

3 .

7 |

2::

Department of Justice

PRESS CONFERENCE

of

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

with

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONFERENCE ROOM
THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1974
10:00 a.m.

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

TOPIC	PAGE
Civil Division-New Assistant Attorney General	2,3,
Departmental Reorganization	4,5
FBI-New Left Program (COINTELPRO)	6,7
Sobell Suit-Rosenberg Evidence	7,8,9
Subversive Organization List	9,10,11,12,20
Jaworski-President's Taxes	12,13,14,15,16, 17,18,19
Presidential Contempt or Subpeona Study	19,21,21
Senator Weicker Documents	20
Libel Legislation	21,22
Presidential Prosecution Immunity	22,23
Wiretapping Authority & Approval	23,24,25,26,27, 28,29
Freedom of Information Act & FBI Release Under the Act	29,30,31,32,33, 34
Sperling Ground Rules-Other Reporters	34,35,36,37

Ģ

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

. 19

20

21

22

23

24

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Good morning.

I've asked you to come here this morning to give you a release on recidivism.

But some of you have had the opportunity meet Carla Hills, and we're very proud to have her in this very important job.

The Civil Division is the lawyer for the rest of the government, and for some of the Justice Department agencies as well. And they have 220 --?

MRS. HILLS: 237.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: 237 lawyers over there.

And most of the major cases originate -- that go to the

Supreme Court -- originate in the Civil Division.

She has as clients every other government office.

And, as you know over the years, the empire building that happens in any government, one of the first things that a government department wants to do is to build their own legal section and argue their own cases.

We have to combat this, constantly, by providing better service than they can provide for themselves, and to have a client relationship that they not only accept but appreciate.

Carla Hills has the background of big firm law practice, experience in big cases, handling subordinates, and

REPORTED DO LING Michartt, Svenda de L. Mar. D. 193021

3

5

6

7

9,

10

11 ____

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

24

25

we think that the Civil Division should be very great.

Carla, do you have anything you want to say this morning to these distinguished people of the press?

MRS. HILLS: Delighted to be here, gentlemen.

as you know, and we were just talking about her weekend job: she has to go home Friday night and start coloring Easter eggs.

[Laughter.]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Just like everybody else!

QUESTION: Are we supposed to call her General?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Sure. She's an Assistant
Attorney General.

It's like I ran into, at a diplomatic reception,
Mrs. Shaw, the wife of the Ambassador
from Australia. And she was telling us about getting credit
cards at the department stores in Washington. He was
knighted recently and she's a Lady.

So she came in and was filling out this form, she put in her name as Helen Shaw; and the girl said, "Well now, is it Mrs. Helen Shaw?" She said, "No, it's Lady Helen Shaw"

Well, anyway, it wound up she gets her credit card, and it's "Mrs. Lady Helen Shaw."

[Laughter.]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: So she's known in Washington

as Mrs. Lady Helen Shaw.

Œ.

So she will be known as Mrs. General Carla Hills:
[Laughter.]

QUESTION: Are you ready for questions?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: One other thing -
[Laughter.]

-- I know you're not much interested in what goes on in the Department, but we've had another reorganization, which we think is permanent this time. We have an Associate Attorney General who figured himself out of a job.

He finally came to the conclusion after making a genuine effort to make this system work, that it was designed for people who are no longer here. And the office of Associate is not really necessary. It divides responsibility and slows down the flow of important chain-of-command things.

We're going to a very simple -- the chart isn't herebut it's a very simple streamlined chain-of-command
responsibility. We hope that it's going to do away with
some of the dissension that we've found here. We discovered
that it was adopted without really the support of most of
the section chiefs.

While this chart is very firm, its not going to change the relationship between the Attorney General and some of the close support agencies, such as Office of Legal Counsel and the governmental relations--that's Legislative Affairs, and so on.

Property of the control of the contr

Nor reject relationship with the FBI.

Probably the biggest impact is going to be in the administrative affairs downstairs. When this plan was adopted last summer, they had a layering of administration put into the legal litigating sections that just seemed to be wasteful. a duplication of people.

We think that we can save a lot of money on this deal and also get more effective work done.

Now, do you have any questions?

