

24

Bepartment of Justice

		,
	BSP-1 1	TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING WITH
	2	
•	3	THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. SAXBE
	4	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
	5	and
	6	
	7	THE "FRONTGROUNDERS" BREAKFAST GROUP
	8	
	g	***
	10	
	11	
	12	SHERATON-CARLTON HOTEL
	13	INORDDAL, IDAOARI II, IDII
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	20	
	20	

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

QUESTION: Everything is on the record. Anyone who has a question go ahead. Why were you late? (Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's a fair question. Miscalculation. No. I had a couple of phone calls this morning about the strike, and I -- it took me longer to get here than I thought.

QUESTION: Are there any new developments in the truckers strike?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. They think they have got it settled; but the problem is, the organization is so loose, that it is a lot different than dealing

with a recognized union. There's about 15 different organizations; and some of the things they are striking for are impossible to satisfy them on.

There is nothing they can do about the width of trucks, the length of trucks, the weight; these are all state matters. There are so many things. They are just striking against a change in their way of life. whether they go back, I don't know.

QUESTION: What is the status? You say you think they might have a settlement? Do you feel that the --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, they have reached agreement, at 5 o'clock this morning.

QUESTION: Oh, they did?

QUESTION: The strikers and the Federal Government?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And the strikers say they
will go back and sell it to their people.

QUESTION: I think you asked your U. S. Attorneys to watch for cases of violence and that type of thing. Is there very much of that reported around the country?

attorney general saxbe: There has been a surprisingly small amount. But there have been two deaths, shootings and rock throwings. The U. S. Attorneys -- and I won't know until I get a report on it -- have been exploring quite a few areas on where they can intervene, and not the least of which is antitrust conspiracy; and then the so-called Rennie Davis Act, which was a 1968 Act -- blocking the highways. And then you go back to the Ku Klux Klan acts that followed the Civil War; and some of them are really rugged.

QUESTION: Do you think any charges are going to be brought as far as you know now? Is there any indication --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, yes. We have already got injunctions in two districts and we are moving into the civil rights area.

OUESTION: Is that under Section 241?

But because of the nature of these strikes, -- it's hard to call it a strike; it's a protest --

they don't want to be a part of the energy crisis and some of the other things that are facing the country. They are loaded down with these expensive rigs; some of them cost as much as \$50,000; they are in book to the bank for everything they've got; it is a cut-throat, competitive business.

I pointed out yesterday I knew truck firms that owned 150 trucks ten years ago; today they don't own any.

It's cheaper to work through these owner-drivers. They will drive cheaper than you can hire people to drive. And as a result of the cut-throat competition, they are in financial difficulty. They want to change this. I am not sure that they can by any negotiation or strike or anything else. And this is one reason that it may be difficult to sell any kind of a settlement. That's why we moved so vigorously in this area; because they said they were going to bring the country to its knees; and I think any kind of a seditious statement like that has to be met headon.

QUESTION: Do you expect to see the trucks rolling

Ch

now, or is that still a question in your mind, as to whether --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The negotiators believe that it is settled.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, I wonder if I could ask you a very provincial question. We have, I think as you know, a Federal Judgeship in Milwaukee that has been vacant for over three years. I understand there has been some interest in it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I have been working on it.

QUESTION: I wonder if you could tell us when you expect something on it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I hope to get a breakthrough in another couple of weeks. I have been talking to Congressmen, Senators, the White House.

QUESTION: Do you still have only one name on that, Glenn Davis, or do you have other names?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; there are other names. Like Glenn Davis, just names floating. No names have been sent up.

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, when you were on the tube last night, you spoke about the possibility of filing amicus curiae briefs on behalf of the Office of the Presidency in the Watergate --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: On behalf of the government.

QUESTION: On behalf of the government. Can you go

into that a little bit and tell me -- I understand you have got a study over there that is on the verge of being made public about the whole impeachment question. Can you tell us what that is?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It is a brief, an 80-page brief, which we think is particularly good.

QUESTION: Who prepared it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The Office of Legal Counsel.

