



# Department of Justice

REFERENCE

P5

668

M1

---

## PRESS CONFERENCE

July 14, 1970

STATEMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN N. MITCHELL

MR. MITCHELL: If you ladies and gentlemen are ready, I would like to welcome you to another periodic press conference of the Justice Department.

Before I get to your questions, I have one announcement to make. Many of you have been inquiring as to what the Department of Justice would be doing to test the constitutionality of the legislation passed by Congress giving the 18-year-olds the right to vote after January 1, 1971.

The Department has now prepared letters which will go to the governors of 50 states. We are directing the governors, and their appropriate state officials, to give us a written report by Monday, August 3, of what they have done and what they are doing to comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1970.

Specifically, we are asking for a status report on what each state has done to eliminate the literacy test; what each state has done to make the necessary changes in their laws dealing with the residency requirements for voting for the President and Vice President and, of course, most importantly, what each state is doing and has done to permit our 18-year-olds to vote on and after January 1, in all elections and primaries.

I would point out that although the law gives 18-year-

olds the right to vote legally, they will not be able to do so unless they are registered.

Because of the urgency of this matter, I have directed the appropriate Departmental attorneys to take all steps necessary to insure that the states comply with all of the provisions of this new law.

We hope we will have positive assurance from each state that it is making whatever changes are necessary in its procedures and statutes, to comply, but we have and will continue to take the position that if we do not receive a positive response by August 3, we will assume that the state does not intend to comply fully with the new federal statute and we, of course, will move accordingly.

That is the end of my statement, and I am available for your questions.

QUESTION: President Nixon said he hoped there would be an early constitutional test of the 18-year old vote, implying that this matter should be reviewed by the Supreme Court. Has the Department of Justice given that any consideration, and are you moving in that direction?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: We have given that consideration. We believe that certainly the 18-year old voting requirement and possibly the literacy test and residency requirements will be determined only by a Supreme Court test.

The actions that I have outlined here should lead to such a test in all three categories; in addition, as you know, we have the pending litigation in the District of Columbia here which the Department is defending and it is not beyond the realm of possibility that as matters develop in the future, this could possibly be an action with original jurisdiction in the Supreme Court itself.

QUESTION: I have been following your speeches since you took office -- I am talking about the dissenters, protestors and young people themselves. Tell us if your feelings have changed and what factors influenced you.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Carl, if there has been any change at all, it has been in the recognition that what we have been saying in the Department of Justice and other parts of the government have not been getting through to the students on the campuses.

In meetings with them over the past year and some months, I have found that they have gone more for the rhetoric than the fact.

On the other hand, I would point out that if you would go back and look at the speech that I made on Law Day in Detroit last May, a year ago, that you will find many of the same passages and provisions in that speech that are contained in my more recent speeches.

I would say that perhaps we have not changed any of our thoughts or positions, but we have perhaps found a new vehicle for expressing it hopefully to get through to the younger group.

QUESTION: What is it that you want the young people to do?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: To get at the facts relating the position of the Department in its support and belief in all of the constitutional rights, particularly the first amendment rights, including the right of assembly as well as free speech -- making sure that we in the Department and government are going to back those to the fullest extent and at the same time point out to them that violence is not part of the exercise of constitutional rights.

QUESTION: J. Edgar Hoover has reported that the Black Panthers are the most dangerous group in the country and that the SDS is responsible for much of the violence on the campuses. Do you agree with this statement?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I am aware of the Interim

Report that Mr. Hoover put out at the end of the current fiscal year, and I would point out that we in the Department of Justice who are charged with prosecution of cases do not characterize organizations.

Our obligation is, of course, to relate circumstances to individuals and those, of course, who have committed crimes as individuals are pursued under the appropriate provisions of the law.

QUESTION: In another speech you made on Law Day, you spoke out favorably about the Supreme Court as an institution, about its broad policy and you spoke favorably of the justices individually.

In light of that statement, what is your reaction to the current effort to impeach Justice Douglas?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: My Law Day speech of this year, relating to the Supreme Court, had nothing to do with that subject matter at all.

The current consideration by the House of Representatives, of course, was within their domain as the third branch of the government, and I don't think it would be appropriate for me to comment on a pending proceeding of this type.