QUESTION: Is there any estimate, General, on how much the reorganization cost in the first place, and how much the dismantling of the reorganization is costing?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't think it's cost a lot because we didn't implement the whole program.

For instance, on the administration, we only had acting heads, we never made those permanent.

The Associate certainly earned his money because he's the man who performed the study. We would have had to have employed outside people to have done this. And there's no great expense.

I think there was a laying on of a lot of people in administration, but that was a build-up over a year or two, rather than anything that just happened.

These reorganization plans are not new, they go back to 1967.

25

24

1

3 .

4

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

· 19

20

21

22

2.3

7787 662 001 147. 41674 Alema (8.1) 445 - 4467 QUESTION: General, the month is about up in which Mr. Petersen was supposed to assemble a report for you on COINTELPRO, the FBI COINTELPRO, program. What did he report to you?

QUESTION: Is he -- has his deadline been extended or when do you expect to get that report?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, it's in the works.

QUESTION: Obviously we don't expect to see it before you do, but after you see it, will we be so privileged?

A VOICE: He's already on the record as saying that.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I expect to do that.

QUESTION: Well, to whatever extent it can be expedited.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I'm anxious to see it too.

QUESTION: Was there any input from the White House
on this change?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, but we carefully cleared it with the OMB, which is the area of supervision in these, and they agreed with us.

QUESTION: Have you talked to the President about it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. We didn't. Because

this is an area of responsibility of OMB over there, they're the ones who worked with it in setting it up, and they also were the ones who worked with us on the dismantling.

QUESTION: When was last --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They were disillusioned also.

QUESTION: When was the last time you talked to the President?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I haven't talked with the President since before he went to the funeral; it's been almost two weeks.

QUESTION: I don't know if you're up on this, it's a question from my New York desk. They have been following the Sobell case there, and apparently Mr. Sobell's lawyers have claimed that some evidence in the Rosenberg trial many years ago was forged, and now the evidence has disappeared, and the question they wanted me to ask was: What's being done to find out what happened to the evidence, and what regulations are there with respect to keeping such evidence?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I'm interested in the same thing. I don't know.

I know that this is primarily a job for the prosecution, the evidence that is entered into a court case becomes a matter of record. The actual instrument, I don't know.

2 1

3 !!

7

5

6

7

8

9:

10

11

12

13

14

15

· 16

17

9.

•^

QUESTION: In other words, the Justice Department

I notice that they said in that story that they
just couldn't locate it. They don't know whether it was
stolen. They didn't say it was stolen or missing or anything,
they just couldn't locate it.

I have also observed in my visit to a lot of courthouses, when you walk in these property rooms -- well, you've seen the same thing. My God, I don't know how they can find anything.

QUESTION: Well, what steps occur next?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I want to find out if there is any responsibility, and keep it.

QUESTION: Well, apparently they had been signed out to the U. S. Attorney's office in New York. That's what the people who are in charge of the records say.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know. I don't know.

QUESTION: I mean mechanically, do you have someone whom you've asked in your office to take responsibility to ascertain the facts in this case, or what physically have you done?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The only thing I've asked is: what is the responsibility for evidence? It has nothing to do with this particular evidence, or the circumstances surrounding it.

EPOPTING CO., INC Chusetts Avenue, N.C =90, 20011

3 ::

4 5

6

7

8

10

9.

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 !

25

itself is not pursuing an inquiry at this time as to what happened to that particular --

QUESTION: In New York.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: He's part of the Justice Department.

QUESTION: Last week you told us that you were working on a -- trying to make a decision on what to do about the list of subversive organizations. Do you have any decision on that yet?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We have a -- we have a recommendation prepared. It's now being circulated amongst the departments or the sections of the Department of Justice, and it will go to the White House. I can't tell you what it is, because if I do then it removes any option the White House might have. But we expect it to go to the White House, who will make the final decision.

QUESTION: Well, can you characterize it in any way,

General? In terms of whether it reduces the list, or

weeds out --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: -- any organizations?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Does it expand it?

DING CO. MC Challesian A.C. Closer (

9,

_11

.25

information. As I say, if I would, why, I'm leaking to you things that are basically a White House decision. I didn't even realize that it was when I started talking about it, but I'm glad it was raised. I'll send it over there, we hope -- when -- in another week. And it will go to the White House and I'm sure that we'll get quick action.