QUESTION: Is it on the impeachment?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It is a study of the whole issue -- it really more a study than a brief. I hope someday it can be made public, because it is pretty good. But it can't be until it is released by either Mr. Jaworski or the White House.

QUESTION: Was this done at your request, or at the White House's request?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It was under way long before I came in.

QUESTION: What did Mr. Jaworski have to do with impeachment?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Nothing particularly on this. But this is a brief and he is part of our office. It goes into things such as: can you have an indictment before impeachment. It presents pro and con on a number of

25

questions.

QUESTION: On that particular question also?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. It treats it.

QUESTION: You mean they have to have his permission to release it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. But the White House has not seen fit to release this.

QUESTION: Does the White House have copies of it?
ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, yes.

QUESTION: Have you recommended that it be released by the White House?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: This question came up when the Vice

President was in trouble. Was that when the brief was begun,

or was it started --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. I think not.

QUESTION: When was it started?

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

It was under way when I went there.

QUESTION: When was it completed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: About ten days ago.

QUESTION: Does it differ at all from the brief that was filed in the Agnew case?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, it is much more complete.

. 18

QUESTION: Does it differ --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: This has a lot to do with the historical background of impeachment, the English law, the derivation of certain words, the meanings, and this kind of thing.

QUESTION: But does it differ from the conclusion that was made by the Justice Department in the Agnew case, that the Vice President can be indicted prior to impeachment but the President cannot be indicted prior to impeachment?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It doesn't come to any conclusion; that's why I say it's more a study than it is a brief.

QUESTION: It gives both sides of that --ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's right.

QUESTION: What about on the issue of the definition of "impeachable offenses"? Is it the same thing?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It treats that.

QUESTION: It treats it giving the one broad interpretation plus the narrow one --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXEE: People are looking for definite answers are not going to like it; and that is why I call it a study rather than a brief, for one side or the other. It -- I don't know how many saw the House pamphlet. It kind of goes from there, more in depth.

QUESTION: Do you have a personal legal opinion

QUESTION: Yes.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: -- an amicus brief would be filed to be sure that any court has the full content of

about the question of wheeler or not a sitting President can be indicted?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. I think this is a vague area that is probably going to have to be defined by the court.

QUESTION: You wouldn't rule out that possibility offhand?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I think there could be considerable difficulties.

QUESTION: You say you don't have an opinion on whether a sitting President can be indicted?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Are you --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't have a conclusion that I would want to give.

QUESTION: Are you considering the possibility of filing amicus curiae briefs on behalf of the government if and when Jaworski hands down some indictments?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, what I am thinking about, on any one of these areas where we think it goes to the Presidency, the Office of the Presidency --

Δ

the question before it. And amicus briefs are usually filed in partisan matters where each takes their narrow view and the very name is "a friend of the court," that you wish to bring in full information to the court.

For instance, on a subpoena on the West Coast, if this should go into the Federal courts, we probably wouldn't get in in the lower court, but if it went to the Court of Appeals, we would file an amicus brief. We don't think it is in the best interest of the country that the President be available for any lower court in the country to subpoena.

QUESTION: Is there any other remedy that you see for protecting the President against a whole rash of law-suits?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, --

QUESTION: Just the other day -- I was wondering -ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXEE: Well, this is -- we think
the courts would protect him.

QUESTION: You don't see any need for legislation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't think so; not yet.

QUESTION: Do you feel strongly that, in the case of the Erlichman subpoena of the President, that the Justice Department and the White House counsel ought to do everything they can to prevent his forced appearance upon the theory that this may become an issue in many other cases that stem out of Watergate, where people --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, the White House counsel, I am sure, will resist this, or just ignore it; I don't know.

Now, in the case of Thomas Jefferson, he satisfied the court by writing a letter. Maybe that will --

QUESTION: Are you working on the problem of the President's response to a subpoena by the House Judiciary Committee?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; we are not.

QUESTION: You are not.

That has been left to the President's counsel?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Right.

QUESTION: Going back to the Erlichman subpoena, do you think it would be in better interest of the country for the charges to be dismissed ratner than for the President to appear? Would that be the only alternative?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't think that is even an issue.

