

Department of Justice

PRESS BRIEFING

of

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. SAXBE
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

with

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONFERENCE ROOM
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1974

Attorney General William B. Saxbe responded to questions in the following areas:

TOPIC	PAGE
Civil Division Problems	2, 3, 4, 5
First Woman Assistant Attorney General	2, 5
Acquittals in Collinsville case	5, 6, 7
Suits against the Government	7, 8
Indictment of IRA Gun Suppliers	8
Statutes pertaining to Internal Security and Possible Abolishment of the Attorney General's List	9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Hearst Kidnapping	15, 16, 17
Hearst Kidnapping Crime statistics and possible conference	
Crime statistics and possible conference	17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24
Crime statistics and possible conference Capitol Bombing case still open	17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 24
Crime statistics and possible conference Capitol Bombing case still open Indictment of Truck Drivers	17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 24 24, 25, 26

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I had hoped that Carla Hills would be here this morning. She's our new head of the Civil Division, and this is a big challenge; a big job.

As you know, our Civil Division comes in contact more with the other departments of the Cabinet level than any other division. And we get some complaints that we have been rather stodgy in our approach to handling their problems. You know, they get socked with two billion dollar suits, and the Justice Department handles these through the Civil Division.

They don't think we've been innovative enough.

You know, we come in and we say, well, they have no right in court; and we try to dismiss these procedurally.

Well, this is becoming less and less of an answer.

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And one of the big efforts that we are going to put on here is to make the Civil Division a real strong division, because what happens if they are dissatisfied, is there is always tendency for empire building, as you know. And their counsel, in the Labor and HEW, HUD and all of them, say, well, we can better handle these suits, and we don't think we're getting adequate amount of attention from the Justice Department. Our best defense is to do a better job.

Or at least to convince them. That is why Carla Hills has got a real big challenge in taking over Civil Division.

Why not let those people handle those QUESTION: suits?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, traditionally, this is an area of the Justice Department. Nobody argues these level cases before the Supreme Court, where most of these cases are handled, except the Solicitor General. If the Justice Department abandons this prime area of representation, I think it would be a sorry reflection.

And really I think we can do a better job, because many of these problems arise in more than one department.

But this is a continuing thing. I ran into this at the state level. Every administrator wants to bring in more lawyers to build up his own legal section, and to

proliferate the judicial community.

An Attorney General must resist this, because it's one of his prime responsibilities. And, frankly, if you don't control it this way, pretty soon you have the divisions fighting in the courts between themselves.

And that's not good.

QUESTION: Do you have in mind a specific increase in the strength -- the lawyer strength -- of the Civil Division?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, we're short there right now. She has to immediately lay on two Deputies.

I think it's two; isn't that right?

We're hoping that she brings in people of her qualifications, and we can --

QUESTION: But are you talking about wholesale increases in the number of attorneys?

the Civil Division, -- unlike Antitrust and unlike
Civil Rights, where we generate cases -- in other
words, their jub is to go out and generate cases, to bring
cases. The Civil Division is more like the traditional role
of the attorney. The clients come to them. And a great number
of additional attorneys are not going to solve any of originate
any new areas.

What we're trying to do is to make our clients feel

1 more confident.

QUESTION: How many lawyers are there in that division?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It's not a large division.

How many lawyers in that Civil Division, do you know?

VOICE: Around 380:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the Civil Division.

But a lot of this is pretty routine stuff, you know, because we represent the United States in a lot of collections and old claims, all kinds of stuff.

QUESTION: Is she the first woman Assistant A.G.?
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: There's been one other.

VOICE: Back in the Rooservelt days.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, before that, back in the Twenties.

I'll try to have her come here next week so you can get a chance to meet her. She's going through moving right now; she's got three children.

But she's a very interesting person.

A VOICE: Four.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Four children. And they age from 8 to 14, and she's moving from California. But she can do the job.