QUESTION: Have you determined whether or not you have legal authority to establish and maintain such a list?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think that that was under Executive Order.

QUESTION: The validity of that has been questioned.

I wondered if a decision within the Department had been made on that question.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I think the question you raise is even deeper than that. As you may have noticed, the FBI is requesting from other agencies just exactly what the role is, of information gathering on subversive organizations, so-called subversive organizations.

This includes today's terrorists and others. And I think perhaps legislation is needed. The FBI feels that way.

QUESTION: What kind of legislation? You mean just setting out the guidelines for what kind of material should be --

expected to do.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

11

961

QUESTION: Is it fair to say that at least you're changing the list from what it is now, or recommending changing the list from what it is now?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Exactly what they are

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It will be a week --I can't -- there's such a little bit of it left that anything that I would say would whittle it away to nothing.

[Laughter.]

QUESTION: Well, is that what you did?

QUESTION: You said you hadn't talked to the President since before the Pompidou funeral, have you attempted to talk with the President at all?

> ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. No.

QUESTION: Well, you said also that you learned, after talking with us last week, that this was a White House or presidential authority on the list, did someone at the White House communicate that to you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: How was that determined?

The Office of Legal ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Counsel set out exactly the way it is operated, the way it was put together, and if it's going to be changed it has to be changed by the White House.

And if we make a recommendation, why, it has to go

· ? :

22 1

٠<u>٠</u>٢ ا

over there for action.

1 1

9.

QUESTION: Then you think that new legislation is needed in this field?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, this is not connected with the list that we're talking about. We're talking about a continuation of the role. And I think everybody expects the investigatory agent to keep track of terrorists, subversives. We seem to have quite a few irresponsible people in the world today, and I think the American people expect some part of the government to have knowledge on it. If it's going to be the FBI, which is the traditional depository, the FBI in turn should be given exact guidelines as to what they're to do.

QUESTION: Can you update us at all, General, on the story today of Mr. Jaworski being asked to form a grand jury to look at a possible conspiracy in preparing the President's tax returns? You had mentioned the other day that --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know anything about it.

QUESTION: -- some of the stuff had gone over there. Did you not know that it was for that purpose, or for that request?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I read that, but I don't know anything about it.

BRITANC COLUMN.
Bett. School and
LOCARDA

24

QUESTION: Well, which way did the President's tax stuff go; did it come from a Jaworski request, like it does in others you mentioned, or did it come from Mr.

Alexander to Jaworski, unsolicited?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't tell you. I just -- I don't recall.

QUESTION: You don't remember --ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: -- which way.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The -- as I said the other day -- you probably know more about these affairs than I do, because I'm trying to concentrate on a day-to-day routine of the Justice Department.

QUESTION: Right.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And I feel that the Justice Department is adequately represented by Mr. Jaworski.

QUESTION: Right. But he --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And now, as the House Committee gets their steam up, it's going to be, I think, shifting more and more over there.

QUESTION: Who are some of the people that he asked you to get tax records for? You said there were about a dozen.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, if I said a dozen,

I meant this goes back to the time of the original, beginning

of the -- of Mr. Jaworski.

QUESTION: You mean Jaworski himself or the Special Prosecutor? We're talking about Hunt, Liddy, that group as well? Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Colson?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't recall, but what I'm saying is this goes back to when he took over -- in November, whenever it was.

QUESTION: Oh, at the beginning of his investigation.

But you don't recall whether the tax return of the

President, which was sent to Jaworski, came at Mr. Alexander's
recommendation or --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, I have no information on the President's tax returns.

QUESTION: Wouldn't you remember that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: That went to Jaworski?

Well, there's nothing that -- there's no presidential tax material that I know of. There is none that I know of.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That went to Mr. Jaworski.

That's what we're talking about, the piece in the paper.

I know I have no information to either support or deny the piece that was in the New York Times or the Post this morning.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, you see, we're in another one of those little round-robins, where maybe we asked one too many questions.

Ť

9.

Recause the other day you said to your knowledge it had gone over to Jaworski, the President's tax : **
return, vis-a-vis the investigation of DeMarco. Is that right?