QUESTION: Well, I am talking about Sixth Amendment defense that Erlichman could raise the point that he is being denied his best defense by the failure of the President to appear?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: When you get that far, you are guessing.

QUESTION: Well, wouldn't that be part of your brief?

Wouldn't you have to address yourself to the Sixth Amend-1 2 ment protections? ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Possibly. Possibly. But 4-3 4 QUESTION: -- as to whether or not the President --5 ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: -- that's down the road 6 a piece. 7 QUESTION: Pardon me? 8 ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's down the road a 9 piece. 10 QUESTION: What is your relationship with Jaworski's operation at this point. I mean, is he going 11 12 to tell you when he decides -- or when the Grand Jury votes 13 indictment? 14 ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I wouldn't think so. 15 QUESTION: Are you satisfied with your relationship 16 with him? 17 ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: 18 QUESTION: Any problems? 19 ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. 20 QUESTION: Do you question the veracity of John 21 Dean's testimony? 22 ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I have no reason to. 23 don't know that much about it. I just -- I have not any 24 information on that.

QUESTION: As a former Senator who is kind of

25

6

8

10

12

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

familiar with the moods on the Hill, do you feel that the Senate Watergate Committee ought to just close up shop and call it a day?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think so. They are straining a little bit now to keep in business; and the lecture fees are falling off and --

QUESTION: What? Lecture fees?

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And they have got --(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They have got to have a new event in the center ring, or they are -- and with the courts involved, three Grand Juries running, the House now cogged up to proceed, it is going to be tough competition.

QUESTION: Well, if they close it --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, they have run into things like they did on the milk thing. As I understand it, the milk people said, Sure; we will come in. We will bring our whole list of contributions. Oh, boy. That's the last thing they want. And I guess the same way with Howard Hughes. They said fine. Also tell about the \$50,000 I gave to so and so and the \$10,000 to so and so. You know, they aren't so anxious to get the facts as they thought they were.

QUESTION: Do you think they served a useful function while they were in existence?

ATTORNE

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I do.

QUESTION: You are saying that in effect the Committee, in conhection with the two areas that they had talked about going into, the milk producers contributions and the Howard Hughes contributions, are really afraid there because of embarrassing information that might be developed affecting themselves?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That and the fact that it is in litigation. We are defending on our milk producers suit and certainly the Special Committees are involved in both the milk producers and the -- not the Special Committee; the Special Prosecutor -- and it might louse up his activities.

QUESTION: Some people have seized on your early statements that you were making after you were sworn in as Attorney General and drawn the conclusion that you have functioned early on as something of a defense attorney for the President, more than the chief legal officer of the land.

How do you respond to that kind of a conclusion.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Show me where.

QUESTION: Well, some of the statements that you made in your --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, yes, but you said that I had functioned. Show me where I have functioned.

QUESTION: Just in your statements.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I certainly couldn't take the job of Attorney General if I thought the President was guilty; and I had to satisfy myself that there was nothing that was available to me or nothing that was convincing to me that he was. Therefore, I did take the job.

QUESTION: Were you shown the transcript of the March 21 conversation with John Dean?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I haven't seen any transcripts or listened to any tapes.

QUESTION: Have you been shown whatever it is that Senator Scott has been shown?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Do you want to see any transcripts or listen to any tapes?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

The office of -- the Department of Justice is operating, efficiently, I believe, for Mr. Jaworski, and I -- that's the way it is going to be.

QUESTION: What have you based your assessment of the President's lack of guilt in the Watergate affair on?

Just on personal conversations with him?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Personal conversation and the fact that nobody has at that time that I made that state-ment, or since then, shown me any hard evidence that he is involved.

9.

QUESTION: Bill, you reported recently -
ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: -- or soft evidence, I
might add.

QUESTION: You were quoted recently as saying that you believed the tapes had been tinkered with; you were convinced the President did not do it. Given the few people who have had access to both the tape recorder and the tape, why is the investigation taking so long to find out who did the erasure?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know.

QUESTION: Do you keep in touch with the FBI on that regularly?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. I keep in touch with the FBI on a regular basis, but not on this matter; because they are working for Mr. Jaworski.

