

UNITED STATES

*U.S. Congress.*



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 26

OCTOBER 9, 1973 TO OCTOBER 17, 1973

(PAGES 33229 TO 34550)

ation at these reservoir sites in valleys now seen by only the heartiest of hikers and back packers.

We must keep our perspective. We must set and hold to priorities in developing our water resources. In the instance of Bonneville, it is regretted that there must be any change in the contours of a few hundred acres of our land, in the rush of water in our streams, in the habitat of our wildlife. But this must happen to allow us to provide more water for the people who live in our towns and cities, for our industries, for supplemental irrigation water in areas of low agricultural income, for growing more food to meet a frightening worldwide food shortage. First things must come first.

The last paragraph of the letter many of you are being asked to send to Secretary Morton suggests that there are "ample alternatives" to the Bonneville project. I do not know what they are. We must develop and put to beneficial use every drop of water we have within the State of Utah if the State is to have a future. We must develop and put to use Colorado River water, underground water, water from every little stream and backyard well. Until we find an alternative to water, there is no alternative in Utah to full development of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries—our greatest single source of water.

The Bonneville Unit Plan was adopted in good faith by the people of Utah and it has become the basis for contracts and agreements with the Federal Government, and between various interests concerned, including the Central Utah Water Conservancy District, the Salt Lake County Water Conservancy District, the Ute Indian Tribe and the State of Utah.

Construction has been brought to a standstill by the present controversy. To require that Bonneville be restudied, re-evaluated and reformulated—to be held up for any length of time whatsoever now or in the future—would be catastrophic.

I ask my colleagues to disregard any request that may come to them to write the Secretary of the Interior to hold up the Bonneville Unit for further study, and I ask for your support in getting this most important, this most indispensable project, moving again. We do not start anew; we only continue what is now underway.

Earlier today the Governor of Utah and the entire Utah congressional delegation visited Secretary Morton with this unanimous urgent request.

#### THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH STATEMENT ON WATERGATE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently, the executive committee of the Board of Church and Society in the United Methodist Church issued a statement on Watergate and the moral crisis it has precipitated.

I commend this frank, forthright statement to my colleagues as the expression of deep concern by one important church group. It should serve to make us even more concerned with the

need to restore accountability to our Government and to reform many institutions in our Government to help insure that we never again experience another Watergate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the board's statement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

#### WATERGATE—1973

(The following statement is addressed to the members and congregations of the United Methodist Church by the Executive Committee of the Board of Church and Society for their earnest consideration and study.)

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The Watergate events constitute a serious moral crisis for the nation. Too many citizens cynically accept these events as normal and traditional political exercises. We cannot agree. We are appalled at the kind of mentality that justifies burglary in the name of national security, encourages federal harassment of citizens if on a list of enemies, that frustrates the electoral process with dirty tricks and political corruption. This is not "politics as usual." For it is doubtful that we can find anywhere in American history government corruption of such magnitude.

Although, as a Christian body, we acknowledge the need to temper judgment with mercy, we must declare our moral outrage over the Watergate break-in, its cover-up, and other illegal or unethical campaign-related activities. These events confirm our belief in the strong probability of corruption among those who exercise excessive power.

The 1972 General Conference of our United Methodist Church declared: "A free citizenry in a democracy is dependent upon access to accurate information in order to arrive at an informed opinion." And: "The Christian faith stresses the dignity of and respect for human personality. Invasion of the privacy of an ordinary citizen of society negates this dignity and respect. Further, the Christian faith is supportive of a society which elicits hope and trust, not a society that foments fear and threatens oppression."

We in the churches may have mixed feelings about Watergate—moments of righteous anger, moments of shame, moments of compassion for its victims and their families, moments of disgust at those obsessed by power, moments of pride that the system has thus far survived a constitutional crisis, moments of wondering if any reforms or safeguards can protect the political process against perverse manipulations.

At the same time we must admit our common guilt for what is currently ailing the body politic.

Some of us are tempted to relish the plight of those we dislike, to focus on the sins of others whose faults are unable to escape public scrutiny while ours remain in unpublicized oblivion.

We confess that sometimes our own loyalty to institutions and leadership takes precedence over the principles we profess.

We acknowledge that too long have we tolerated an electoral process that places candidates for high office under compromising obligation to special interests.

#### II. OUR CONCERN OVER WATERGATE EVENTS

Nevertheless, we are greatly disturbed about specific aspects of Watergate and surrounding events:

That certain persons high in the White House staff and the Committee to Re-elect the President thought it so important to re-elect President Nixon that they deceived the

American public, and made an informed and responsible election decision impossible.

That the basic rights of all citizens were endangered through illegal wiretapping and criminal burglary carried out in the name of "national security."

That deliberate obstruction of justice was justified for the sake of entrenchment in power.