At least that's what I ... recall.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I read that, but I -- that wasn't my intention to say that any presidential tax returns had gone to Mr. Jaworski.

QUESTION: But you said at the time that the material with Mr. DeMarco's hand in it, of the President's taxes for the year 1969, or whatever it is Jaworski has.

Is that what you did mean?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, I didn't.

I read that, and we'll have to go back to the tape. But the gist of what we're talking about is that these are investigatory files and I think it's unfair to even comment on any kind of an investigatory file.

Now, to my knowledge, Mr. Jaworski is not involved in the President's returns.

QUESTION: You mean directed toward the President?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's correct.

QUESTION: You made that clear, I thought, the other day, but --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, I did.

1!

ð,

.11

_

QUESTION: -- but Mr. DeMarco's handling of it in

1969 was -- or in 1970 for the '69 return, was what we understood you to say was sent over,

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I can't even verify that. I haven't gone back and looked at it, and, frankly, I just don't want to comment on it.

QUESTION: Well, General, the Times story said that you had given Mr. Jaworski, as an Attorney General's opinion, apparently to allow him to look into individuals who were personal employees of the President.

attorner general saxes: This boils down to the question of the extent of the powers of the Special Prosecutor. And they are so broad that I don't think there's any room for arguing that whether he should handle them or whether regular Justice Department people should handle them on anything that arises out of the years from '69 on, in regard to campaign contributions; and anything connected with the Watergate.

I wish you'd go back and read that charter, it's rather broad.

QUESTION: Well, I think what we're trying to get at is that there's a clause in the charter that says that he may investigate these specific things you've mentioned and anything else referred to him by the Attorney General.

The Times story this morning said that you had referred a matter, apparently not covered by the other parts of

the charter. That's what we're trying to find out.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAMBE: Yes.

QUESTION: Has there been any new referral?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: There was a request from

-- for an opinion -- not an opinion, rather to refer certain areas to Jaworski, and we felt that it was clearly within his area of responsibility.

Now, this was things that arose, as I said the other day, beginning clear back when I came on board. The dozen people that I mentioned were the total of this. I considered that a sizable group, and I said the other day a sizable group. Most of these people are under indictment. Some have been tried.

I felt it was just a part of a total investigation of individuals, and that it couldn't be held up.

QUESTION: Well, the Special Prosecutor doesn't have any real tax experts, you've got a considerable number of them in this building. Why should this matter, whether Mr. DeMarco or others who acted in a culpable manner, be referred to Mr. Jaworski's staff.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I just don't think that the Justice Department can -- I think that if you approach it from that, you'd have a proliferation, to say this little area and that little area.

I don't think that he's in any danger of being

G

-

.

short of people there to perform this function.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't consider that there has been, no.

QUESTION: That's what the Times story said this morning. You're saying that that's not correct?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I thought that -- to me that story just didn't make much sense, because it starts off as a headline and says that the -- Alexander has stated, or indicated that he sent all this stuff to Jaworski for prosecution. If he has, I don't know about it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXEE: Not necessarily, but I think I would.

QUESTION: Would you necessarily know?

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, what I was trying to get at with my previous question is in the sense of the cutting edge, in deciding what stuff goes to Jaworski and what stuff stays here; not so much a matter of finding a Watergate connection. But now it is whether it has become something involving the President or those close to the President, so as to insure that there will be no public doubts about the independence of the probe, but that kind of material; anything involving the President and his fellows gets kicked over to Jaworski.

3 ;;

9-

23.7

3 1 4

5

8 9

10

11

. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Isn't that really about what it amounts to?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: You've got several things. You've got the timeframe, you've got the place of employment, You've got three things that and you've got the nature. fit within that charter. And I don't think that the tax area is eliminated, simply because we may have more tax people than they have.

Your OLC did an enterprising job of QUESTION: putting a study together on the impeachment question. curious whether anyone has asked them to put together a similar study with respect to Congress' contempt authority or Congress' ability to subpoena materials from the President, from a reluctant President?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, that isn't likely, either, because they really weren't too enthusiastic about our impeachment study.

[Laughter.]

QUESTION: So nothing is being done along that line? ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Not now.

QUESTION: Who wasn't enthusiastic?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The Congress. The Congress wasn't. We did this, it was under way when I came here, and I thought it was a good study. And when it was ready, we offered it to them, and they accepted it rather reluctantly, but indicated they felt they had better =- better sources.

