## SFChronicle SEP 1 4 1973 Royce Brier **'Implied Immunit** Of a President

HESTERFIELD SMITH, president of the American Bar Association, told a State Bar meeting in Anaheim he saw no way a President or Vice President can be indicted or tried for crime while in office He doesn't believe they can be harassed or intimi-dated by the court in any way.

The dispatch does not reveal his reasoning, but so much care-less talk on the subject going about invites examination. Yesterday Pennsylvania politicians were reported to be saying Vice President Agnew would be indicted within a fortnight on the Baltimore charges.



2.3

There are two separate pas-sages in the Constitution bearing on what may be informally called imposing discipline on a President for alleged misdoing. The best-known is Section 4 of Article II: "The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery or other high crimes and misde-

## \* \* \*

NOTE THE VICE PRESIDENT is on the same IN level as the President here; who "all civil offi-cers" may be is not defined. It is an ambiguity and possibly an oversight of that master of Republican theory, James Madison, who drafted much of the

The other passage is in Article I, Section 7: "Judgment in case of impeachment shall not extend further than removal from office" (and future dis-qualification) "but the party convicted shall nev-ertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment according to law" judgment and punishment, according to law.

Taken together these passages appear to constitute an implied immunity, akin to implied powers' which are not expressed, but have often in our history been upheld by the courts.

## \* \*

T HIS MAY BE ANOTHER slip of Mr. Madison, who made a few which have long triggered con-troversy between the executive and legislative departments. But in a showdown the implied immunity would be subject to adjudication by the Supreme

As it rests, the presumed exemption from crim-inal prosecution of a President or Vice President continues until conviction in the impeachment process, whereupon the convicted is on the same footing

ess, whereupon the convicted is on the same rooting as any private citizen. There remains a question: what did the Found-ing Fathers intend in the Constitutional Convention, 1787? One can only guess, but Mr. Smith's words "harassment" and "intimidation" may be keys. Clearly the Founders in their expressed powers in-tended a President should be free from undue coer-cion by the legislative and indicial branches. Such cion by the legislative and judicial branches. Such coercion, they saw, could be solely political in character, and many Congresses have tried political coercion, but without notable success.

Altogether, unless the Supreme Court voids the implied immunity of the foregoing passages, a President or Vice President must be impeached and convicted before they can be taken to court for any of-

It is truly a big national enigma, and a newspaper piece can only endeavor to bring it to light.

Con ...

September: 14, 1973

The second