777	10.00	
- PK	TV1	

HOOVER REPORTING CO., INC. 320 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

PRESS BRIEFING

OF

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

WITH

THE WASHINGTON JOURNALISM CENTER

10:30 a.m.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1974

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONFERENCE ROOM

3

4

5

from?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE; How do you do.

A VOICE: The group has been in Washington --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Now, where are you all

A VOICE: Well, let's go around the table.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: All right.

They have all been here since January 15, A VOICE: so I am sure they've got lots of questions.

> ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, so I understand.

[Introductions.]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's pretty well geographically distributed.

A VOICE: We believe in balance of power.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Who has the first question?

QUESTION: How do you function as Attorney General on a day-by-day basis?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, of course we haven't had normal times here, because the job of getting acquainted with the Department has been really terrific for someone who hadn't been here. Some of the litigating things I'm fairly familiar with, but we have so much administrative duties that it has been quite a job.

Now, when I first came here, I spent at least two days a week visiting sections and familiarizing myself, going

over and spending several hours and having them parade through and tell what they did and how they did it; and visiting facilities.

I visited FBI field offices in the big cities and the small cities. I visited prisons. I visited some of the U. S. Attorneys' offices, the courts.

So all of this time was a little outside the normal routine of the Attorney General's office.

And then for the first two and a half months I didn't have a Deputy. Well, that meant that I had a constant parade every day of people from the litigating divisions who came in to make policy decisions on whether to bring cases, whether to settle cases, whether to approve certain actions.

This took a lot of time, and I frankly just found out I couldn't cut it, up until the time I got a Deputy I would just go home and be so tired I couldn't sleep.

It was just pretty heavy.

However, I've got an excellent Deputy, a better lawyer than I am, and with more expertise in bureaucratic dealings and Washington departments, and a hard worker.

And he handles this, which is a great relief, and that is the routine day-to-day settlements, approvals. We have to have approvals, the Attorney General has to approve tax cases; settlements, land case settlements.

The only thing that's left to me, that I have to do in the routine, is on the electronic surveillance. I personally review all of those applications for a warrant, for this type of activity. All the petitions for clemency, that's through the prison and the parole attorneys, pardon attorney.

The civil rights actions, I have to personally approve all those, they go through a routine that's been established here for some period of time.

And personnel and organization in the office has taken a terrible amount of time, because the week that Richardson left, he put into effect a reorganization plan that really, I don't think they understood what they were doing. And it was keyed to people who left with him. It no doubt would have served, with his people; but the people left with him.

We tried to make it work. They had a high

Department position for a non-lawyer, who served as an

administrative clearing house; and an adviser. And I filled

that with a capable man, and after several months he

determined that there just wasn't any place for him.

The turnover in personnel, not unusual, but still a difficult time getting competent people. We haven't filled up yet. It's a recruiting job, and I think any Department reflects the policies and personality, even, of the Attorney

7 8

Q

General. And this means that it takes time.

QUESTION: Has your perspective changed much since coming down as opposed to being on the Hill?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, it has.

QUESTION: How?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, in this fashion more than anything else: We're in the not popular business of investigating and apprehending and trying and jailing people. This is a big part of our business. Or litigating them out of business.

In other words, we're a punitive department. We can't sit back and let things come to us. We originate trouble for people.

And it's not very popular. And when you have to do these things, you just can't go out and expect a lot of popular approbation or support, even though most people want it done, it doesn't mean that they want to do it; and, frankly, they don't want to have much to do with anybody that does.

So it's an entirely different attitude, and it's one that I found difficulty in adjusting to. And I think this has caused a change. I'm not turned off on it, but, nevertheless, I recognize that it's a thing that you have to live with when you're in the law enforcement business.

And I suppose every rookie cop realizes this after a period

-- when you're doing an unpopular thing.

QUESTION: Since you're apparently willing to speak on the record, could you address us on the record of the Justice Department's attitude toward newspaper crossownership of broadcast facilities, and what you see is the ultimate result of the suits that Justice is bringing?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't talk about that, because this is in litigation.

QUESTION: Can you tell us what the philosophy is, or what Justice is --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, I can't, because we're talking about matters of antitrust investigation and litigation, and it will be developed in the cases.

QUESTION: Could you tell me who in your Department is supervising that area?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Mr. Kauper.