-

3:

And since that time we've had no request for another one. So we haven't.

QUESTION: Senator Javits made some public statement about this issue of the conservative, or the subversive control list last week. Have you talked to him since last Friday? Have you gotten his views about whether there should be a reactivation or a change?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I have not.

QUESTION: Have you obtained all the documents yet which Senator Weicker released the other day? You said on Tuesday morning that you would study them.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know. I haven't personally seen them. He said that he was sending them down.

Now, as I understand it, what he talked about was information that he had received as a member of the Watergate Committee, and I would guess that this would go to Mr. Jaworski.

QUESTION: What would you do if, down the road,

Congress were to vote a contempt citation against the

President, under the statutes 2 USC 192 et seq. The

U. S. Attorney must present that sort of matter to a grand

jury, yet there are those who believe that the grand jury

has no power to indict a sitting President, and therefore the

whole thing is silly.

What would you do in that sort of situation?

21

į

5

7

8 S.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 9.

24 2

25 :

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It is, it's a -- we've made no decision, and, to my knowledge, no study on it. It's a classic confrontation on separation of powers.

OUESTION: Have you read Jack Chester's brief on the subject of whether the Congress can subpoena the President?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

Do you think that bears on this question? QUESTION: ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I read part of it.

QUESTION: Do you think that bears on this question?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Part of it bears on that.

QUESTION: You said to your knowledge you didn't have any study on this. Have you got studies going on other things that we would be interested in?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Not -- not in this area. The Office of Legal Counsel, as you know, does these things. We also have an Office of Criminal Justice, which we hope to get carved up to do these kind of studies. They are not at the present time going into this kind of thing, they're working on the NCIC and computerized general history and conflict between NCIC and inlets, and this kind of thing.

There are no in-depth studies on these things going on.

QUESTION: Could you tell us what progress has been made on the libel legislation that I believe OLC is drafting? I

3 !

9.

22 !

- K

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: None to my knowledge.
That is, I have nothing new to report.

As I told you last week, the hang-up is trying to interpret what malice is. And to my knowledge they've made no progress. It's a tough area.

QUESTION: Several weeks ago I asked, and while your Deputy seemed to have a judgment in the matter I didn't think that you did at that time; I asked whether you thought that Congress had the authority to pass a law which would, in essence, exempt the President from prosecution for alleged crimes if he resigned. And we talked about whether that would be sort of a bill of attainder in reverse, and so on.

Have you thought about that matter any further?

Do you have any thoughts as to whether that's --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I've thought about it,
but I don't have any conclusions. It's a tough one -- again,
it's confrontation on the separation of powers. And what
you're talking about is what someone suggested -- who was it,
Mills -- who said that if the President would resign, that
they would give him an exemption from any prosecution.

One of the difficulties is that even on a commutation of a sentence or a pardon, and so on, Congress doesn't have the authority to do this. It resides in the President.

Now, whether they could assume by statute something like this, I'm just not ready to answer. It doesn't seem

4

5

6

8

10

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

19

. 19 20

21

2.3

23

-- 't

25

readily possible to me. What do you think?

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL SILBERMAN: I didn't hear the question.

QUESTION: The same question I asked about four weeks ago, and you were sitting behind Mr. Saxbe, and you were kind of shaking your head no on that date, so I assumed that you had studied the issue. The question being whether Congress could exempt the President from prosecution --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Criminal prosecution.

QUESTION: -- in exchange for resignation.

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL SILBERMAN: I refuse the question.

[Laughter.]

QUESTION: That's one way to get out of it!

QUESTION: Is anybody studying this question for you, to help you make a decision?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Are you going to have anybody study it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't think it will come
to me for a decision.

QUESTION: May I ask a question about wiretapping authority? About three years ago I asked here at the Department whether in fact Attorney General Mitchell was the czar for all wiretaps, that is, any wiretapping conducted by a federal agent against a citizen of the United States, no

matter what agency that federal agent worked for.

would that come through the Attorney General's desk? Would he -- is he in the central position? I was assured that was true, that no wiretaps would be installed without his permission.