QUESTION: On the FBI report, on another aspect, could you comment on the propriety of the FBI reporting to you that students were organizing to support political candidates and programs opposed to the administration policies, and doesn't this run counter to your Texas speech?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I can't put it in that context,

but I would point out that the passage in the Director's Report had nothing to do with the activities of the FBI as such. It was reporting a factual circumstance.

The most important factor of it is that the passage stated that the students were hopefully directing their efforts toward getting out of college for a number of weeks, or whatever period was indicated, in order to carry on those activities.

He was reporting the factual situation as determined by the Bureau.

QUESTION: Something we don't understand about the Justice Department. In granting immunity of prosecution and forgiving long years in jail as penalties as a result of the Statute, there are indictments on the books against two men who did a lot of defrauding in Washington and in the Washington area of area homeowners.

You are forgiving those men all those charges in order to get their testimony against Congressman Dowdy, and in the indictment against Dowdy, you are doing the same thing you accused Mr. Dowdy of, I noticed in several cases.

Is it the Justice Department policy to grant immunity from prosecution in order to get states' evidence?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: That was a long and involved question. It is a pending case, as you know. I would point out that it is an important part of law enforcement and the administration of justice that immunity be given in the appropriate cases.

Of course, it is given very sparingly and only in instances where it serves the ends of justice.

QUESTION: The House-Senate Conferees have passed on the D. C. Crime Bill, including such provisions as the No-Knock Bill. Do you see this as a test balloon for which this legislation could be applied nation-wide?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Many of the states already have these provisions. I am sure you are well aware of this. No-Knock exists in some 30 states, so that what we are doing here, hopefully, is putting together the best piece of criminal justice legislation that we can for the District of Columbia.

Hopefully, we will be able to implement it to the benefit of the ends of justice and if it does work as we anticipate, I am sure there are many provisions that other states will be interested in looking at.

QUESTION: Yesterday, Mr. Leonard said that your administration is going to push school desegregation to the limit of the law. Do you think that will add to your problems of violence among students?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I think we know from past experience that the implementation of desegregation orders has caused problems in the south and other places where it has taken place.

I do not believe that the carrying out of desegregation orders or agreements can be put in the context of the student disorders that are generally referred to.

There may be some irritation until the plans are implemented, but we don't look forward to any controversy among the students.

QUESTION: You are coordinator on all federal disturbance operations and it is my understanding that computers are cataloging persons who are participants in these demonstrations, but not law violators.

Could you tell what legal underpinning there is for that kind of intelligence operation and why the government thinks it is necessary?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I know nothing about what the Secret Service is doing in this area. We have intelligence that exists for gathering information about potential disturbances that we might have to address ourselves to.

Necessarily, in working to that direction, the individuals that become involved and the information we do obtain about those individuals that have participated, is kept in our Intelligence Unit.

QUESTION: In that regard, do you advance a constitutional theory similar to the one used in the Chicago 7 days to cover use of electronic surveillance?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: It has nothing to do with it. To my knowledge, there are no decisions of the courts that would restrain us from compiling this type of information and for its use for the purpose to which it was put.

QUESTION: Did you consider resigning from the

President's cabinet after the Carswell nomination was defeated.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: The only way I can answer that is no. There are, however, occasions on which one might wish to be fired. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: Do you see any changes in the Burger court that you want to tell us about?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I am sure that my assessment of the court is available to everybody. I believe that the Chief Justice has made substantial steps forward in the administration of the court and the rest of the Federal system.

I think in his first year that was perhaps the greatest impact and I recall some of the other justices on the court in writing opinions referring to recently new-found wisdom. Whether that was the effect of the Chief Justice or otherwise, I can't say.

QUESTION: Can we get back to the change in rhetorical emphasis in some of your recent speeches and statements? Could you give us a little more of a clue as to why you felt it necessary and advisable to make those changes? Were you worried about polarization in the country among the youth, and did you discuss this in advance with the President?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: No, I am not in the habit of discussing my speeches with the President or he with me, but I think the thrust of your question is, or the answer should be to your question that what we stand for, what we are doing and what we think was not getting through to the young people

on the campuses. Certainly, not the varying groups I have met with -- college students, law faculty, and the rest.

So, that the innovation -- if there is an innovation -- in what you refer to as rhetoric is that we are trying to make our position more clearly understandable to them so that they won't have the problem of misunderstanding what we are doing.

QUESTION: Do you anticipate that the pressure you are applying on school desegregation in the south will cost the party politically or the party political support in '72?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I would say that in this area -- although we don't look at it in this context -- in this area there are few of these districts left and most have come into compliance by agreement.