QUESTION: Could I ask you about the Alton, Illinois

RTING CO., INC. etts Avenue, N.S.

them, one of the defendants has alleged that it was unfair prosecution, malicious prosecution by the Justice Department pressured by Senator Percy, -- a former member of the strike force, acting as a defense attorney, raised this similar allegation.

Are you acquainted with the case? Have you looked

case, the BNDD agents who were acquitted yesterday.

Are you acquainted with the case? Have you looked into it? Have you planned to look into it to see if that was so.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: When you have sufficient grounds for indictment before a grand jury, you don't look behind it. We get a lot of people that allege things that are not lawyers; but the grand jury saw fit to indict these people. And what flows out of that indictment is a followup. This is the workings of the jury system in America.

They didn't convict, and you would have to go inside that jury room to find out why.

QUESTION: Is this going to set back the Department's efforts to make sure that civil rights are not violated, do you think?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No.

QUESTION: Is there a moral example set?

of our determinations is that we raise the level of professionalism in the DEA. It's a new department, they have got a tough job to do. They are working at it, their

4 5

training is more intensive than it's ever been.

We don't like those kind of incidents, and I'm sure that there will be inadvertent cases; but we intend to keep them to a minimum.

QUESTION: Under the law signed by the President on March 16th, can the people who are allegedly the victims in this, the Collinsville case, sue the government, or is it only cases that happen after that?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It's only cases that happen after that, to my knowledge.

VOICE: There are still some perjury and obstruction of justice charges pending.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: He says that there are other cases still pending as a result of these indictments. So that it isn't closed out.

QUESTION: The two others that haven't --

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The tort claims, which we've been very anxious to get going because of its effect on the exclusionary rule, will only apply to -- you can't go back on such things.

QUESTION: Will that change the status of these men at all as far as the drug agency is concerned? What will their disposition be?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I don't know. I haven't talked to Bartels on this. As you know, these are not all of the people involved in this. It was a melange of local police

you that.

and DEA people.

Every effort is made to prevent this kind of thing.

But it's a tough business, and you're dealing with hardened.

criminals and there are going to be mistakes.

Now, we think that the Tort Claims Act will at least try to make people whole, but you never can erase out, by a monetary relief, some of the distress caused by a mistake.

One of the most obvious around here, of course, is the AT&F case here in Washington.

QUESTION: The AT&F?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The gun dealer who was shot.

QUESTION: Oh, yes.

QUESTION: In yesterday's indictments on the IRA, can you say for the record how many guns made it to the IRA?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I don't know. I can't tell

QUESTION: Some of them did.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: A hundred of the guns were recovered, as you know; whether some made it or not, I don't know. I would guess that that will be developed in the case.

QUESTION: I'm sorry?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It will probably be developed in the case.

QUESTION: But you cannot say right now?

y

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I cannot say.

QUESTION: The other day Kevin Maroney testified before the House Internal Security Committee, and he said that the FBI now has 52 full-scale investigations under way, under the Internal Security laws.

Other people tell me that these laws, you know, as such, as Internal Security laws, are either ineffective or in serious question now. Could you find out for us what these laws are and what authority the FBI has to carry on investigations of this kind?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: We're going through an investigation here right now, that is to determine on the Attorney General's subversive organizations list, whether there should be such a list and whether it's realistic -- that the ones that are on that are realistic. Some of them, we believe, don't even exist.

But the one thing that I do want to impress on you: as long as we have the duty, put on by Congress, to protect the people from subversive activities and terrorism and so on, the Justice Department is going to live up to that responsibility.

We're just not going to say, well, it's unrealistic.

There are people in this world who would like to see the overthrow of this government. We forget this. And we blow hot and cold from one generation to the next. The last

PORTING CO., INC. husetts Avenue, N.C.

generation, we couldn't get enough investigations. This generation, it seems that any investigation is too much.