And then a short time later I found out that, for example, DOD was doing wiretapping, and it never crossed their minds to bring that matter to the attention of the Attorney General.

What is the status of that? Are you the czar or ain't you the czar?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I think so.

But I know that under the Keith decision there are absolutely no Category III wiretaps without my authorization, and a judge. I don't believe that -- well, except the states, as you know, for the 10 states.

QUESTION: Well, I'm only talking about federal employees.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: All right.

I don't believe there's any other federal agency that ever goes into court, although I think that Treasury could. I'm talking about Alcehol, Tobacco, Firearms -- but I don't believe that they do.

QUESTION: Well, we see those showing up, though, in the report to the office of the Administrator of U. S.

1 5

6

1

2

3

7

92

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

19

20

21 ! !

277

21

25 ;

#7#6 05 | W1 #45 Ave | | | | | | | | | | #2000 Courts. For example, if the Secret Service was wiretapping

F. Donald Nixon's telephone at the request of the President,

I seem to recall that we've been told that somewhere along

the line, I don't see that that ever showed up in the

report to the Office of the Administrator of the U. S. Courts.

I don't understand how it didn't show up.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: To my knowledge, the

Secret Service was not used for wiretap for this Administration.

Now, that's --

QUESTION: Except for the Donald Nixon installation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXEE: Well, was that Secret

Service?

QUESTION: That's what he said, as I recall, that's what the President said.

QUESTION: Well, I wasn't a witness, so I can't swear to it first person, but that's what we had understood.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, of course, under the <u>Keith</u> decision, that wouldn't be possible, would it?
Unless you fall back on the national security, which we have very narrowed.

QUESTION: Well, are you satisfied that no federal agency is conducting wiretaps without your approval?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't say that I'm satisfied, but I have no knowledge, I have no knowledge, and I do not believe that there are any domestic wiretaps

23 24

2 .;

3 :

5

7

8

3,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

DRTING CO., INC.: DRTING CO., INC.: DRTIE Avenue, N.E. C. 200.:: except those authorized by the Department of Justice.

QUESTION: Now, some of the Army wiretapping is overseas, and thus they claim some sort of an extraterritoriality about them. Yet a wiretap by the U. S. Government against a U. S. citizen, even if it takes place on the moon, I suppose is covered by the Fourth Amendment, wouldn't you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I'm not at all sure that they are engaged in those services.

QUESTION: Well, they reported it to Senator Ervin.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think that at one time there were widespread intelligence operations within the Army, and Fort Holabird and Fort Monroe and computers, and all of this. But I've been led to believe that this is no longer done.

QUESTION: Well, just as a matter of principle,
would you expect that if DOD, if Military Intelligence in
let's say, Europe wanted to run taps on certain American
servicemen suspected of trafficking in drugs, would you
anticipate that their requests for that tapping in Frankfurt,
West Germany, would be approved by you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: If they had need for it, their recourse would be to work through the authorities in the country. And I'm talking about drugs or any of this, and to work through the regularly constituted -- now --

QUESTION: Authorities in which country, sir?

25 24

1 1

ī

5

8

95

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

ORTHALCOLN'S. Setts Avenue, in 1

3

5

G

8

7

9:-

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

90

23

21

415

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: In France and Germany, wherever they are. And I'm led to believe that this is what happens.

As you know, we have 400 agents of the DEA, Drug Enforcement Agency, around the world. They have no authority to wiretap Americans, --

QUESTION: Well, even --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: -- but you are also probably aware it's estimated there are 70,000 wiretaps in France.

The procedure would be to go to the police of the country where you're working, if you're worried about drugs or whatever it is, it's their problem.

Now, as to whether it's American citizens, they're being wiretapped in France by France; that's a question that has just never come up.

Whether they are entitled to Fourth Amendment protection while they are in France.

QUESTION: Well, can I leave that with you as a query, then, for your judgment? My question being whether a tap by U. S. agents overseas against U. S. citizens is covered by the Fourth Amendment?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: All right.

QUESTION: It's a judgmental question. I don't think it's ever been litigated.

ertika col 180. Datis Algeb 180. Do asses

_11

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And my initial answer is I don't believe there's any of it going on. As a theoretical situation, why, we'll try and do it.

As an American citizen, does he have any constitutional protection against being wiretapped by, say, in a Russian hotel?

