

made to pay 25.74 per cent more, or 40.74 per cent more, compared with the old tenants who will pay only 15 per cent more.

This is inequitable. Nor is it necessary for the city to go from one extreme to another in order to give landlords a better return. The landlords have not demonstrated the need for a 9.5 per cent return. No one has demonstrated that they cannot get along with a return midway between 9.5 per cent and the present 6 per cent.

It is wrong for the city to join with landlords to consummate a preposterous squeeze. Where, after all, can the average wage earner tenant go?

SAMUEL APPLEBAUM  
Brooklyn, May 27, 1970

### Gardner's Speech

To the Editor:

There has been considerable confusion surrounding the invitation issued to John Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition, to speak to the Illinois Constitutional Convention. The facts are these:

As president of the Convention, I invited Mr. Gardner to speak on the constitutional implications of the urban crisis. In my judgment, his experience, knowledge and study of urban problems qualified him pre-eminently to help our delegates in considering the kinds of things that should be in a new state constitution that would be responsive to the critical needs of our cities.

It became apparent that Mr. Gardner, after accepting our invitation to discuss this subject, decided that the war in Southeast Asia with all of its ramifications was of much greater concern, and was determined to speak on this broad policy question rather than the subject assigned.

Of course, Mr. Gardner's

views on international and domestic policy are important. The issues concern all of us.

The delegates to the Illinois Constitutional Convention have come to Springfield to prepare a state constitution, not to study, debate and formulate positions on foreign policy.

Mr. Gardner's proposed address had no direct relationship to the deliberations of the convention. The nature and the intensity of Mr. Gardner's remarks actually threatened the spirit of nonpartisanship and the deliberative, studious character of the convention.

Since the convention was obviously an inappropriate forum for Mr. Gardner's released talk, he was asked to respond directly to our invitation by speaking on the urban crisis and constitutional remedies. We offered to help him find access to news media for his broad policy statement outside of the convention.

### Rejected Suggestion

This suggestion was rejected, and Mr. Gardner returned to Washington without addressing our convention.

Reports that Cambodia and other issues not directly involved in our deliberations have been debated at the convention are erroneous. Charges that the action taken was politically motivated are not true.

The action taken reflected a belief that the attention of the convention should be focused exclusively on matters that are the responsibility and concern of the Convention, and that providing a forum for Mr. Gardner's policy statement would be inappropriate, improper and particularly dangerous to the achievement of the first major reform of an Illinois State Convention in one hundred years.

SAMUEL W. WITWER  
President  
Constitutional Convention  
Springfield, Ill., May 25, 1970