But, while it may be unpopular today, it's still one of our responsibilities. Until we're relieved of it by Congress, we're going to do the best we can to know these organizations.

As I said a few days ago, if there's a terrorist organization in existence and operating in Washington, I would like to think that the FBI has a member in it.

QUESTION: Well, do you think that the laws are adequate to permit you to do that now?

examination right now. This has been kicking around the Department for some time. I wasn't really aware when I came here that this examination was going on. It kind of went into limbo during transition. We're putting it back on the front burner. We'll have answers for you.

QUESTION: Do you expect to have a revised or new list to supersede the one -- I think it was last updated in 1955.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: If we have the authority to do it. That's part of our investigation.

QUESTION: How soon might that be completed?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I don't know, I can't tell
you. We just got started on it.

QUESTION: Who is in charge of it?

2

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, obviously, the Criminal Division has the primary authority, but it's going to be an FBI, Criminal Division, Office of Legal Counsel, and the Office of Criminal Justice. They will all have to work together.

It's not an easy thing, frankly.

QUESTION: Is there any projection on what proportion of the named organizations on the list might be cut back, if at all, or expanded? In other words, --

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It will depend, frankly, on just a realistic review. The FBI is already involved in it, and things change.

The ones we were worried about ten years ago differ from the ones today, or twenty years ago. The ones today are generally a new breed, the terrorist organizations, anyway.

QUESTION: I wonder if you could elaborate a little bit on why a new breed, and what are the characteristics of the new breed?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, terrorism, as we've known it in the last few years, is emanating from different groups of people. We used to be frightened primarily with the Communist-based organizations, that they were the political ideology of the Communists of those days, established the infiltration and the active participation in domestic

organizations.

with detente, and with the war in Vietnam, and, frankly, with some of the things that exploded the domino theory, we've come to realize that we can withstand this type a little bit better than we thought we could.

You know, we used to think that an ideal would seep in and all at once, why, we were in great danger of overthrowing our institutions.

Today, the worldwide trends are more towards terrorism, and we see the thing that is happening in Northern Ireland, and we see threats of political kidnapping and so on in other parts of the world. And it comes back to us in a different kind of threat than it was in 1955.

QUESTION: But one of the major purposes of drawing up that list 25 years ago was to screen people coming into the government, for government jobs. Do you think it would have the same role if you updated, or even created a new list? Would it be a checklist for employers?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, we're dealing with a different type of person. Obviously there's going to be some of this, but there was a -- as you know, going back to the McCarthy hearings and so on -- there was a great distrust of the intellectual.

One of the changes that has come about is because of the Jewish intellectual who was, in those days, very

A REP(

enamored of the Communist Party, and some of these were

Americans and some of them were foreign instigators.

Communism has, in many ways, lost their attractiveness.

And, as Maoism grows, a different kind of Communism, we have an entirely different type of person involved in it.

I look at India as an active battleground of differing ideologies today. The states of Behar, of West Bengal, have become a battleground between Maoists and traditional Communists, and the Socialist, more or less, establishment of India.

India is a democracy, but it's tempered tremendously by Socialism. It's a democracy that we don't quite understand, but is nevertheless a democracy.

The Naxalites of Calcutta are Maoist-oriented.

The Communists of Calcutta are Russian-oriented. We are having a first-class confrontation there.

And I think on a -- while that's oriented to India,
-- you can see the same thing happening in many African
states today, and I think it's a confrontation that is going
to become even more apparent to America.

It doesn't enter into our lives today, but we can observe and see what's happening. It doesn't actively enter into our lives.

But it's violent in India. People are killed every day over this confrontation.

2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know.

General, at the present time -- I know QUESTION: the study isn't completed -- are you leaning towards doing away with the Attorney General's subversive list or revitalizing, putting on organizations that you feel are --

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Until we get through with this study, I don't want to say. We will want to study the basis of it, our legal responsibility, and the effectiveness. And the use.