QUESTION: "Kopper"?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: K-a-u-p-e-r.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: Yes, sir. In the wake of Watergate, there have been proposals on the Hill for the creation of an independent Justice Department. Do you think such a plan is desirable and feasible? How would you envision such a plan working? How would it affect the day-to-day operations of the Department?

visualize it under our tripartite government, nobody knows quite where to put it, how it would fit. You couldn't put it under the courts. I don't think it would work under the Legislative arm, and if you remove it from the Executive, you'd have to perch it out some place where it would be beyond political responsibility, which is the way we run our government.

So I have trouble reconciling these views and the testimony up there from previous Attorneys General.

Katzenbach testified; Clark, and the rest of them, they couldn't reconcile it.

QUESTION: To follow up on that, there were, out of this, proposals for a permanent Special Prosecutor and proposals for separating the Bureau of Prisons from the Justice Department. What do you think about the need for those things?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, the permanent Special Prosecutor brings pretty much the same problems as the independent Justice Department. The buck has to stop some place, and you have to have responsibility.

And the best way that we've found in this country for responsibility is the responsibility to the electorate.

And we just don't like people that we can't throw out.

And when you set up some kind of a Super Prosecutor,

you run into a great many difficulities.

I don't just discard these ideas out of hand, but the people who originate them just don't come up with plans that hold water.

Now, what was the other part you asked?

QUESTION: In the course of the hearings on an independent Justice Department there was testimony that the Bureau of Prisons be separated from Justice and maybe put it in HEW.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think that's something Congress has to work their wisdoms on. I don't know how it got into the Justice Department, but it's here; and it's my job to run it while it's here. If they want to take it out, that's their business.

QUESTION: Do you concur with Mr. St. Clair's assertion that the dispute between Mr. Jaworski and the President over access to evidence is merely a matter of dispute within the Executive Branch?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I won't get involved in that. I think that Jaworski represents the Justice Department, and I would hesitate to make any statement that involved itself in Watergate. We're out of it. Jaworski has that responsibility, and he speaks for the Justice Department.

QUESTION: One of the problems arising in your nomination, or one of the things that you've had to confront

after being nominated has been to reinstate faith in the Justice Department as a Justice Department.

How are you going about the business of restoring faith in the Justice Department?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think it's even bigger than that. I think it's in the legal system, and in lawyers; I don't think it's just the Justice Department.

This is nationwide. Half a dozen State's Attorneys General have gone to the penitentiary, or have been indicted. And we've got at least two federal judges, one was convicted, another one indicted. It isn't limited just to the Justice Department.

And we've got seventeen lawyers, I think somebody came up with, in the Watergate affair.

I don't think there's any way to do it, except to proceed in a day-by-day basis of demonstrating competency, respect for our institutions, and fairness in their activities.

I don't know any other way to do it. We can't go out and say to people, "Look at me, I'm honest; the Justice Department is honest." Those are hollow words.

You just have to demonstrate them. That's going to take time.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, to follow that up, in your years as a lawyer and in public life, has something changed,

or is this just an aberration we're going through, or --?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think the change has been -- if there is one, and I feel there is; is a losing of the personal relationship to lawyers, as lawyers get into corporate work, as they get into big activities, those lose personal responsibility of the lawyer-client ethical standards.

And I don't question that 99 percent of the lawyers are honest and doing their best to represent their clients.

But, at the same time, we've seen some ridiculous courtroom behavior on the part of lawyers, which have embarrassed all lawyers. We've seen the twisting of some prosecutorial activities. All of these things reflections adversely.

QUESTION: In line with the image of the Justice

Department, do you think it was proper, or perhaps these

remarks were misconstrued, some of the pronouncements you

made on the Hearst case, and there were also some rather

provocative quotes made about so-called Jewish intellectuals

being soft on Communism.

Were these simply sensationalized by the press, or what effect have these comments had? Have you had any feedback on them?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, I've had a lot of feedback.

7 8

I suppose it arose all from my naivete and not comprehending the type of business that I was in. And I -- on the Hearst thing, though, I can't help but think that if this had been some obscure black girl who had taken off, no one would have given one damn, because her parents felt bad or because they were hurt that she was called a common criminal, or these things.

This is a decision every policeman has got to make before he makes an arrest, or before he swears out a warrant.