QUESTION: Well, that wouldn't be covered by the Fourth Amendment if it's a Russian doing the tap; but the Fourth Amendment does seek to regulate the conduct of the U. S. Government and its agents, it seems to me, whether they are operating in Mexico or France or whatever.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, if it's the military placing the wiretap in that hotel, then the question arises.

QUESTION: Now, in your answer to his question,
you said that you didn't think there were any domestic
wiretaps, Title III wiretaps conducted without your knowledge.
Do you think there are any other kinds of wiretaps, any
national security taps that do not flow through the Justice
Department?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't believe so.

QUESTION: Are there any orders or rules or
instructions to everybody else, telling them to come to you
first?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. They're channeled.

QUESTION: And that -- and you do get requests from other agencies?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Right. And they meet the ; #:
same standard as any other.

QUESTION: The other day, testifying up on the Hill, Ramsey Clark said that there had been requests during his time here from the State Department to tap the phones of visiting delegations with whom the State Department was going to negotiate, sort of a mirror behind the other guy's poker hand.

Have you seen any of that kind of request?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't comment on that,
but I have no knowledge -- but I wouldn't comment on it if

I mean, you're talking about the bug in the chandelier and all this business in the meeting room and so on.

QUESTION: Yes.

QUESTION: Is Mr. Saloschin working full time to kill the FOI amendments on the [[ill?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, Mr. Saloschin is trying to strengthen the bill. One of the problems we just can't understand is how in the hell are we going to get the money, the various departments going to get the money to comply with some of the things. Some of them are going to be very

DNG COLING. As Avance 11.0.

3

1 !

2 1.

. 5

7

8

9:

- 10

11

12

13

I did.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2:,

expensive.

22 1

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The -- and a quick recovery. Ten days is -- and I liken it to, if you're going to get criminal prosecution, if you make a mistake it's going to keep going down the line until you get down to a GS-5, who's going to make the decisions. And I think it's self-defeating.

QUESTION: You mean the indexing thing?

Now, we support the bill. We just think that it can be a much more effective bill if it's put together in such a way, first, that there is money provided to handle the additional cost. Some say that the additional cost runs as high as a billion dollars.

Their projections are very unrealistic. And the suggestions that he's making are being given careful consideration. We're not being summarily dismissed, as one would believe on this. The people of Mr. Kennedy's staff and others have given careful consideration to this recommendation. They want this bill to work, and we do, too.

QUESTION: What's your position -- you've probably stated it but I haven't caught up with it -- on the Exemption. One problem, the Patsy Mink problem, that they are attempting to cure, to give the courts authority to, shall we say, whether to review whether a national security classification is properly attached to sought-after documents?

Trip ou are Buildings AC Little

1

5

7

6

8 9:

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 2;

20

23

54

25

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We're not hung up on that. We're living with that right now. It's not a great problem.

QUESTION: In other words, you don't believe that the courts -- I'll be more specific. One of your predecessors, Attorney General Mitchell, in a speech, expressed his doubts about the ability of federal judges to look into such questions and resolve them, and thought they would be improper inasmuch as they didn't have Q-sigma, something or other, clearance.

Do you have any problem with that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. I think that that's .a fact of life, and we go along with it.

Now, our hang-up, if we get away from the financial, we don't think that you can urge citizen participation in law enforcement. Now, this is a big thrust right now to get people to cooperate with the police, and to call -- we post telephone numbers every place: Call the police.

We're afraid that if at any time -- and we're not saying this bill does it, but it's got to be explicit that it doesn't -- if at any time that a citizen is going to read about his testimony the next day in the paper, it's going to make it more difficult to get citizen participation in criminal law enforcement.

Right now the people just say, "I don't want to get involved." They see a burglary, they see a robbery, they see violence, and they say, "I don't want to get involved".

Unless you get people to call up the police and tell them about violations, well, you've lost all your greatest sources of information for law enforcement. And I don't think the police can operate under a whole lot more handicaps.

Now, I think we've got to protect those persons, the citizens.

QUESTION: When Chief Kelley came in office down the hall -- this is another subject -- he indicated, in response to a question as to how he would handle requests from the White House, he said he felt he would do it just by operating through channels, that he would insist that such requests funnel through the AG's office and then to him and so on.

