

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 119—PART 32

DECEMBER 13, 1973 TO DECEMBER 18, 1973

(PAGES 41257 TO 42368)

RECEIVED

AUG 1 9 1975

*U. S. International Trade  
Commission  
Law Library*

### LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 898

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2686) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide for the transfer of the legal services program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to a Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes.

### INDEPENDENT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR ACT OF 1973—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 899

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, although S. 2611, the Special Prosecutor bill, has been placed on the calendar and may not be taken up by the Senate until next session, I wish to submit an amendment to S. 2611 at this time so that my colleagues may review the amendment and so that it may be taken up by the Senate when, and if, S. 2611 is before this body.

My amendment adds a sentence to section 6 of the bill. It provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all personnel of the Special Prosecutor appointed by the Attorney General pursuant to regulation and holding office on the date of enactment of this Act or on the date on which the Special Prosecutor assumes office under this Act are transferred to the Special Prosecutor appointed under this Act. The Special Prosecutor appointed under this Act shall have the sole authority to discharge any personnel transferred under this subsection and to discharge any other personnel appointed by him.

During the last several days, we have witnessed a series of attacks on the special prosecution staff which Archibald Cox assembled and Leon Jaworski inherited. The attacks have originated in the White House and have been most bitter. For instance, Ronald Zeigler stated that members of the Special Prosecutor's staff have an "ingrained suspicion and visceral dislike for this President and this administration."

We all know about the events of October 20. The President caused Special Prosecutor Cox to be fired; Attorney General Elliot Richardson resigned because he would not fire Cox; and Deputy Attorney General William Ruckelshaus was also fired for refusing to fire Cox. The "Saturday Night Massacre" was precipitated by the President's refusal to surrender the so-called Watergate tapes and Special Prosecutor Cox's insistence on using the courts to force the surrender of the tapes.

Following the events of that weekend, an unprecedented public outcry arose. From around the country came letters, telegrams, phone calls, editorials, commentaries—all voicing public outrage over the events of the weekend. The events of that weekend created a sense of turmoil and outrage in this country that is still evident in the mail I receive daily. The country saw that a complete investigation of the Watergate affair was necessary, and they told the President that they would not tolerate sabotage of that investigation.

It may be that the recent criticisms of the Special Prosecutor's staff by the White House merely represent inadvertent outbursts caused by a sense of frustration over the events of the past months.

However, it may also be that the White House purge target is not the Special Prosecutor this time, but rather the Special Prosecutor's staff. I seriously doubt the legality of any plans the White House may have to fire members of the Special Prosecutor's staff. In addition, I am seriously dismayed if, in fact, thought is being given to such action.

No step could more easily throw this Nation back into the turmoil that we experienced over the weekend of October 20 than an attempt by the White House to tamper with the Special Prosecutor's staff. Such an action would only serve to further undermine the President's credibility and to further convince the public that a fair and complete Watergate investigation will never take place as long as this administration is in power.

In order to insure against such an eventuality, I am amending the bill to create an independent Special Prosecutor by adding a provision which vests the sole power to fire employees of the special prosecution force in the Special Prosecutor himself. Under the bill, he is already given the power to "appoint, fix the compensation, and assign the duties of such employees as he deems necessary." It seems obvious that he, and he alone, should have the power to discharge said employees. The recent attacks on the staff by the White House, and the possibility of Presidential interference with the staff that these attacks may portend, make the vesting of the sole power of discharge in the Special Prosecutor imperative.

The current Department of Justice guidelines give the Special Prosecutor this power. And any bill which the Congress passes to create an independent Special Prosecutor should contain a provision such as the one I am offering today.

The Special Prosecutor's staff consists of a group of talented, qualified, and dedicated individuals. The men and women on the Special Prosecutor's staff have the day-to-day responsibility for one of the most important criminal investigations in American history. Unfounded or unsupported charges against the staff serve no useful national purpose. Attempts to purge the staff would be disastrous.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed in the Record at this point.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 899

On page 14, line 1, insert "(a)" after "Sec. 6."

On page 14, between lines 21-22, insert the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all personnel of the Special Prosecutor appointed by the Attorney General pursuant to regulation and holding office on the date of enactment of this Act or on the date on which the Special Prosecutor assumes office under this Act are transferred to the Special Prosecutor appointed under this Act. The

Special Prosecutor appointed under this Act shall have the sole authority to discharge any personnel transferred under this subsection and to discharge any other personnel appointed by him."

### PRISONER OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION TAX ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 900

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment I intend to offer to H.R. 8214. This amendment is identical to S. 2347, the Historical Structures Tax Act which I introduced on August 3, 1973. This legislation was referred to the Committee on Finance where it is currently pending. I would note, Mr. President, in closing, that S. 2347 has been cosponsored by Senators BIBLE, DOLE, DOMENICI, DOMINICK, GOLDWATER, JAVITS, MCINTYRE, METCALF, MOSS, PERCY, STEVENS, and TOWER.

AMENDMENT NO. 903

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8214) to modify the tax treatment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilian employees who are prisoners of war or missing in action, and for other purposes.

### HOUSING ACT OF 1973—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 901

(Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.)

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment to S. 2182, the proposed Revised Housing Act of 1973. As you know, this bill is now pending before the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, of which I am a member. The amendment which I am formally introducing today, and which I have already raised in the committee, would amend section 2A of the bill. This section, as now written, authorizes bond guarantees and interest subsidies for the taxable bonds issued by State housing finance agencies. This would be the first time that the Congress has specifically authorized support for, and assistance to, these State agencies, and I compliment Senator SPARKMAN for making this proposal in his original bill.

My proposed amendment would expand the scope and reach of section 2A. This is essential, given the present housing stalemate. The administration has proposed that the existing Federal production programs be terminated, to be replaced by a form of income support or housing allowances to the poor. While I am sympathetic to certain aspects of this approach and while I recognize that the old programs have their weaknesses and need reform, I am not convinced that there will be an adequate supply of housing and an adequate rate of housing construction for low-, moderate-, and middle-income families, unless there is some form of subsidy for housing production. Certainly, production incentives are necessary in areas of low vacancy and high