We feel that in talking to the people that are the subjects of these court orders and undertakings that they understand that the law of the land is now such that requires them to desegregate and I don't believe that there are very many people who are looking at this as a political matter any further.

It is getting more ready acceptance and I am sure that once this coming school year is over that the circumstance will be well behind us.

QUESTION: The head of the Civil Rights Division, Jerris Leonard, was asked yesterday if he would support a change in the law to get at some of the racial isolation that doesn't seem to be giving way under the present law and he, in effect, referred to the question he asked you and said that was something

that his superiors would have to respond to. Could you speak to that question?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I think Mr. Leonard referred to administration policy. As you know, the President has spoken on this subject matter.

I would answer it for myself by saying, or pointing out that you must recognize that there are constitutional principles involved as to how far one may go in this process and with respect to the statutory provisions that Senator Mondale spoke to, I would like to see them and examine them in the light of the constitutional provisions before making such a determination.

QUESTION: What are the constitutional problems?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: As to how far the Congress would require the school districts to go in the desegregation process.

QUESTION: You said you are not getting through to young people. Are you concerned about whether you are getting through to the Blacks?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Of course. We are concerned in getting through to all segments of the population.

QUESTIONS: Do you see any grounds for the concern on the campuses about repression? Are you concerned about the possibility of repression in this country?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: No, I don't, other than in this rhetorical vein that keeps coming up. As you know, as far as the Federal government is concerned, this administration we

fought in the Congress to keep the Federal government off the campus except through funding and other aid.

It has been a tough fight and we have been successful in it. We feel that the posture of the Federal government with relationship to the campus should be one which we are now involved in and not one of police or law enforcement.

If the campuses, as such, look upon what we are doing here in the Federal government and the law enforcement area as being repressive, it is because they have not been getting the message. This is what we are trying to get through.

QUESTION: Do you expect the record of this Congress on anti-crime legislation to be an issue in the fall campaign, and will you be available to speak for Republican candidates this fall?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: With respect to the first question, we still have time between now and the election. Most of our legislation has passed the Senate. Most of it has received or is currently receiving hearings by the various House committees and I would anticipate that the Congress will move on at least our major basis of crime legislation before the elections.

I specifically refer, of course, to the D. C. legislation which has been resolved in conference; and to our narcotics bill, the one that is so important to us that has passed the Senate, and to our organized crime bill, which as you know has passed the Senate and is in the House Judiciary Committee, and the fourth one is the Law Enforcement Assistance Program which is

quite important.

QUESTION: I hold in my hands, the Police Guidance Manual financed entirely by your department. I quote the Washington Star, "Intended as a national model for police training literature." I would like to know what you are doing with this work which the Department financed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I can't answer that specifically. I will provide you with an answer, but if the document which I recognize as what you say it is, it will be used for the purpose expressed.

QUESTION: You held a news conference a year ago today in connection with Bastille Day. Is there any possibility that we can expect any kind of regularly scheduled news conferences from Mrs. Mitchell?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: With respect to my own, I think we will have periodic press conferences on a more regular basis. As far as Mrs. Mitchell is concerned, as you know, she generally speaks for herself.

QUESTION: As your first annual press conference, you gave us a bit of a rundown on the wire tapping and bugging in the security field. You said it was down from what it had been when you took office. Can you bring us up to date on the trend?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I am not sure I can answer your question. Our Title III, court-authorized wire taps are up extensively over last year. Our national and internal security wire taps generally are pretty constant.

QUESTION: It hasn't changed much?

MR. MITCHELL: No, not greatly.

QUESTION: Can you tell us in the court order on tapping, how many have been and what use you have made of the 24-hour emergency tap?

MR. MITCHELL: I am not certain, but I don't recall that it has ever been used. I don't recall it ever having been satisfactorily used.

QUESTION: What happens if on the Internal Revenue decisions to take away tax exemptions from private schools that carry only white students, what happens if a private school opens its doors to Black and white students and no Black students come? Are they still tax exempt? Are they still to be tax exempt?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service is in charge of the rulings and decisions in this area. I understand he is putting out new regulations and I would assume that the circumstances you recite show a non-discriminatory policy that the ruling will be forthcoming.