He says, "I arrest you for" -- blank, whatever it is.

But, it was an unpopular thing to say. Nobody wanted Patty Hearst to be involved in this thing, and it's a heartbreaking thing.

Now, as to the Jewish intellectual part of it, it was an observation I made, tied in to statements at that time that never became ppart of it. It had to do with why we were recommending that the subversive list be junked, which we have recommended to the White House. Because it was outdated.

And I projected an idea that -- they asked me why were these outfits no longer considered subversive. And I got into a projected discussion as to the conditions after a war, the witch-hunting of the McCarthy committee, and so on, that there was some anti-Semitism, and there were a number of Jewish intellectuals who were fascinated with Communism

at the time. And after the development of the Russian-Israel conflict, that they lost that interest.

And the organizations died. And the anti-Communism of McCarthy might have been camouflaged as anti-Semitism.

But when you draw out -- and I learned from it -- when you draw out long, involved personal thoughts like that, the only thing that develops is the fact that you said that there were Jewish intellectuals that were enamored with Communism.

QUESTION: Can you give us your reaction to the President's taped transcripts? Is this the same President Nixon that you have known in private? And do you think it was a wise move on his part to police those transcripts?

it, on the transcripts or on the Watergate proceedings, I just don't think it's my position, in the position I have, to do this. It's being prosecuted by Jaworski, and I've found that I can't have personal views on such things.

And that's what you're asking for, really.

QUESTION: I know, but just to follow that up,
would you then stand by your comment before you were
Attorney General, along the "bawdy house piano player"
comment, would you stand by that, that one would still have
to know what was going on?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Not at all. Again, I just

1	can't have personal convictions on that now. I'm in a
2	different ballgame.
3	QUESTION: Why is it you can have personal
4	convictions on the Patty Hearst case, but you can't have
5	personal convictions on the Watergate case?
6	ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Because it's my job to
7	catch criminals and put them in jail.
8	QUESTION: A second question, then you still stand
9	by your comment that you think Patty Hearst is a common
10	criminal?
11	ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Right.
12	QUESTION: What is your relationship with Mr.
13	Jaworski? And do you meet at all?
14	ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.
15	QUESTION: Do you oversee his records? Does
16	your accounting office or
17	ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We handle his housekeeping
18	We pay his people. We provide him with space. I don't see
19	him; don't talk to him.
20	QUESTION: What is your reaction to the idea of
21	establishing an appeals court that would take some of the
22	load off the Supreme Court? Would that do you see that
23	as an effective means of alleviating the Supreme Court's
24	workload?
25	ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Unless we can limit the

4 5

number of cases going to the Supreme Court, we're going to have to have some safety valve.

The proliferation of cases before the Supreme Court is going to have somehow be controlled.

QUESTION: But are there other ways that you can see of limiting the number of cases going to the Supreme Court?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, and some of them may not be to everyone's liking.

For instance, one of them, they gave a decision yesterday on this, these class suits -- boy, that's going to knock a whole lot of cases out. Because class litigation has become a very popular form.

But I'm not so sure that they should eliminate business by knocking out certain types of cases. But that's their area.

QUESTION: Sir, could you just briefly describe the degree of independence that the Director of the FBI has, and the Solicitor General?

I was surprised, as I think a lot of people were,

-- quite a civics lesson -- in the ITT thing. We find that
the Solicitor General, at least at that time, was kind of a
free agent, and the General treated with him almost equally.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I think that again depends upon the relationship between the Attorney General and

.

the Solicitor General.

Now, with my Solicitor General, we work together.

There's no feeling of difference. I respect his views.

He has to make the decisions on the cases to appeal, how to do this. And when he says that he can't take the case up, we make other arrangements.

But we don't necessarily drop the case.

Now, as to the FBI, that's another thing. You've got to remember that for 35 years the FBI ran almost completely independent from the Justice Department, and only just recently -- in fact, since I have become Attorney General -- have we brought them into the Justice Department.

And it's a long, slow process. But I'm determined to do it. They are either going to be part of the Justice Department, or Congress is going to set them up independently.

I think they should be part of the Justice

Department, and Director Kelley feels that way. He's got

a lot of old hard cases that, you know, that come along with

Mr. Hoover, and they prize their independence very highly.