That independent agencies, such as the FBI and CIA, were pressured into partial cooperation with the illegal aims of Executive staff.

That campaign contributions, received as a public trust, were diverted into payment for commission of criminal acts, for legal defense and hush money, and for the performance of "dirty tricks."

That corporations and individuals, in a dangerous form of political extortion, were coerced into making substantial illegal contributions under the fear of reprisals and in order to maintain influence within government.

In the course of the Watergate hearings, we have also been disturbed by the use of language to minimize the full character of many illegal or immoral acts performed. For instance, the term "national security" has been used to cover domestic actions taken out of partisan political consideration and without regard to any substantiated foreign threat. Further, we are concerned about euphemisms where burglary becomes "sur-reptitious entry," breaking and entering become "intelligence-gathering operations," and government-sponsored crimes are called "White House horrors."

There are many things that we still do not know or understand about Watergate:

What pressures were brought upon the House Banking and Currency Committee to prevent its members from holding hearings on Watergate in August of 1972, hearings that might have informed the American electorate regarding the affair before the Presidential elections?

What, if anything, did the President know regarding the Watergate cover-up before being informed about it on March 21, 1973?

How could the President be shielded so completely from knowledge of the cover-up when many of his aides and daily associates were actively conspiring to "keep the lid on?"

Who in the White House authorized the burglary of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office to gain access to confidential medical records?

Yet we do know that the Watergate cover-up was effective and that, by the obstruction of justice and with the help of perjured testimony, the lid was kept on until well after the election in November 1972.

We do know that the President's political associates, inside and outside the White House, became deeply involved, not only in covering up the Watergate break-in, but also in other deplorable activities tending to subvert our democratic political institutions.

We do know that a thorough attempt was made by Presidential aides to keep the information on the cover-up from the American public.

Those responsible for such flagrant wrongdoing should be prosecuted for violations of the law. Yet they are entitled, as are all Americans citizens, to the full safeguards of the judicial process. Any extenuating circumstances should be given consideration in particular cases.

#### III. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Watergate and surrounding events make clear to us that at least three national governmental reforms are in order: (1) the American political system must be improved; (2) the accessibility of the President must be effectively increased; and (3) certain powers being currently exercised by the office of the President must be examined as to their constitutional basis.

*The Political System:* The Executive Committee of the Board of Church and Society

registers its support of the following measures:

Strict limitations on the amount an individual or organization may contribute to the political campaign of any given candidate or party.

A carefully devised form of public financing for a substantial part of national election campaign costs.

Only one campaign committee to be eligible to receive both public and private contributions for each candidate.

An independent Federal Elections Commission with the power to enforce as well as monitor election laws.

Development of checks and safeguards to keep the Executive branch from using the instruments of government power to attack political adversaries.

Elimination of the use of wiretapping and electronic surveillance by public authorities without a specific court order, as an unwarranted invasion of privacy in line with the Supreme Court's ruling.

Strengthening the independent agencies so as to enable them to withstand improper pressures, whether by the Executive branch of the federal government, by Congress, or by any special interest group.

Establishing effective Congressional oversight of the FBI and the CIA, both in regard to budget and expenditures and in regard to policy and operations.

*Accessibility of the President:* We offer the following suggestions with respect to making the office of the President more open:

(1) Presidents should be expected to meet with the press in open dialogue at least monthly.

(2) Presidents, in order to keep appropriately in touch with the American people, should be willing to meet personally, from time to time, with responsible representatives from the various major segments of society.

(3) Members of the President's Cabinet and agency heads should be expected to appear regularly as requested before the Congress and its respective Committees and be subject to questioning regarding the policies and performance of their departments and agencies.

*The Constitutional Powers of the Presidency:* The Constitution was initially formulated to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility . . . promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty . . ." Historically the church has found itself staunchly in support of such high purposes and we now affirm our continuing faith in the validity of these lofty principles.

When the President takes the oath of office he (she) affirms that "I . . . will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." Under the Constitution the office of the President, including the White House staff, is subject to the laws of the country.

In light of the provisions of the First Amendment, the office of the President should not be permitted to use bureaucratic means to silence the criticism or compel the support of journalists, political enemies, or corporate executives. No executive privilege inherent in the Constitution was meant to protect such self-serving use of power.

Further, under the Fourth Amendment, the President, in the absence of a grave emergency presenting a "clear and present danger," should not have the authority to abrogate "the right of the people to be secure . . . against unreasonable searches and seizures. . . ." Surreptitious entry should never be justified in domestic affairs on the basis of some vague doctrine of national security. The President should not be placed upon a pedestal, somehow above the law. We urge that the Congress share in the responsibility for interpretation of what may or may not be done in the name of national security.