QUESTION: Is there any --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think it is important that we maintain this charter that Congress granted. I think it is something that I am obligated to do, is stay the hell out of it.

QUESTION: How much contact have you had with Jaworski?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I have seen him twice.

Once on an internal matter in the Attorney General's office
and the other time I uncovered some things in the files I

1 / A 14

thought he might want and asked him to come in and look at them. He came in and looked, said he had it, and that was it.

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, the White House quotes Mr. St. Clair as saying that it is not necessary for the FBI to interview the President on the question of the gap, the hum in the tape. Did this decision come through you or to you in any way?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Does Mr. Jaworski have the authority to direct the FBI to question the President if he feels it is necessary?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: This is going to be a point of contention I would gather, from the statements between the President's counsel and Mr. Jaworski; and I am not going to guess at what the outcome will be. And that is all I would be doing.

QUESTION: Won't you have to resolve that issue? ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

Go back and read that charter, and you will realize the power that he has. He has got extensive power.

QUESTION: You mean if they tell him no, the FBI can't interview the President, and he says Yes, I want the FBI to interview the President, you don't have to resolve that? Jaworski just loses?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, no. That would be one

1 of the issues that goes to court. 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 President? 10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OUESTION: Is that the issue --

QUESTION: What would --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know that. It could be. But this and a great many other areas will finally be resolved if they become points of contention.

QUESTION: Isn't the -- doesn't the charter specify that Jaworski has the power to investigate the

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's correct.

QUESTION: And would not the power to investigate also include the power or the right to interrogate?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: But they say no.

QUESTION: Who is "they"?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, you are talking -you asked about St. Clair. So he says no. I mean you just don't beat him over the head with the charter.

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: Well, in drawing up the charter, what was the view of the Justice Department in terms of this kind of a problem?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know. I had no part in it and it speaks for itself. And as I say, when you

reach a point of contention, you don't joust it off some way. That is what the courts are for.

QUESTION: How would you get into the courts the problem of whether the President can be interviewed by the FBI?

QUESTION: Subpoena.

QUESTION: You would have to subpoen the President for personal testimony by the FBI. And he would resist.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: He would resist.

QUESTION: Then you go in a court for --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: You have got an issue.

QUESTION: One of the central conditions under which you took the job, central point of the Senate confirmation hearings was that you would have complete independence to do the job as you saw fit.

Have you had any problem at all, any interference from the White House, or anywhere else in the Administration, to do what you think is necessary to carry out the job?

No.

QUESTION: How often do you contact the President or he contacts you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE:

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh; I have seen him an average of once a week or twice a week, Cabinet meetings, meetings on other issues; some of the litigation -- or some of the messages, things like this.

4 5

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, on this privacy legislation, where did that originate? Where did it come from?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, those bills were written in the Justice Department.

QUESTION: At the request of the President?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I would guess at the request of the White House. Whether it came directly from the President, I don't know. We discussed this; and he was for it. Now, we have got some difference of opinion that will be ironed out in the Committee. We put it all in there.

There is great opposition to the sealing of the records, and maybe justifiably.

QUESTION: Well, knowing you are starting out divided, doesn't that kill the thing right there? I mean, why should Congress do anything when you can't figure out what you want?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Congress has been divided a long time and it never put them out of business.

QUESTION: Well, doesn't that give you an awful burden to go up there and say, well, some people think this and some people think that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; I don't think so. My goodness; that's what the committee system is for. But rather

; 5

18:

than not have the issue raised, I opt to put it in there.

And I talked to members of the Committee, and some of them think it's great and others say it is no good at all.

QUESTION: Will there be a Presidential message on it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know whether there will be or not. The bills are already up there, as you know. It was included at some length in the -- not only the speech, but then in the enlarged area of the speech. There is not a whole lot more to be said on it. But it is an important area.