But again I reiterate,/we have a responsibility, we're going to perform it. We're not going to -- one thing that I'm determined to do here in the Justice Department is to stay away from national policy except where we have a responsibility.

In other words, if the Congress sets out an area for us to fulfill, we're going to do it. And if we differ from that, we will tell them. But we're not going to change policy internally. I think that the very essence of a police department or a city or anything else is to not be or assume a policy-making role.

We are the representatives of the constituted government, and when they say what the law is, we perform.

QUESTION: Is it possible that you would recommend new or different legislation as a result of this study?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It's possible. But I don't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

QUESTION: Could you say how recently this study of the list began?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, it originated about ten months ago, and then went into limbo.

QUESTION: And then --?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Right now we're trying to pull it together, to get it back on the main line.

QUESTION: Wasn't there a recommendation at that time that the list be dropped?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: If there was, it wasn't I thought it had been acted on, but nothing administratively was ever done.

QUESTION: How recently did you pick this up again and start working on it?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yesterday.

QUESTION: Oh.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: As a result of her questions.

QUESTION: Good!

[Laughter.]

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: That's why I think the press influence is good. You know, we've been so busy we overlooked a lot of things. And, frankly, I think it's good. One of the reasons I want to keep meeting in meetings like this, it stirs you up.

QUESTION: What can you tell us about the Hearst

25

24

EPORTING CO. INC. husetts Avenue, N.C.

FBI. Has the FBI had trouble?

QUESTION:

case? Driver's license, et cetera. Is she about to be set loose, or --?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I don't know. I have no information except what you have.

QUESTION: What about the FBI's role there, General?

Are they prepared to act upon her release?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I can't tell you. I haven't had any briefing today since this development, and we all hope that she is going to be returned.

QUESTION: Do you know -- is there any possibility that some sort of a deal has been made so that they would leave the country and she would be turned over outside the country?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I don't know of any such deal.

QUESTION: The wording of the message yesterday indicated that she might be returned some place other than the Bay area.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I know nothing about that.

They are dealing directly with the Hearst family, and we have no --.

they have gotten from the family? Yesterday I understand the

man who received the message did not show it or give it to the

Is the FBI satisfied with the cooperation

b 22

ING CO., INC. Is Avenue, N.E. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I don't want to comment on any part of the Hearst case until this girl is recovered.

QUESTION: Any more thoughts on the crime increase since you met with the President?

asked for a response from the representatives of the law enforcement community as to what they think caused this, and, two, how can we get back on track of lowering the crime rate. And we haven't had our feedback on that yet. We got out a message day before yesterday -- or would it be Friday -- no, it was Monday, I guess.

And when we get this back and it gives us something to make an agenda, we're going to have people in contact.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, the FBI crime figures are greeted with skepticism in some quarters. Do you think they are pretty good, are you confident in them? That they are a true reflection, and that there actually is an increase in rate --

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: All we have.

QUESTION: -- of crime.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: By the way, we have 220 lawyers in the Civil Division.

The FBI figures are no better than the reporting that we get from police departments. And, frankly, the only way that we can test these figures is the way the LEAA is

doing it, is on house-to-house investigation in certain target areas.

One of the difficulties is that that has to be trended. There are people who think that everybody on the street is a crook. There are people who think that somebody is violating their rights every day. You have to temper this — a lot of people don't know what the elements of a crime are.

How many times -- just look at your own mail, the letters to the editor; many things, especially on civil crime, that people think somebody should be sued or arrested on just don't hang together. As a lawyer you run into this all the time. People come to your office and say, "I want so-and-so sued" or "I want so-and-so put in jail". You say you can't do it. You don't have the elements of a crime.

So we have to temper this. Obviously, a lot of things that people allege to crime in the way of theft is mysterious disappearance. You know, the ring turns up in the trap of the sink a year later. We've already notified them that the maid stole it.