Have requests for FBI investigative files come from the White House through you to Director Kelley?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Have not. And those investigative files are strictly on a need-to-know basis in law enforcement. And we've gotten no such requests from the White House.

QUESTION: Some of the historians who have been trying to get FBI records under that order that Richardson signed last summer have said, have complained, about the slowness with which the FBI is processing the material.

24 25

1 |

2 !

3 :

5

6

8

Œ.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

90

23

Titlo Col. IIIO. To Avenue, N.C. 2001.2

9.

. 19

I think at least one has written you once or twice.

Professor Weinstein from Smith College.

Are you satisfied with the progress that the FBI is making in answering these requests, or --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Generally I am. Some of these problems are personality problems that go back a long time, and if there's danger of people being involved in changing their life, of being disturbed, I think we have an obligation to them.

QUESTION: But is there any intention on your part to either amend that order or to -- well, just to scrap it in any way, or not?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. We release things every day that can be released. There are a great many more released than are refused.

I think it's working. The people that they turn down are the people that they think would actually -- there are informants, there are people involved whose identity cannot be clothed if the information is released.

QUESTION: Is there any comparison between the FBI files and the Census records?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXEC: And what?

QUESTION: And the Census records.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: You can't see the Census records past

about 1900. They were just made available this year.

The Census records, the door-to-door census.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, that's covered by an entirely different set of statutes.

OUESTION: Have there been any developments in the Hearst case?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: None that I know of.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, can we talk for a minute on a parochial matter that you reminded me of --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: All right.

QUESTION: -- with your first reference. day you went to Godfrey Sperling's breakfast press conference. As you probably know, this is an invitation-only group. And they very specifically exclude the wires and, I think, the broadcast people.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Unh-hunh.

QUESTION: At 5:00 p.m. on that day, my Bureau called me and said, could I get the announcement that you had made that day on the Hearst case. And I said, Well, he made no announcement, I understood he went to a private gathering of reporters.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Unh-hunh.

QUESTION: But I went to the Information Office and asked if there was a tape. I was told there was a tape, and I was told, however, that I could not hear the tape because

BRTING CO. INC in series Australia 3.23

18

5

6

7

8

g:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

2 !

3

å

5

6

8

Q:

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

. 21

22

23 24

25

assurance had been given to Mr. Sperling that it would not be used for news release purposes.

Now, I, don't really see why the Attorney General in that statement should be -- have these conditions imposed on him by one or more newsmen.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: You've just got to have your own breakfast, that's all!

QUESTION: Well, I think the rule of reason would be --

[Laughter.]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAYBE: Jack, tell him. I asked Jack the same thing.

QUESTION: Well, my thinking, sir, is that once anybody at that breakfast has published what was said at the breakfast, there is no longer any reason for Jack to keep a tight sphincter on this thing. He can -- as far as I'm concerned, he ought to be able to let that tape go. And I think, in future, this would be a very sensible policy, and I would urge it on you strongly.

about something that I know very little about, and that's press relations. So I -- and I depended on Jack for this, and Jack get up and defend yourself.

JACK HUSHEN: It was their affair, we were their guests.

QUESTION: Yes, but I mean, do they need you or do

you need them? I mean, I don't see why any reporter should

tell a Cabinet member that: You gotta do it this way, Buddy; or else we won't have you back.

Something like that. That's silly. I mean -- and . *.*
when the Attorney General says something --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I have not -- I had no idea that any of these kind of restrictions were on when I went there --

QUESTION: Well, that's what I say; next time you get into one of these, why don't you make sure that, you know, sweep the field for mines first.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, stand up and tell him something.

[Laughter.]

A VOICE: Express yourself.

QUESTION: Can we find out what that bulletin is on the table -- about the public lawyers --

A VOICE: No tape for anyone.

QUESTION: No? Fair enough.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Herbert Porter was sentenced to thirty days, in a federal corrections -- "sic" -- institution --

[Laughter.]

QUESTION: Which wire service is that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know, but they've got to get a new printer.

FORTING DOLLAND MEETING AMERICAN EL DEC 20002

23

24 🗄

A VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Saxbe.

ĩ

Critica selatus sendantres art Michiga E