His list of civic honors is lengthy. He taught the James Cannon Bible Class at St. John's United Methodist Church for 43 years, also serving terms as a steward and trustee of the church.

His leadership abilities were quickly recognized in all of his endeavors. After serving as president of the Aiken Rotary Club he moved up to the American Legion National post. He was also South Carolina's Legion commander, as well as a national vice commander.

He served at one time as president of the Aiken Business Men's Club and was a Mason and Shriner.

In the field of health, he served three terms as president of the South Carolina Cancer Society and was twice campaign director for the state society. He was also a state and county director of the Tuberculosis Association.

After retiring from the Extension Service in 1957, Mr. Ward served for several years as executive director of the Aiken Chamber of Commerce. He was honored as Aiken's Man of the Year in 1959.

Mr. Ward was a man of exceptional qualities, he was always for, through and after-dinner speaker that he is best remembered by his fellow citizens. Although in demand as a speaker in many parts of the nation, he was always available for worthy causes at home, and he was master of ceremonies for many of the important gatherings in the city until his health failed.

With the death of Mr. Ward could hold his audiences spellbound or subject them to gaules of laughter. His central theme through more than 80 years of public life was one of faith and belief in his fellow man. His death on Saturday is an occasion for sadness in our community and state, and we extend our sympathies to his family.

[From the Augusta (S.C.) Chronicle, Aug. 20, 1974]

AUDLEY H. WARD

Aiken and the state of South Carolina, both of which he loved so well and ably served, are ever so much diminished today for their loss to death over the weekend of Audley H. Ward.

Long known throughout the South as an able and effective speaker, the Florence County, S.C. native was one of the region's most knowledgeable agricultural experts. He served from 1924 to 1957, as the district agent for the Clemson Extension Service.

Always active in public affairs, Audley Ward was past president of the Aiken Rotary Club, past district governor of Rotary International, past president of the Aiken Businessmen's Club, as well as a member of several other civic groups. A long-time member of the Masons, he was elected one of its national vice-commanders in 1951.

Even after retirement, Mr. Ward served for several years as the executive director of the Aiken Chamber of Commerce and was active in both the South Carolina Cancer Society and the Tuberculosis Association. For outstanding service to his community, he was the recipient of the Chamber of Commerce's Man of the Year Award in 1959.

Audley Ward was a man who lent his ability and the weight of his sound judgment to the service of others, and who earned the respect and admiration of all who knew him. He will be missed, not only by his family, but by thousands of friends and associates who had long appreciated his contributions to the advancement of his city, state and nation.

THE PRESIDENTIAL PARDON

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Ford's action on Sunday—pardon- ing former President Nixon—may have been an act of mercy toward Mr. Nixon. But I would like to suggest that it was an unfair, unfortunate, and unethical act toward the American people and toward our system of justice.

Over the past 2 1/2 years, the American people have heard one allegation after another about the activities within the executive branch. And they have come to be known as the Watergate coverup.

They have heard admission after admission—from the lowest "dirty trickster" to the President himself—of questionable, if not illegal, activity by high Government officials.

They have seen conviction after conviction of public servants. And they have listened as the integrity and independence of our law enforcement and regulatory agencies have been called into question.

These charges have struck at the very heart of our Government. They question our basic assumptions and tenets.

To believe that now—after all of this—the American people will settle for anything less than the full truth—complete disclosure of the entirety of Watergate—would be naive and ridiculous underestimation of the intelligence and integrity of the American people.

There is a passage in Richard Nixon's Watergate transcripts which I believe merits rereading. It comes from a conversation on March 15, 1973, between the President and John Dean. The President is discussing Watergate. He says:

"How much of a crisis will it be? . . . The point is, everything is a crisis. . . . It will remain a crisis among the upper intellectual types. . . . It will be a crisis among our own Republicans too, and the Democrats, and the rest. Average people won't think it is much of a crisis unless it affects them.

Here we have one of the more obvious indications of Richard Nixon's underestimation of the intelligence of the American people.

In the telegrams, letters, telephone calls, and personal visits I got after the Saturday Night Massacre, after the Agnew plea, and after the tapes disclosures were any indication, the American people are a lot smarter than Richard Nixon ever thought.