It takes time. But it's going to work out.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, in an interview which is several months old now, I guess, you listed four goals that you would like to see done during your tenure in the Justice Department. They were: to crack down on white-collar crime; assault against drug pushers, suppliers; efficient use of

federal funds under DLEAA; and improving federal prisons and correctionals.

I wonder if you could tell us how you've set about to start accomplishing these goals.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, on the white-collar crime, we are making headway, we're running, at the present time, schools here for the U. S. Attorneys, who handle 95 percent of the cases in the Department, on how to detect, how to investigate, how to preserve evidence, how to present a case.

We are also increasing the number of accountants.

White-collar crimes generally require a high degree of skill in accountancy. We are -- we are doing this.

As to the prisons, we're making headway there.

It's a matter of trying to get facilities adequate so we can exercise some of the humane things that can only be offered to prisoners under the best of facilities. Some of our facilities are not good. We're going to have to abandon some prisons.

But we are opening new facilities, we're buying facilities. I just went up last week to inspect a new prison in Wisconsin that's going on line this week.

But there again I met with the wardens, I talked with them, I told them what I wanted from them. All the wardens, at a meeting. I'm encouraged on that score.

Now, as to the drugs, the whole drug picture is changing. We're trying to change with it. And we think that we've got an adequate setup. That's the only one that I'm not sure we're on top of, completely.

QUESTION: The Turkish question, where they are starting to grow the poppies again, is that a setback, do you think? Are you disappointed that the President didn't come out and --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: -- speak to the Turkish Government?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, it isn't something that can be accomplished by the President speaking to them.

Now, we've put \$31 million into Turkey, to buy poppies, poppy fields. Only a couple million of that trickles down to the peasants.

Now, for the President to come out and denounce Turkey, because it didn't turn out the way we wanted, isn't the smartest kind of international diplomacy. And I have considerable trouble with my drug people, they couldn't understand why we just didn't lambast Turkey, and say, Well, they stole the money; they didn't distribute it properly.

We can't go into the internal affairs of other countries to that degree.

The most that we can hope for is to get cooperation.

We're getting this. For instance, with Mexico now we're

getting excellent cooperation. They're working to the full extent of their capacity.

Their capacity isn't what we would like to see it, but it's encouraging.

And -- what was the fourth one?

QUESTION: The better use of LEAA funds.

attorney General Saxbe: This is, I'm afraid, going to have to go back to Congress for better legislation. This concept of new federalism just doesn't leave any room for too much discretion. In other words, we can't go to a State and say, We're not going to give you any money unless you do this and this and this.

As a result, a lot of money is not spent in what we think are the best ways. This is true. The GAO comes along and rips us up because the courts have not spent their money wisely.

Well, under the federalism concept, what we're doing is revenue sharing. And the very concept of revenue sharing is that you give it to them and they will then, in their wisdom, under the concept of the republic form of government, spend it wisely.

So we can't have it both ways.

If Congress wants us to get the biggest bang for the buck, they're going to have to give us the power. Right now we're just over there shoveling out money with scoop

shovels. And this is the concept of revenue sharing.

QUESTION: How do you feel about Senator Bentsen's proposal to depoliticize the Justice Department, in effect putting more employees in the Justice Department under the Hatch Act, making many employees career prosecutors, and forbidding the Attorney General to participate in any way in presidential campaigns?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can live with any bill that Senator Bentsen can get through Congress. But -[Laughter.]

arguing about this. This is a congressional problem. And they like to appoint the U. S. Attorneys. They like to appoint the federal judges. And I think it's a fact we've got to live with.

I would like to see the marshal service right now made a career service. There's no reason that marshals should be political appointees. We can develop much more expertise in a career service.

But -- and I'm going to suggest this -- but I have little hope that the Senators are going to give up their right to appoint marshals.

So, while the concept sounds good, I just don't see it, right now.

QUESTION: One of the parts of the Bentsen proposal

is to make a larger contingent of the attorneys under the Attorney General career service personnel.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Most of them are now.

Most of them are now. Except for the heads of sections,

and a few exemptions.

I would like to see it out in the U. S. Attorney's office. Now, they -- this is where the work is done. I would like to see a career service built up in the U. S. Attorney's offices.

Right now, even with the political pull and haul, we've got 26 or 7 percent that are holdovers from 1969.