These kind of things you have to take into consideration. Or the guy that takes a swing at you in the saloon. You say that's violent action and the man ought to be in the penitentiary.

QUESTION: But that sort of thing should be happening

at roughly the same rate all the time. The amount of error in there ought to be pretty constant, and yet the figures do seem to zig and zag, and the component figures inside the gross figures seem to zig and zag. Doesn't that cause you any misgivings?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The misgiving is that there might be people who are trying to make their city look better by doctoring the figures. Well, we have no evidence of this, and the FBI just won't comment on it at all, because there is no way.

QUESTION: That could work both ways, couldn't it, that they want to make their city look better, or their budget bigger by making the things look bad.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: That's right.

QUESTION: There were two things I wanted to check on.

One, you said a minute ago that you were going to have this

message out to law enforcement people, get an agenda, and then

get them together. You're now back to your thinking of last

week that there should be some sort of a nationwide conference

on this?

the attorner general: If -- if we get enough feedback that gives us some substance. If they all write back and
say all we need is more money -- you know, if you ask the mayor:
what are you going to do about crime, his answer is: give
us more money.

2

3

And if they are put on the street, with no job, and

enough cities that say, Well, this is caused by an increase in the drug traffic, the demands of an expensive habit, or this is caused by a breakdown in our court procedure, where our backlog is such that there is no threat or deterrent to the guy. If it's a different trend in social development, it gives us something we can get our teeth in, that we can talk about.

I don't know that we will have all the people in in the country, that's a pretty big order. But there's no use getting people in unless you've got something concrete to talk about.

QUESTION: The second thing I wanted to ask you:

Last week we didn't focus on the very sharp apparent increase
in the crime rate in the last three months. It was 5 percent
for the year, and then 16 percent in the last quarter.

Have you gotten any feel for whether that's a meaningful figure, or -- and if so, what it means?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The only indication that we have is that it's directly proportional to the increase in the unemployment, and the group between 15 and 24.

Now, these are the last on the job and the first off the job, and we also know that this is the most susceptible crime group.

_ ..

PORTING CO., INC.

tremendous demands or expense, we'll learn something. We don't know that that's sure, but that's been the one suggestion that seems to be in more police chiefs' minds than any other.

QUESTION: Wasn't there a uniform reporting system developed for law enforcement agencies some years ago, as suggested by the FBI?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

QUESTION: And still you're having problems in terms of reporting techniques.

Is any new reporting system under consideration which would sort of level off this valley.

is a voluntary technique. It's no better than the figures that they have at the local level. Some police departments have good records, some have bad. Some have suggested that their cities do doctor the records, to look good, or to look bad.

And it's purely voluntary. If they give us bad figures, there is no way that we can censor them, or no effective way that we can throw the figures out.

That's part of the LEAA project, to be able to assess their figures, to see whether they are any good or not.

QUESTION: So how valid do you think they are?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think that they are

generally honest reports by police departments. And I think there is a substantial amount of crime that is not reported, and the reasons that we get from those that don't report them are different than the reasons they give us.

Now, if the old man comes home and breaks the kid's arm, the wife isn't going to report it. But some guy comes around in confidence and shuts the front door, she will tell him, yeah, we have a lot of violent crime in this household, but we never reported it. We haven't reported it because we didn't think the police would do anything.

Well, that isn't why she doesn't report it. She didn't want the old man to go to jail. Or she didn't want to get beat up when he got out.

Now, this is also true of a lot of pilferage, petty crime. The guy that runs the store knows the fellow is stealing from him, but he says, well, he isn't stealing very much, and I can't replace him; I'm not going to report it.

yeah, I know a guy that stole two hundred dollars from me last month. But the police wouldn't do anything about it. I can't -- I haven't got time to take off to testify.

So there is a gap in reporting. But the reasons they give are not always the right reasons.

this year.