QUESTION: With the August 3 deadline for action, is this automatically required to go to the Supreme Court?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: No, I would think not. We have, of course, the potential of doing that if the court in an appropriate case would assume the jurisdiction, but in order to make sure that we cover all of our potentials to get these matters resolved at the earliest possible date, we would certainly start off the suits in the three-judge panel and move

them to the Supreme Court as quickly as possible. I am sure that you are aware that the literacy test provisions become effective immediately.

This is another issue that we would like to have resolved at the earliest possible opportunity.

QUESTION: Would there be any action prior to August 3?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: It is possible that there will be. We are exploring all of the avenues and it is conceivable that there could be.

QUESTION: One more step on that, if I may. If any given state shows no signs of complying with the Voting Rights Act of 1970, can you then move against that state and have your original suit? Would that be the vehicle for its development?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: In the proper circumstances and with an appropriate determination that they were opposed to taking the requisite steps, this would be an area where we might consider jurisdiction.

QUESTION: And the Department would have to be defending on the Act?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: The Department will defend the Act. We have been directed to do so by the Congress and the President of the United States.

QUESTION: Could you tell us something about the Baltimore case? George Beall says the case is being investigated. Do you consider the case closed and would you give us your reasons?

MR. MITCHELL: A case is never closed until there has been an affirmative decision made in that respect. In this particular matter, or at least so far, the final determination has not been made. The reason the Justice Department did not authorize the signing of the Indictment Bill by the U. S. Attorney, is because of the staff of the Criminal Division, which did not agree with the U. S. Attorney in Baltimore with respect to the merits of the case.

The memorandum in the Criminal Division of the Department, which went from the bottom all the way through the review process to the top, setting forth the reasons why they didn't agree with the U. S. District Attorney in Baltimore, was filed by the court.

QUESTION: Do you feel it helpful in getting your case across to have your wife talking about the radicals and living in a high security compound?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: As far as what my wife is saying, I think you will have to look at it in full context. She has said some nice and intelligent things about the youth and has had some rapport with them, as you may have seen reported in the paper, and I don't look upon the Watergate as a high security compound. I think it is overrated and too expensive.

QUESTION: You mentioned a minute ago that the amount of wire tapping under Title III has been upped extensively. Could you give us some idea of the magnitude of last year and this year in absolute terms?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I would say that it is up over 100 percent.

QUESTION: What was it last year in absolute terms:

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Including renewals and extensions, we had 33.

QUESTION: Last year?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Last year, during the filing period. It is up over 100 percent at this time.

QUESTION: You said earlier in response to a question on school desegregation that once this school year is over the circumstances should be well behind us, suggesting that the obligation will have been fulfilled in the south.

When do you anticipate that it will be over next year and the issue will be entirely behind us?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I would think that after the 1970—1971 school year, that not only will the school districts in the south have converted from the dual school system to the unitary school system, but most of the irritants that were brought about by these conversions will be behind us and desegregation will be accepted as a fact of life and that the process of education can go on the way it should.

After all, education is what the schools exist for and we have to look to the implementation of the best possible education.

QUESTION: You spoke of the need, in order to help the young in the country to understand what the administration is doing to shift your posture of public statements. You said it was an important thing to do.

Does it also not follow that it is important for the Vice-President to make a similar shift?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I think I can leave the Vice-President to take care of his own approach to the problem. I would like to point out again that if you take and look at the total text of the Vice-President's statements and view them in that total text and the extension of what he says, all I can see is that the newspapers in this area have given him a bum rap.

QUESTION: There has not been an administrator appointed for LEAA and Congress is considering changing the administrative set-up. Why has there not been an appointment and do you support the changes being proposed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: The reason there hasn't been an appointment, the House and Senate have a revision of the legislation relating to that subject matter under consideration. It would be rather fruitless to go ahead and make an appointment in this.

I personally am not going to interfere with what the Congress is doing. I think I have made my position clear on the subject matter. As far as my position is concerned, I would keep the troika, but in a changed form.

QUESTION: What kind of changed form?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Basically, to provide that

the administrator in the No. 1 spot would have complete control over the operational functions of the administration in respect to hiring personnel and buying pencils, and so forth, so that it isn't necessary for all three administrators to concur in that area.

QUESTION: You haven't said what the cause for the increase is in wiretapping?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: The cause for the increase is the further activity of our investigating agencies and this is primarily in connection with our strike forces and in connection with our Bureau of Narcotics and dangerous drugs.