QUESTION: Do you and the President disagree on several issues in this legislation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; the President doesn't disagree. I am talking about --

QUESTION: People within the Justice Department?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: -- people within the

Justice Department. But then this is no big flap. I mean -
QUESTION: Well, what issues are there?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, the only one of any moment is the sealing of the records. Most police departments all over the country -- and this is the attitude -- just think it is against public policy to seal records on misdemeanors at four years and felonies on seven years; that

public policy demands better information than that.

QUESTION: What do you think about it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I haven't made up my mind on it. I'm inclined to agree with them on that; that there has got to be some stigma attached to criminality. We just can't remove it by a stroke of the pen; and you say, well, after seven years, everybody is good again. What about a record that is clear, though, for four or seven years?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXEE: That's what we are talking about.

QUESTION: You are talking about arrest records, though, aren't you? Where there isn't --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We are talking about arrest records that could go out as information.

QUESTION: There is no criminality in being arrested. You have to be convicted.

about the criminal history of a person is not sent out unless they have arrests and prosecution, conviction records. You don't circulate arrest records, misdemeanors records and things like that. I'm talking about proven criminals.

QUESTION: Now, you said that with a stroke of the pen we just can't say after seven years that everyone is good again.

Why must we say with the stroke of a pen after seven

- 4

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

20

22

24

23

25

years that everyone is bad again?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We don't. We just --QUESTION: Right there you said there must be a stigma of --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We are saying that the ones who have been law violators should get some break, and maybe seven years is the right number and maybe it isn't.

OUESTION: Are you talking in terms of a longer period of years that the records would be available?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, yes.

OUESTION: -- rather than --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Rather than -- they think the period is too short. They don't question that these records should be sealed; and they are talking about ten years.

There is reason to believe this, too; because there is pretty good evidence that if a person can make it past age 28, he's not going to get involved in serious difficulties again.

> QUESTION: Capital punishment is an issue again --ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Un-hmm.

QUESTION: -- what is your feeling on --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think capital punishment is a deterrent.

QUESTION: You think it should be reinstated for

certain Federal crimes?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Right.

QUESTION: Is there any move to do that? You had the kidnapping --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, this kidnapping has got more overtones than just a kidnapping. With the violence that has been happening out in San Francisco and just the wanton murder -- we just walk up to people on the street or those people in that morgue, if this is tied in to a terrorist organization; maybe it isn't a kidnapping.

QUESTION: Is there -- do you think it is?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We have no proof of that at the present time, but the police out there are giving us indication that they fear this.

QUESTION: Has there been any message from the kidnappers at all, either direct or indirect? There is no - ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Not to my knowledge.

QUESTION: -- there is no idea at this point what they have in mind?

QUESTION: What do you mean when you say it is more than a kidnapping?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It is a terrorist thing, like these other killings.

QUESTION: You mean it's racial, black-white; the

blacks have got a gang?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, you can't even say that. Are you familiar with this organization that has been operating out there?

QUESTION: No, I --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't give you --

QUESTION: -- understand the killings have been blacks killing whites.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, there was a white woman involved in the kidnapping, though, or she appeared to be white.

QUESTION: There was a black superintendent killed, too.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: There is a group that calls itself the Symbionese.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. The Symbionese.

QUESTION: Is there evidence --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It is a fanatical group.

QUESTION: What is the -- do you know anything -- can you tell us a little bit about what intelligence you have on this group? Is it a political organization or what? What are their goals? Do you know anything --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know that much about it at the present time. We are going to get a reading

on it this morning sometime.

QUESTION: Any indication it is more than just the Bay Area operation, or is it --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: -- is it national?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE:

Well, that part is what we are watching for right now.

QUESTION: Do you have any indication that it is more than a Bay Area operation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: You do?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: Is it something--

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No hard evidence to that; no hard evidence, but again, dealing with people who have some famililarity with this type of operation, they warn that it could be -- could show up here in Washington and it could show up at any place.

QUESTION: What kind of soft evidence do you have?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Just only the information

from people who have familiarity with this kind of operation
in the Bay Area.

QUESTION: What other areas could this outfit be operating in, based on what you suspect or know at this time?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: In the east. Washington, New York.

QUESTION: What's the name of that group again?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Symbionese.

