

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 28

NOVEMBER 6, 1973 TO NOVEMBER 15, 1973

(PAGES 35989 TO 37438)

and state level, is essential to enhance the viability of the small town's economy."

On the other hand, Rainey says, "It is not likely that the future of small town America will be decided by any monolithic government policy.

"As has been the case in the past, the growth of small towns will be the result of millions of decisions made in an inconsistent and highly pluralistic environment," Rainey said.

As to where do we go in regard to small towns, he says:

"... We have behind us 15 to 20 years in experimentation in regional economic development.

"We have tried the local development efforts, the chamber of commerce activity, a broad range of local financing schemes to lure industry into depressed areas and smaller towns.

"We have tried a wide range of state and federal subsidies and grants-in-aid.

"We have tried multistate regions. We have tried multi-county development corporations.

"In short, we have tried most of the ideas surfaced since World War II."

What should we do?

Rainey says he doesn't know.

COMMISSION ON THE PRESIDENCY?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in a recent Senate speech I discussed a number of aspects of the institution of the Presidency, which have contributed to a decline in the responsiveness of that institution to the Congress and the American people. Certainly, events of recent weeks should focus our attention even more closely on those steps which must be taken—by both the President and the Congress—to restore a balance of power between the branches of Government and make both the executive and legislative branches more responsive to the American public.

In this connection, a recent editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, commenting on the proposals which I have advanced, effectively discusses a number of these important issues. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Oct. 16, 1973]

COMMISSION ON THE PRESIDENCY?

The feeling is rather generally held across a broad spectrum of national leadership that no matter what President Nixon does or does not do to regain the confidence of the people his Administration is doomed to ineffectiveness. This impression emerges strongly from a series of interviews conducted by Thomas Ottenad of the Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau. One top Democratic leader was blunt: "This Administration is a dead duck," he said.

If the Nixon Administration is fated to act in a caretaker capacity for the next three years, does this not offer the country an opportunity to take a good look at the institution of the presidency, with a view to reforms? We think it does, for as *The New York Times* observed some time ago, even before Watergate brought the Nixon Administration into disrepute "there had been widespread concern that the office of the presidency had somehow become bloated, unresponsive, unduly secretive, out of touch with the people and perhaps even with reality."

Since the end of World War II the Chief Executive has acquired power that he never

had before. A president now controls nuclear weapons and heads of military establishment 20 times the size it was at the beginning of that war. There are big new bureaucracies in Washington; and technological advances enable a president to roam the world by jet and be seen in millions of living rooms through television. But nothing has been done to tailor the office to the new conditions.

It is this background that lends interest to a proposal by Senator Walter F. Mondale, a Minnesota Democrat. He believes that over the last three or four decades "the presidency has become larger than life and larger than the law." And he further believes Watergate has imbued the nation with a new resolve to meet national problems, the greatest being the protection of liberty "against a government that would diminish it."

So Mr. Mondale has recommended several specific steps that need to be taken promptly, and he has proposed in a Senate resolution that for the longer range there should be established a Commission on the Office of the Presidency, whose purpose would be to examine what has happened to the office, why it has happened, and what can be done to make sure the office remains open and accountable to Congress and the people. The commission would be composed of members of the Executive and Legislative branches and distinguished private citizens.

The work of the group would not be undertaken as soon as possible to end the abuses of power revealed by Watergate and require a more open and responsive presidency, one nearer "life size." But a commission such as Mr. Mondale suggests might be a constructive spin-off from Watergate (even though, we suspect, the idea of another governmental commission will produce a few yawns among the populace).

Mr. Mondale is a capable young man who has presidential ambitions himself, and his proposal may be tied to his personal objectives. Yet that need not detract from its merit. Such a commission could well articulate standards that would benefit the presidency and the country in the future; Mr. Mondale's resolution ought to be adopted.

A LACK OF CONFIDENCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we all know of the outpouring of protest from the American people at the activities of the President in recent weeks—including the firing of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox; the initial attempt by the President to defy an order of the Federal courts; and the new revelations that two of the most pertinent of the Presidential tapes are missing.

My own mail has run 20 to 1 against the President, with more than 1,000 letters, telegrams, and phone calls received—the vast majority of them urging impeachment of the President.

Meanwhile, in Idaho, the leading newspapers of the State—most of which supported the President's reelection last year—have become extremely critical of the manner in which the President has handled the Watergate crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of editorial opinion from Idaho, including editorials from the Idaho Statesman in Boise; the Idaho State Journal in Pocatello; the Lewiston Morning Tribune; the Daily Idahoian in Moscow; and the Times-News in Twin Falls, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Idaho State Journal, Oct. 22, 1973]
AN ACT OF POWER

No matter how President Nixon attempts to explain it, fairly or unfairly his firing of special Watergate investigator Archibald Cox comes across to the public as meaning only one thing: Cox was getting too close to the truth, and thus was sacked.

That firing and subsequent resignations of Attorney General Elliot Richardson and Deputy Attorney General William Ruckelshaus are another shattering blow to what public confidence remains in the Nixon administration.

Firing Cox was an act of naked power, and one which seems unnecessary. Nixon did it because Cox said he would challenge the President's compromise offer to produce transcriptions of the Watergate tapes as failing to meet the order of the U.S. Court of Appeals. That court had ruled Nixon should make tapes of private conversations available to Judge John Sirica, who might then decide what information from them should be given to Cox. The court might well have accepted Nixon's offer in order to avoid further confrontation, and Cox would have been forced to abide by the court's decision.

Ironically, Nixon's offer met with generally favorable reaction in Congress and with constitutional authorities. But his vengeful firing of Cox immediately stirred serious new talk of impeachment, and chills once more the recently-thawing relations between Congress and the White House. By the same token, the added slippage in public support means the President's ability to govern at home and deal in foreign affairs will be further undermined.

It seems doubtful that Congress will impeach the President. There still is great reluctance to subject the nation to that wrenching ordeal.

But is there then any alternative means of satisfying the public as to whether the President was involved—as his former counsel John Dean claims—or innocent—as Mr. Nixon insists—in coverup of the Watergate break-in of Democratic national headquarters? The prospect seems dim.

Even if Sen. John Stennis is permitted to hear portions of the private tapes, and even if transcriptions of the recordings are made available to the court, it will not be the same as simply producing the tapes. Too many questions will remain unanswered.

And Nixon's promise that the Watergate investigation will continue "with full vigor" under the Justice Department has a very hollow ring, in view of Mr. Cox's fate. Rumors of planned mass resignations within the Justice Department followed news of the firing. Indeed, continuation of the Watergate investigation would be a hypocritical sham which no self-respecting Justice Department prosecutor should undertake.

When Archibald Cox was hired as special prosecutor, Atty. Gen. Richardson said Cox "will be aware that his ultimate accountability is to the American people." Richard Nixon obviously felt differently. And he, apparently, is accountable to no one.

[From the Lewiston Morning Tribune,
Oct. 22, 1973]

YOU WON'T HAVE COX TO KICK AROUND ANY MORE

The appointment of a special Watergate prosecutor was always a sticky wicket. Technically it amounted to a demonstrably untrustworthy administration investigating the extent of its own transgressions. But there was hope that a respectable investigation and prosecution could be accomplished if:

1. The special prosecutor was a man of impeccable integrity.
2. The special prosecutor would be given absolute independence of the administration he was investigating.
3. The administration would disqualify