QUESTION: There have been persistent reports of the Administration being politically anxious to see Jimmy Hoffa out of prison. Since that falls within the Justice Department and you are known as the political operator for the President, could you speak to that issue?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: If you are relating to the newspapers stories in the legislation that was referred to in one of the columns this week, <sup>that</sup> has been up on the hill for a long, long time. A good many months. I would point out that it was recommended by the FBI in 1960 and has been part of the legislative program of this Department ever since.

It has no relationship to it. With respect to Mr. Hoffa in his current position, I wouldn't know what it has to do with politics. It doesn't enter into the Justice Department's activity.

As you probably know, there are two ways he can get out of the present condition and that is through independent activity of the Parole Board and a Presidential pardon.

QUESTION: At the time Secretary Hickel wrote his letter to the President, the office of the President has become extremely isolated and the cabinet members could not get through.

Do you get through without any difficulty and do you have a feeling that you do it with more ease than other members of the cabinet?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I can't speak for the other members, but I can say that any time I have matters sufficient to talk to the President about, I can talk to him on the telephone or see him.

QUESTION: Some of the student groups are planning to shut down or attempt to shut down some of the campuses late in October so that the students can work on the political campaign of certain candidates of the House or Senate. Do you think that is a good idea, or does that generate certain trouble on the campuses?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: It should <sup>not</sup> generate a potential for trouble. I think the students should be interested in the political process and should engage in it at every possible opportunity. I can't imagine anybody quarreling with that.

The only caveat we might put forward in connection with this is that students go to colleges to get an education. They shouldn't abort their educations to involve themselves in the

political process which means if they get out in October they will extend their terms on one side so that they will have the full benefit of the scholastic resources.

QUESTION: With Congressional action being taken against organized crime, do you see that as a trend toward a different kind of focus? There has been emotional concern with law and order. Now, with Congressional action against organized crime taking away the monies that are being implemented through the functions of organized crime, is this a new impetus?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Perhaps I don't understand it, at least if I don't, I have a subject matter that you might be interested in. Mr. Wilson and myself are actually convinced that organized crime and its activities in the ghetto areas has an extremely deleterious effect on those areas and that the further we go along in our organized crime program and the more we remove these people from their sale of narcotics, prostitution, gambling and extortion and the rest of it, it will help to end, in a small way, the trouble in the ghetto area.

QUESTION: I am wondering if there is a greater concern on all the billions of dollars that come out of highly organized crime and the emotional impact of the average system in the idea of law and order on the streets?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I think I could convert what I said to the point that we can get to the activities of organized crime and it will have a great impact on the areas and the ghetto and streets where emotions and other factors are involved. Organized crime leads to street crime.

QUESTION: Aside from the justice and political matters, there have been reports of varying degrees as to what position you took on the Cambodian operation. Did you express any reservations to the President concerning the plans for the Cambodian operation, or did you back them from the beginning?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I think that all I can say is what I have said before, that I participated in some of the meetings as a member of the National Security Council and the ultimate decision, as you know, was made by the President.

QUESTION: J. Edgar Hoover has denounced the Black Panthers as a most dangerous organization. I wonder if you think the statement might impair the Black Panthers in getting a fair trial.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Those individuals who are on trial in Connecticut and New York are not on trial as Black Panthers. They are on trial for crimes that they are alleged to have committed. The situation is entirely different. You don't try a Black Panther. They are tried as individuals for the crimes they commit

QUESTION: Are you going to campaign this fall, and if you are are you going to campaign for Senator Goodell of New York?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I have no plans to campaign for any individual at this time. What the future will bring, I really don't know at the moment.

QUESTION: As a followup, can a juror separate the offense through which a man is on trial with the fact that he is a Black Panther and that Mr. Hoover has said he is a member of the most

dangerous organization in America?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: The jurors have a more difficult problem in distinguishing facts and statements than just that, and I hope our jury system works well enough to enable them to do so.

QUESTION: As a member of Mr. Nixon's former law firm, would you tell us what contributions you and other members of the firm have made to the Nixon Administration?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: There is another member of the law firm working in the White House by the name of Len Garment. I am in the Justice Department. Those are the only two I can think of. Maybe it would be better if you assessed what contributions we made.

QUESTION: Concerning Mr. Hoover's statement on the Black Panthers, he said your agency is not or should not be involved in evaluating the particular groups.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I am not quite sure I heard the first part of your question. Are you trying to make a distinction? I think the situation really resolves itself to the point of the immediacy of the comment.