On Sunday, we saw Gerald Ford make the very same mistake—perceiving what the American people want and what they deserve.

They will not tolerate the ultimate Watergate coverup. But that is exactly what Mr. Ford's pardon was. It will keep the truth about Watergate from the American people, possibly forever.

For months now the American people have demanded the truth and we have been seeking the truth. That is what the Senate Watergate Committee was all about; that is what the impeachment inquiry was all about; and that is what the grand juries are all about.

Now that the normal judicial processes have been short-circuited by Mr. Ford's action, our chance to get the truth have been largely eliminated. Let me make one thing clear. We cannot now expect to get the truth about Watergate directly from the former President. We cannot expect a plea accompanied by a disclosure or confession; we cannot expect a trial of the former President for any illegal acts which may have been committed. We can hope only that, at best, some sketchy details may be disclosure at trials of former Nixon associates.

In fact, if Mr. Nixon's statement of Sunday is any indication, all we may ever learn, according to his $2 million biography some years hence, is that he is totally innocent.

In the meantime, the tapes and documents which contain the only real source of the truth remain in the possession of the President. Mr. Nixon can be affected by court order, and also announced Sunday, signed by a Government agency.

Not only is there no right of public access to the truth, there is, in fact, a real possibility that the truth will be destroyed, probably after the publication of Mr. Nixon's "truth telling" biography.

We will not know the truth in order to better legislate remedies to prevent future Watergates.

We will not know the truth in order to avoid this Constitutional record straight on the worst political scandal in American history.

We will not even know what Mr. Ford has pardoned—be it misuse of the CIA and FBI, harassing tax audits, the sale of ambassadships, the compromise of the antitrust laws, or whatever.

Contrary to what Mr. Ford must have thought, I do not believe the American people will stand for it. I believe the American people want the full truth. I believe the only real "national interest" is full disclosure.

Accordingly, I have written to Senator SAM ERVIN, in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, asking that he immediately issue a subpoena for all relevant Nixon tapes and documents to insure that they are presented to the American people.

When he was asked—during his confirmation hearings—about the prospects for a pardon of his predecessor, Mr. Ford said: I do not think the public would stand for it.

Mr. Ford was very right then and is very wrong now.

Not only, however, is Mr. Ford's act the ultimate coverup. It is also the ultimate injustice.

As I drive to the Capitol Building each morning, I see four words written over the portals of the Supreme Court Building—"Equal Justice Under Law." These words are "Equal Justice Under Law."

Among our most basic principles, equality before the law must rank at the very top. It is part of the due process clause of the fifth amendment and the very same mistake—perceiving what Mr. Ford did was wrong.
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Yet, what have the American people seen in this context over the past several months. First, a former Attorney General enters a guilty plea to a minor offense and escapes jail entirely, while admitting lying at his own confirmation hearing about a significant matter of law enforcement. Then, a Vice President of the United States enters a nolo contendere plea to a minor charge and escapes jail, while admitting lying to the American people and, possibly, being part of massive illegal activity. Yet, he too escapes significant punishment. How do we explain to John Dean and all the others who have or will serve sentences for Watergate-related activity that Richard Nixon has a seaside view in San Clemente? How do we explain to those who have public assistance denied to them for minor infractions that Richard Nixon is getting a $60,000 per year pension, an allowance for travel, $60,000 per year for staff salaries, and an allowance for offices? How do we explain to the victims of burglaries, robberies, and other crimes that Richard Nixon is protected by the Executive branch, is in a nolo contendere plea to a minor charge and escapes jail, while admitting lying to the American people and, possibly, being part of massive illegal activity. Yet, he too escapes significant punishment?