QUESTION: A liberation army.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: How is it spelled here?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: S-y-m --

QUESTION: -- b-i-o-n-e-s-e.

QUESTION: Their MO seems to be like the terrorist activities of the Palestinian groups. Do you have any connection thus far --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That is one of the baffling things about it. They talk about a liberating force but nobody knows what they want to liberate.

QUESTION: You don't know what their goal is, then?
ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Are you saying that there is some reason to believe that there is a nation -- national terrorist group at work now?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We have no evidence that would support such a statement. I am just telling you what we are looking for and what the fear is; and the only input we have is from police officers with some familiarity that think that it possibly could be.

É

·

·S

QUESTION: What is the FBI doing on the Hearst kidnapping?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They are deeply involved.

QUESTION: They have a lot of people -- are they
sending people out there to beef up their San Francisco
office?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; that's a pretty big office.

QUESTION: What kinds of methods are you employing to try to track down this Symbionese group? Are you doing a lot of wiretapping, --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: There are no domestic wiretaps except those ordered by courts; and last year, for the whole year there were less than 200.

QUESTION: How many have you authorized since you have been Attorney General?

Of course, when you say "authorized," all I can do is authorize them to go to court to ask for one, and I assure you it is very well screened. It goes through the FBI and it goes through the Criminal Division and it goes through -- my executive secretary reviews it and then it goes to the court and they have to make a case in court. And if the court -- it is like issuing a warrant. It is no frivolous thing.

QUESTION: It is being used strictly for national security purposes, or what are the criteria for wiretap?

ATTORNEY GENERAL 'SAXBE: Well, on domestic, it is primarily criminal.

QUESTION: Have you turned down any requests?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, some of them never get to me. In other words, they are rejected before they get to me. But this is a seldom thing. And as you know, under this, after the wiretap runs, the person has to be informed and it is a statutory proceeding.

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, I'd like to ask -ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: By the way, there's ten
states that have wiretaps, too. But in the total in the
United States last year, of the ten states and the ones
run by the United States, there were less than a thousand
total in the country.

QUESTION: I just want to get in this one question; and that is, have you or your staff looked into the suggestion that Chairman Mills made about the question of immunity for the President following resignation. Have you had any discussions with the White House or the Counsel staff?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Do you think the country would be better served if the President were to step down?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That calls for an opinion

that I can't make.

QUESTION: General, you said last year, last

August, I believe, right after -- while you were a member

of the Armed Services Committee, when the disclosure of the

Cambodian bombing in '69 and '70 were made, you made a

statement, I believe, that you viewed that as -- something

along the lines of the most viable impeachable offense

if there was one. That of all the things that had been

disclosed this, in your mind, was -- would stand as the most

impeachable offense, the authorization of that bombing.

Do you still feel that way, or --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't even recall making the statement.

QUESTION: I just want to ask you about what your whole goal is in the Justice Department. I read some law-and-order type statements you made claiming this country was verging on becoming a country not of law.

What do you hope to accomplish there?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I have got a very narrow corridor that I am interested in. It is like on this strike thing. I didn't want to get involved in negotiation of the settlement. It is none of my business.

I am not in the Senate any longer; I can't be an expert on everything.

(Laughter.)

9.

11 -

: 16

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And I am interested in this narrow channel of effective operation of the mission that is given to the Department of Justice. Now, this mission is limited to investigation, to prosecution through the U.S. Attorneys, which are the front line of the Justice Department. There are 94 U.S. Attorneys in this country.

Supporting these attorneys is our Criminal Division in Washington here, which handles things beyond their ability -- I am talking about syndicated crime, -- and other areas that require a larger scope. Vigorous prosecution on the antitrust laws, which involve investigation and the development of conspiracies to violate the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and other provisions.

A drug division which has grown in size and consolidates all of the drug operations in the country in investigation, treaty making and identification, lab work, in licensing, narcotics, and all of these things, and in prosecution, where it is needed; that is, an assist to the U. S. Attorney, who again is the front-line guy. This is an important area.

