to speak to you tonight upon a very vital issue—the right to dissent.

With all that has been written upon this subject, the right to dissent, with all that has been spoken on the issue, I could feel, perhaps, and should feel like the eighty year old gentleman the judge mistakenly sentenced to jail for fifty years, for the unlikely crime of rape. The kindly looking octogenarian asked the court "Did you say fifty years?" The judge stery replied, "Yes I did." The gentleman's candid reply was "your honor, I won't live that long." The judge retorted, "Do the best you can." So under the circumstances, That is what I am going to attempt to do—the best I can.

Today the moral conscience of the country is aroused. Tomorrow November 15, 1969, the moral conscience of the country will be aroused. It doesn't take imagination to conclude that the country is divided into two camps. The issue which causes some on both sides to heap or display righteous indignation, of course, is the war in Vietnam.

We must remember that both camps enjoy the protection of the Constitution of the United States in their right to dissent. Those who dissent from the position of our national policy are no less protected by the Constitution, just as the so-called silent majority in its right to support our national policy, or in other words, for the right to dissent from the dissenters.

This division of camps is evident from demonstrations at the White House, the Capitol, and the Pentagon as well, just as it has been obvious from the campus unrest all over our land. Just recently on the October 15th moratorium day—100,000 people assembled in Boston, 30,000 passed the White House, 12,000 assembled in Chicago, and 250,000 gathered in New York. Life magazine carried the story "America Gathers Under a Sign of Peace." And this occurred as we say from Maine to Florida, and from Massachusetts to California. It included men and women of all walks of life, from students to Ph. D's, from professors to businessmen, from lawyers to doctors, from atheists to clergy, Christians and Jews. It occurred at large colleges and small, great universities and the not so great.

More recently, the right to dissent was given expression on Veterans' Day when 10,000 to 15,000 people assembled at the monument to support our national policy on Vietnam—to dissent from the dissenters. Its expression tomorrow is expected to be made by some 150,000 to 200,000 in the Nation's Capital, and some 200,000 in California, as America once again exercises the right to dissent in the form of a moratorium.

The issue today can not be whether they have the right to dissent. The right has been clearly established, protected by the Constitution, and implemented by the Supreme Court—in countless cases, from the clear and present danger test of *Schenck* (1919) and

*Gillow* (1925), through Smith Act violations in *Dennis*, (1951), to the black arm band Vietnam protest in *Tinker v. Des Moines* (1969).

We know, too, that the precious right is not absolute. What Justice Holmes observed in *Schenck* is still true today:

"The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theatre and causing panic. It does not even protect a man from an injunction against uttering words that have all the effect of force . . ."

And let me hasten to add, this great right certainly does not include the right to assassinate a President; to kill a Nobel Prize winner, or make a martyr of a Senator. Nor does it include a right to otherwise do violence or injury to person or property. And as Justice Rutledge said, when he restated the clear and present danger test in *Whitney v. California*, (1927):

"But, although the right of free speech and assembly are fundamental, they are not in their nature absolute. Their exercise is subject to restriction, if the particular restriction proposed is required in order to protect the state from destruction or from serious injury, political, economic or moral."

Under the mandate laid down by the Supreme Court and our United States court of appeals, our government has, once again, recently recognized the right to dissent, evidenced in the issuance of permits for the present moratorium. I want you to know, I am not here to discuss that highly technical and political issue. Under our tripartite system of government, the legislative, executive and judicial branches are separate entities. Where political matters are concerned, there can be no greater necessity for application of this principle than in matters of politics. I do assert my belief, however, that neither President Johnson nor President Nixon have desired to harm our country, nor any of its citizens. I also believe that they, like proponents and opponents, want peace and the return of our soldiers, sailors and marines to their homes. However, I would like to discuss with you what seems to me to be the history of the right to dissent and in what channels the vast energies of dissent ought to be directed.

Born out of revolt from England, predicated upon sheer disgust with the intolerable conditions of colonialism, guided by freedom loving men of justice and equality, through eternities of sweat, blood and tears, we can truly say that our entire country was built on the right to dissent.

Hence, as I see it, the first great dissent is the Declaration of Independence. Although it is the second paragraph of that beautiful document which is oft-times quoted in the familiar passage that we know so well, as it begins, "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness", it is really the first paragraph that sets the tone of the dissent in the following words:

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

After setting forth these principles which impelled the representatives of the United States to issue the declaration; and having charged the king of Great Britain with a history of repeated "injuries and usurpations"; and having further charged him with the establishment of an absolute tyranny over the States, the framers of the Declaration, the framers of the First Great Dissent,