And I'd like to see that built up.

If we had a career service there, we could rotate them in and out of Washington, bring them into the Antitrust, and then they could go back and they would be the antitrust expert in the Atlanta office; and we'd bring them into the Criminal Division; bring them into the Lands and Civil.

But, again, this has always been a political thing, and I'm just not too optimistic about getting it done.

QUESTION: But you would support the Bentsen proposal?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I would support most of it. Now, I think the U. S. attorneys should be appointed, I don't think we can get as good a people through a career system. And I can only judge by the fact that the ones that

are set up by statute to be above politics, and I'm talking about the regulatory boards that are the notoriously worse bureaucracies in Washington. And there's no responsiveness to the people. They're dominated by the people that are supposed to control them. The ICC is dominated by the people they are supposed to control. And if you've observed nothing else here, I'm sure you've observed that.

And I just don't have a great deal of confidence that you could do it that way.

But I would like to see the people under the U. S.

But I would like to see the people under the U. S. Attorneys. And the same way on the appointment of federal judges. My goodness, I hate to leave it up to the American Bar Association!

And unless you find some way to elect them, I don't know how else.

QUESTION: Do you have any views on the focus that is placed on so-called victimless crimes, such as homosexuality, prostitution, --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Pornography.

QUESTION: -- pornography. Do you think the police could perhaps better spend their time on some of the interests that you were talking about, drug traffic, white-collar crime, and so forth? Do you think there should be a de-emphasis on these so-called victimless crimes?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, but it isn't that

4 5

easy. Because society has established certain mores over the centuries that they want to enforce. And to throw those in the ashcan -- you may talk it, but you never do it.

And if pornography is offensive to a substantial majority of the people in the community, they are going to outlaw pornography.

And it's true of traffic. Traffic is generally victimless, isn't it? Somebody gets run over occasionally, but the stop signs, the parking, all of this, that's victimless. If you just look at it in a narrow way.

But the fact is that if you didn't control traffic, we couldn't move.

Now, this is true of a lot of other things.

We also know that if a guy makes moonshine whiskey and he sells it to somebody, and the guy likes it; so where is the victim?

We go at it and say, Well, he didn't pay any tax on it. So the government's the victim.

So every one has got a kink in it. It just isn't that easy to say that this is victimless crime. And pretty soon the courts have stretched to the point where you've got a victim on every crime.

QUESTION: Speaking of victims and crimes, the

Justice Department has called for more study on bills that

have been proposed to have federal compensation for crime

victims. Do you have any new views on this, do you think the legislation is worthwhile?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I do. I think that it's embarrassing to us right now that we cannot compensate some people, that they suffer because of activities of a government agency. There's no way they can recover.

For instance, in the Collinsville, Illinois, case, where they beat up those people, wrecked their house, and so on. There's no way they can be compensated for that.

Now, they've got personal suits against the individuals, civil suits, but I don't think they -- even if they got a judgment, whether it would be collectible or not.

But I would certainly like to see those people compensated.

QUESTION: What kind of commitment are you willing to make in terms of pushing for this kind of legislation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't make commitments on pushing with Congress, because I've spent so much time up there I realize how empty they are. We've got dozens of bills up there, that I could make all the commitments to hell and gone; but it's just meaningless.

I'll give you one bill, that if we could pass that bill today we could do away with one of the most serious problems in the country. And that's the infiltration of the aliens.

We're catching and sending back about 70,000 a month, and they tell us that this is maybe a third of the people coming in. If you got them all out of Washington, you couldn't find a waiter in any restaurant.

The illegal alien is with us.

Now, if we make it a felony to employ an illegal alien, that solves the problem. Because these people come here because they're desperate and need work.

Congress won't pass it.

QUESTION: What are the forces against that particular bill?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Mainly agriculture.

They want cheap work, they want cheap employees, and they can't get them any other way.

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, you say you meet frequently with the FBI Director, and you work much more closely with the FBI than --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, sir.

QUESTION: -- was done previously. I wonder if you, personally, are concerned about the way FBI files were used and the way names appear in the files without -- with just charges and not dispositions; if you're doing anything about cleaning that up.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Those files are not available to anybody; an investigatory file is not available.

4 5

They aren't available to the police. The only distribution that is made are of rap sheets, criminal histories; these all come from public records.

