

general. However, in view of Senator Hoagland's offered amendment and the discussion there are a couple of things that I feel I cannot allow to pass without commenting on. When you are dealing in international relations, you should have an understanding of the powers bestowed on the President by the Constitution and laws of this country. There were some senators who felt that the President could not take action unilaterally with reference to a certain treaty with a certain country that I won't mention because it might bring about additional confusion. These senators went to court and they learned something that they probably already knew. There are things which the President can do, which the President will do regardless of what the Legislature of this or any other state will say, regardless in some instances of what a majority of the Congress will say, and in some instances the President is given that power by the Constitution. You run the risk whenever you elect people to office of electing a fool, a clown, a jackass or a scoundrel as happened in the last case with Nixon and he may have been all of them, but nevertheless whoever fills that office is in power to use every authority reposed in that office by the Constitution and laws of this country. The only time this Legislature becomes concerned about an issue is when it is touching people's pocketbooks personally. Now there have been many times when there have been perfunctory ratifications of resolutions, passing resolutions the contents of which nobody could even recite after voting in favor of it. When we talk on this floor now about losses to the state, the state as an entity is not losing anything. There are certain interests and individuals in the state who may stand at a future time to lose some money. There were employees with Chrysler who had to agree to take a loss in terms of what they had been made to expect to receive in order that that company could continue to operate. When you are in business there are risks to be undertaken. Perhaps what is being shown now by this recent situation along with that of oil and other natural resources of a country, and land is a natural resource of the country, and should belong to all of the people and not a few for exploitation and personal profit, that other countries which nationalize the natural resources of that country are in a much better position to meet the changing conditions in the world and the vagaries of the population changes within a country itself. You wouldn't find Saudi Arabia turning its oil reserves over to a few conspiring grasping companies that would sacrifice the welfare of the country itself for the sake of profit. When you have the potential of a third world war with a country which will threaten to bury this country and have the military means to do it and the will to carry it out, you should realize that