O

QUESTION: If there is this correlation between a very sharp rise in the crime rate and unemployment, and we're now into almost the end of the next -
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: We are in the -
QUESTION: Yes, we're in the second quarter of

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Right.

QUESTION: Do you have any figures for the first quarter of this year that tell you how things are going now?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have no -- nothing concrete -- but my personal inquiry indicates that it still continues.

QUESTION: And do you think -- are you proposing or suggesting to anybody that something be done about this, if that seems to be the thing that's causing the crime increase?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, the social changes, like unemployment and things like that, are beyond the ken of the Justice Department. If it's social conditions, that's something else. If it's something that the Justice Department can do by more effective police work, yes, we are going to do something about it.

We are going to re-assess our performance.

QUESTION: Well, is it your feeling that's the answer to this, if it's an unemployment caused increase?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I'm not ready to say that that is the answer, though.

QUESTION: Going back to an old unsolved crime, do you know whether there is still an active investigation going on in the Capitol bombing, or whether that's --

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, there is.

QUESTION: It's been so long since a question has been raised about that, has there been any kind of developments connected with the case?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: As soon as we get another indictment, we will do it. We have no evidence now that would support an indictment. I think in time, like many other things, we will get some answers.

I might add that you're going to receive this morning a release -- we're talking about the wheels grinding slowly, but they grind infinitely fine, as you know. I was determined to have a followup on this truck violence, the truck protest. And I laid it on pretty heavy to the U.S. Attorneys, the FBI and everybody else, that we try to follow up on this, and we have gotten some indictments and pleas on this.

This release this morning, a man was killed when a rock was dropped through the windshield. And, as you know, these people said they were going to bring the government to its knees. This is one of continuing investigations. And we keep on it.

QUESTION: General, --

QUESTION: You mean other indictments are expected in this area?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: What?

QUESTION: Do you expect to have other indictments in this area, is that what you mean?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: We are sure working on it.

You know, there's an atmosphere that pervades any protest or active strike, that they somehow can do things on these that they can't do any other time. And law-abiding citizens get swept up in this atmosphere.

Again I point out that this was not a strike.

When you have a strike you have to have an employer and a labor problem -- that's our approach to it in this country.

I expect that this was a protest, and some chose to protest by dropping a rock through the windshield, which killed people.

QUESTION: Is there an investigation of possible conspiracy, not involving violence directly? In other words, are you considering conspiracy charges, conspiring to do something other than physical harm?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: We are not disposing of any charges. We are trying to make as thorough an investigation on this as we can. I am certainly gratified that we have come this far in this short a time.

And, as you noticed here, two other truckers pleaded

RTING CO., INC.

-

guilty to similar charges.

QUESTION: Are there state charges filed against these people?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: These are -- there are state charges -- there already were some State charges.

And this is a conspiracy charge.

QUESTION: What about the conspiracy law generally?

It's been widely criticized for a long time. We have it in

the Watergate now, we have it in this case that you just

handed us. Is there any consideration recommending changing

or dropping the conspiracy law?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have no intention of doing so.

QUESTION: Why not?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Simply because this is one of the few areas where we have an opportunity to prosecute people. And I think conspiracy is a crime. If we drop it, we would lose one of our greatest tools against organized crime.

QUESTION: Some time ago you indicated that you were opposed to going back into the Kent State affair, but the grand jury has now indicted a number of people in connection with that. Do you have any second thoughts about your original attitude?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, I was speaking primarily

4 5

PORTING CO., INC.

of the conspiracy approach to it. And these indictments are now being tried, and I think the system is at work, and I don't want to comment on it.

QUESTION: General, what's the status of the libel legislation that the President asked you all to draft? To protect political figures.

our primary involvement is trying to get an interpretation of malice. And I don't know how it's coming. I will have to talk to Mr. Dixon about it; he's working on it. Because this is the area that we think should be spelled out.

QUESTION: If we could perhaps check on it next week?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: If we've got something, sure.

VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Saxbe.