The general statement about the organization by Mr. Hoover has no effect on the prosecuting aspects of it, but if somebody in the Justice Department talked with respect to a particular case in the same terms, it might present some problems.

QUESTION: Do you think the Washington street crime problems have been mitigated?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: No, it has not. That is

why we are anticipating with great delight the final passage and signing of the so-called Crime Legislation which goes far beyond that to the reorganization of the courts and bail reform and defenders operation and hopefully better corrections, and all of the other aspects of the criminal justice system.

QUESTION: Since the flap over the subpoenas on reporters and TV notes and film has the Department been getting any of this sort of information by negotiations and simple requests other than subpoenas?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Yes.

QUESTION: Could you give us some examples?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I am not sure the newspaper media people would like to have the information now. I can assure you there has been voluntary compliance.

QUESTION: In what kinds of cases? Black Panther? Anti-trust?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: No, most of them had to do with the antiriot statutes.

QUESTION: Which cities? Generally, how do you feel about the Negro in the Black communities to the policies and activities of the Nixon Administration?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I have been disturbed by them. I believe that some of the spokesmen for the community are not being realistic about what the Nixon Administration is doing in these fields. It is another place where the message hasn't gotten through.

I give as an illustration the convention of the NAACP

in Cincinnati where one of the gentlemen got up and condemned the operation of the Philadelphia Plan and said it was not being implemented and was being sold out to the Hard Hats.

When Mr. Fletcher got on the floor and told the story it turned the whole thing around. There is much loose talk about what the Nixon Administration is doing and not doing .

QUESTION: In addition to the discontent of the Blacks on the campus, we have seen the Hard Hats take to the streets and more in America seem to be up in arms. Does this disturb you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: We would like to have tranquility in all sections of the country and all of its various groups and what we are trying to do is, as you say, is bring these people together. It has not been accomplished. Along with you, we are working it out.

QUESTION: Mr. Mitchell, you mentioned certain constitutional limits to segregation. What constitutional limits do you have in mind?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I referred to legislation that might have those constitutional limitations and said that I would, before endorsing a piece of legislation, I would like to see its contents. What legislation I was talking about, I don't know specifically.

QUESTION: In the discussion of change in the law, as you understood it, came from Mr. Leonard?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Mr. Leonard was using the law as to relate to the court, Congress and perhaps even the

Constitution. He even mentioned specifically as courts, as you know.

QUESTION: The question is, what changes did he have in mind rather than what Senator Mondale had in mind.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I haven't talked to him about it.

QUESTION: Do you find any irony in that you will have to defend the 18-year-old vote provision and do you think it will be necessary for Congress to order its own defense of that law?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I find no problem about this at all. I think any good lawyer can take any side of the case and argue it with equal ability. This certainly is the case from the point of view of the Justice Department from time to time.

We certainly don't agree with all of the cases or the prospective conclusion of all of the cases that we have in the Department. With respect to the Congress, I don't believe that it will be necessary for them to have their own counsel.

Not only will the Justice Department be involved in this, but I am sure there will be many outstanding newspapers participating.

I understand the Democratic National Committee is working in the field along with other groups, but if the Congress desires to have counsel in the matter, we certainly would welcome cooperating with them in every way.

QUESTION: It has been reported in several newspaper columns that you have on your desk a prepared indictment for Governor Arch Moore of West Virginia, a pending income tax case.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: That was a pure spec story. That has nothing to do with it. I won't comment on any pending investigation.

QUESTION: Is there such an investigation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: I wouldn't comment on that.

QUESTION: We have had a fairly quiet summer in the ghettos. Do you think any of the credit for this or absence of violence might go to the stern image that comes from the Justice Department?

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: No, I do not. I don't think that is necessarily the case. I would put it in perhaps three categories. I think the fact that the Federal government is prepared to respond to any potential large-size riot or civil disturbance does have a cooling effect.

I am talking about those of the type of New Haven and other places where we prepositioned law enforcement officers, National Guard units, and in a couple of cases Federal units.

I would prefer to give the greater amount of credit to the understanding now of some of these groups that it is non-productive to bring about a large-scale riot.

Secondly, I believe that the police forces in this country have become more professional with respect to their approach to these problems and the way that they handled them.

Thirdly, I would like to take some credit on behalf of our community relation services which work behind the scenes and under ground, but it is very, very effective in many of these areas. Thank you, gentlemen.