Mr. President, the events of Sunday have provoked much critical commentary. I wish to share with my colleagues two of the most thoughtful. They are the editorials from the New York Times and The Minneapolis Tribune, and I believe that they well-express the outrage which many of us feel.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times of September 8, 1974, entitled "The Failure of Mr. Ford" and the editorial of the same date from The Minneapolis Tribune be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From The New York Times, Sept. 8, 1974]

THE FAILURE OF MR. FORD

In giving former President Nixon an inappropriate and premature grant of clemency, President Ford has affronted the Constitution and the American system of justice.
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I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times of September 8, 1974, entitled "The Failure of Mr. Ford" and the editorial of the same date from The Minneapolis Tribune be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From The Minneapolis Tribune, September 9, 1974]

THE FAILURE OF MR. FORD

In giving former President Nixon an inappropriate and premature grant of clemency, President Ford has affronted the Constitution and the American system of justice.
President Ford speaks of compassion. It is tragic that he had no compassion and concern for the Constitution and the Government of law that he has sworn to uphold and defend. There is no single act of a non-criminal nature that would have more gravely damaged the credibility of this Government in the eyes of the world and of its own people than this unconstitutional action.

Rather than calm public passions and restore a fundamental sense of national unity, Mr. Ford has ignited fresh controversy. How better that compassionate is sure to become apparent to the American people as demonstrated by the immediate resignation in protest of the President’s own press secretary, J. T. Fellor, acting as “a matter of conscience.”

Mr. Ford’s action will be enforced without fear or favor. This blundering intervention is a body blow to the American system of justice. It will not only invalidate the Watergate cover-up, but will also destroy the trust that has been engendered in the integrity of the Justice Department’s special prosecutor and his staff by the American people.

Moreover, the arrangement avoids nothing in the way of publicity and public controversy. Presumably, the cover-up trial involving Mr. Nixon’s former aides is still to be held, and he is sure to be called as a witness. He will have to testify at length under oath to all the demeaning details of the cover-up.

Because his pardon has immunized him, he cannot avoid testifying by claiming the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination in appearing as a prosecution witness. He will be compelled to do just that.

We think Mr. Ford was right on August 28—and, on the basis of the words he used in announcing his pardon, wrong yesterday. The House of Representatives has voted to remove Mr. Nixon from his post as President. Only the most unwise and untimely for me to make any commitment. He went on to say that he would not make such a commitment “until the matter reaches me.”

But yesterday, before any formal legal action had been taken, he put into the public domain the announcement that he would offer Richard Nixon a pardon at an appropriate stage of a criminal proceeding. That decision quite properly has rested solely with the judicial branch of the Government. It is explicitly rooted in the Constitution, is clear, and is sweeping.

But, as Mr. Ford himself repeatedly stressed during his August 28 news conference, the question of a pardon should not have been decided until after at least the beginning of a legal process against Nixon. In the absence of any such process, the American people must conclude that Mr. Ford has espoused a double standard of justice—one for ex-presidents and another for the rest of us. The only exception to this rule, Mr. Ford himself repeatedly stressed yesterday, supports the legal process.

Nixon yesterday issued a statement similar to many that he has made before. He admitted no guilt for his role in the Watergate cover-up. In particular, he said he had not acted in a criminal manner. His off-the-cuff comment that Nixon’s health was “threatened” by continued uncertainty over his fate may be the best explanation for why Mr. Ford decided to act now rather than waiting, as he had previously said he would do, until formal legal proceedings had at least begun.

The Ford-Nixon deal has been perplexing for Mr. Ford to short-circuit the judicial process. But if there were, he did not make them sufficiently clear yesterday. If he believed, as the pardoners yesterday, that pardoning Richard Nixon was essential to healing the nation’s political wounds, he owes the country some further explanation. Without it, his action may have precisely the opposite effect.

OKLAHOMA CITY POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, occasionally we see news accounts of some unpleasant incident involving a law enforcement officer who has acted improperly in the performance of his job. I believe such incidents are rare and certainly not indicative of the type of men and women who serve the people so well.

Recently an article appeared in the Daily Oklahoman which described several acts of simple human kindness performed by Oklahoma City police officers. The incidents are both typical and illustrative. Such acts, which usually involve spending money out of their own pockets, are, I believe, much more representative of the character of law enforcement officers and should not go unnoticed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record, as follows:

POLICE LIKE TO HELP BUT WalletS SometimeS Too Thin (By Steve Trolinger)

Imagine the big, tough policeman tenderly—and clumsily—cleaning up an abandoned baby and pinning on a fresh diaper or shelling out money from his own wallet at 3 a.m. so a three-year-old boy and child can have lodging and food.

Such events happen almost daily at the Oklahoma City Police Department.
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