Now, in the privacy laws, which I support, we are going to make a requirement on all police, not just the FBI, that nothing can be distributed unless there is a conclusive determination on that case. The arrest cannot be -- now, that doesn't mean -- that means that if there has been no positive decision within a year, that will be taken off.

Now, why put it on at all? Simply because a guy is arrested for bank robbery in Norfolk and he's turned loose, and he's arrested here the next day on a bank robbery and he's turned loose, and he robs a bank in Gaithersburg tomorrow. We know that criminal histories are violent and move fast.

Now, criminal career usually lasts from five to seven years. If a guy can make it past 32, we know that he's not going to get involved in crime. And that's why we even talk about not making these histories available, if there's been no entry for five or seven years.

This is meeting quite a bit of opposition.

And, frankly, there's so many holes in it -there's so many holes in it. Well, what's one of the holes?

Any newspaper could invade my privacy at any time they want

to. You can keep more record on every criminal action that

I've ever done or been convicted of. What the hell good

is it to deny to the police department to do the same thing?

When any credit service, any newspaper that wants to, and

with a computer will have this available and can spread it

over the front page any time they want to?

So if we're talking about privacy, it's got to be complete privacy.

QUESTION: I wonder if you feel that if someone's name is in one of the investigative files, say, my name as Joe Citizen, do you think I should be able to at least find out if there's such a file?

attorney General Saxbe: No. The -- how does it get in there? It gets in there, usually, by a complaint, of a neighbor, a friend, an enemy; and to say that it has to be properly filed and an affidavit filed and you be given notice that your neighbor has said that you're making home brew in your basement and selling it out the back door, or some other heinous crime, would serve no purpose.

It would -- and certainly if that is going to be used in any manner, then you should be notified.

But if it is a ridiculous complaint, worthless complaint -- say, we have a warranted wiretap on somebody, and you call them about a lost dog. Your name would show on that file. And there would be no end to the notifications.

You're not involved in any way in this guy's counterfeiting operation or whatever it might be. But, because there was a tap on that telephone, properly put on there by a warrant, your name would show.

Now, I'm not -- if there's a better way to do it,
we want to know about it. But, frankly, there hasn't been
a better way to do it. And the security of investigative
files must be kept secure. Because they can't be distributed
to local police departments, or local politicians, officials,
or anybody else; and to my knowledge they are not.

I can't even see those files. Oh, I suppose I could, but I don't want to.

No one has access to those files except on a need-to-know basis, and they have to prove it. And they have to have a real need, not just some phony thing.

I'm going to have to go, I've got an 11:30 appointment.

QUESTION: Okay. I just wanted to ask, you mentioned earlier in the discussion that the flap created by your statements in the Patty Hearst case may have arisen out of your naivete and your not comprehending the kind of business you're in. I'm not clear what you meant by "the kind of business" you're in.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The law enforcement business.

The fact that nobody wants to believe the bad news, and the

fact that nobody loves a cop, and that the friendly treatment that I had received as a Senator, which I came down here, fat and happy and blithely presumed I would receive, went out the window when I lost my irresponsibility -- because up there you can say anything. You can be an expert on everything!

[Laughter.]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Most of them are!
[Laughter.]

QUESTION: And what is your relationship now with the Randolph Hearsts? Has it --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: What?

QUESTION: What is your relationship with the Randolph Hearsts now? I mean, is it amiable, or is it strained, or what?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It's the same, the same that it always has been. To me he's just a name, I don't know him. But I feel for him. I wish that his daughter wasn't involved in this. My goodness, there's a hell of a lot of people in this country that have got the same trouble that he has, whose daughter has gone into a life of crime, or drugs.

It's all a matter of degree. They ran off with some boy they didn't approve of, or -- the trouble isn't limited to the rich, and the well-known.

If you want to know real tragedy, go up here in some of the black areas here in Washington, and you find a hell of a lot more tragedy than Randolph Hearst has. And we have to think about those people, too.

And I wish this had never happened to her, but it And she, I suppose, would be classed as an enemy of But, as I say, it's a damn shame.

> A VOICE: Well, thank you.

A VOICE: Yes, thank you.

A VOICE: It was very interesting.

[Whereupon, at approximately 11:15 o'clock, a.m., the press briefing was concluded.]