We recognize the doctrine of "separation of powers" as provided for by our Constitu-

tion. Yet we do not believe that such a doctrine can rightfully be invoked to prevent Presidential documents from being surrendered to the courts or to the Congress when criminal acts may be involved. Therefore, we respectfully urge the President to provide access to the pertinent papers and tapes, with appropriate safeguards for any necessary confidentiality, in order that there may be an objective determination as to whether any wrongdoing has been committed.

The overwhelming majority of our citizens respect and honor the office of President and want to be able to have confidence in the incumbent. The maintenance of that confidence will be determined largely by the continuing conduct, accessibility, and accountability of the President.

The President said he assumes "full responsibility" for the campaign abuses that have taken place in connection with Watergate and surrounding events. He feels we should leave Watergate to the courts and "get on with the job that needs to be done." But how does one assume responsibility for events by turning one's back on them? How can a President assume responsibility and yet dissociate himself from the improprieties of his own staff?

Instead of putting it all behind us and drawing the curtain of half-knowledge, we need to ask what it means to "assume responsibility" and to "learn the important lessons of Watergate." We believe that assuming responsibility means doing everything possible to bring out the truth; it means supporting specific campaign reforms; it means selecting White House personnel who will uphold the honor of the office and place themselves under the just restraints of constitutional authority. But it also means that all American citizens must become more deeply involved in the electoral process.

In any event, it is our earnest hope and fervent prayer that the God of history who stands above the destinies of all states and persons will lead our nation in the days ahead toward a more open government, a more responsible citizenry, and a new awakening of conscience for all.—Adopted by the Executive Committee, Board of Church and Society, the United Methodist Church, September 18, 1973.

#### AFRICAN DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, many of us are aware of the terrible tragedy that has struck the six nations of the Sahel region of West Africa. Massive famine now threatens millions of people in this region, because of prolonged drought, and already large numbers have starved to death or died from diseases they have been made susceptible to by extreme malnutrition.

It has been estimated that the 24 million people of this area, during this year, may lose 60 percent of their cattle and 50 percent of their grain harvest. Only an outstanding multilateral relief effort, in which the United States has actively participated, has saved millions from starvation already.

During the August recess I traveled to one of the drought stricken countries, Upper Volta, in order to determine the extent of the drought and to view the relief efforts for myself. It is difficult for us who live comfortable lives to conceive of the suffering and anguish that exists in the poorest parts of the world.

A visit such as I undertook must strengthen anyone's resolve to back strongly the new foreign aid program by broad functions and to oppose an inward looking policy or to avert our eyes from

the needs of our fellow men. I am greatly encouraged by the passage by the Senate last week of the new foreign aid bill, which would emphasize agricultural production, population planning, and health, precisely those areas of need so evident on my visit to Upper Volta.

I have cosponsored a bill, S. 2241, with Senators HUMPHREY, MCGEE, PEARSON, and KENNEDY, that would authorize \$30 million for relief and rehabilitation in the six West African Sahel countries of Upper Volta, Mali, Senegal, Chad, Niger, and Mauritania. This is a necessary step to provide funds for the relief effort and begin long-range plans to rehabilitate the drought area. The United States has already provided \$4.7 million in fiscal year 1973 for disaster relief in the area, and an additional amount of about \$5 million is projected for use in fiscal year 1974.

I arrived in Ouagadougou, the capital of Upper Volta, on the morning of August 29, 1973. On my arrival I visited an airdrop bagging operation at the airport. U.S. Peace Corps volunteers, local and Red Cross volunteers were loading planes in preparation for dropping sorghum gifted by the United States of America from French, Belgian, and West German planes into the remote regions of the country. I next visited an indigents' center, where the needs of the old and infirm were heart-rending. I also visited the central market and a grain sales point as 25 percent of the grain is sold on a cash-and-carry system of distribution to the people who are employed and the money is used to underwrite the cost of transporting the grain into the country by truck.

During my stay in Ouagadougou I met a number of government officials, including the Prime Minister Gerard Kango Ouedraogo. The government ministers were thoroughly appreciative of American aid and were on excellent terms with the U.S. Embassy. Much of the credit for this cordial attitude toward the United States must go to the outstanding work of the U.S. Ambassador in Upper Volta, Mr. Donald Easum. Also the Peace Corps was well received and well liked by the ministers.

The government ministers and other officials stressed that their primary needs are already emergency millet and sorghum for next year. For, although a new crop is coming in, it will clearly be inadequate for more than a few months because so much of the seed has been used for food, and so many of the cattle have died from starvation. Their other important needs are water, for irrigation and well digging; conservation, especially reforestation; and control of black flies, which cause blindness. They infested an area with good soil and resulted in 30 percent of the best farmland being evacuated.

I emphasized the humanitarian basis of the aid in my discussions with Upper Voltan officials, and I urged them to be "humanitarian" in return, most particularly on the Convention on Terrorism. This appeal to responsible action in the councils of developing countries was well received by the ministers.

I commend to my colleagues a thorough analysis of the situation in the