In supporting Internal Revenue in the prosecution of tax cases. This is obviously an important section. And then the backup to all of these front-line operations and of course the LEAA, which has to do with the distribution of money to the states for the purpose of improving law

G

enforcement; the operation of the prison system; the parole system; the Immigration and Naturalization section; and then the support for this, which is housekeeping first and then of course the appeals through the offices of the Solicitor General.

Now, this involves 50,000 people. The U. S.

Marshal is another support area. And of course, the FBI,

the investigative arm that works for the attorneys. And

this is 50,000 people, 3,500 lawyers; and it is a big order.

Now, a department like that can run by itself for a certain period of time; it has got a life of its own.

The U. S. Attorneys were operating long before there was a Department of Justice; for almost a hundred years, they were the only people in the field. The Department of Justice wasn't established until 1879.

So it does have a life of its own. But it needs coordination. It needs somebody to ramrod it, to defend it from people at the top who want favors, who demand things; and also to fight for things for it that it must have: budgets, the powers it seems to have.

Now, I talked rather naively two or three months ago -- somebody said -- about depoliticizing the Department of Justice. Well, I was kind of naive, I guess, because to me the political involvement in the Department of Justice is whether the judges are appointed politically by Congress,

nominated and approved by Congress; whether the U.S. Attorney is appointed the same way -- to me that is the extent of the political involvement in the Department of Justice.

I later found that some editors anyway -- I don't think the reporters -- but some editors were taking it as though there was political intervention in the Department of Justice. My goodness, that just can't happen. I never

gave a thought that anybody would think that politicizing the Department of Justice means that some Congressman, Senator, or political boss could come in and get anything in the way of a special favor.

Maybe I am naive about it, but this is the way I operated as a state attorney general. I didn't care if it was the Governor or who it was. The office is run by the book. There's no favors; there's absolutely no ability for anybody to compromise for political purposes, pro or con. So to interject this attitude -- because there were some who were beginning to question, you know. It is hard to withstand pressure from Congressmen. And I have Congressmen that have come into my office with a request, a demand.

I had one come in the other day bringing a letter to free Jimmy Hoffa of his restrictions of political activity.

I said, well, my intention is to release this letter when I receive it -- and I still haven't gotten the original;

.21

I got the copy; but do you want to be identified as the person who brought it in? Hell, no. He doesn't want to be identified.

QUESTION: Who was it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I called him up yesterday, and I said, I am going to talk about this. Do you want to be identified?

No, sir.

Well, I am not going to identify him. I think that as far as doing anything effective, he didn't do anything effective.

QUESTION: Why is he doing it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I suppose for constituents.

QUESTION: In other words, he wants the word
to get out to Hoffa supporters that he did it, but he doesn't
want the anti-Hoffa people to know?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's it, I would guess.

QUESTION: Don't you feel like you're protecting
him?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; I want to have the confidence of people. If you want to come into the office and tell me something and you don't want to tell the paper you came in, you should be able to. This is an unusual attitude of the press, I might add. They don't want me to protect my sources.

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Which, as I consider, is what I am doing.

QUESTION: Maybe you can help him politically by giving him that little notariety.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I gave him the opportunity.
(Laughter.)

QUESTION: With regard to the FBI, there was a report here that a 16-year-old girl from New Jersey, I believe, was put under surveillance because she wrote a letter to the Socialist Workers Party. Have you looked into that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: And what have you found out; what have you done about it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It could happen, probably did.

The intelligence gathering is a continuing thing. It wasn't very long ago that we thought that we thought that we weren't doing enough of it. We had great hearings here in Washington. The heat and the pressure goes up and down. Ten years ago, you couldn't get enough; and now, any is too much. And obviously this was a foolish thing to do. But if you have what is classified as a questionable area, you get some input; you look at the piece of paper; you have no way of knowing; so it comes to individualization. What do

S

you say? You don't investigate anything?

QUESTION: Have you struck a balance now? What can you do to --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I don't know whether you can strike a balance when you are involved in an emotional thing. Congress says that the FBI will perform certain functions. Now, if Congress doesn't want anybody investigated for any purpose, they can so say. They have not said that.

We think that it is a necessary thing. Now, when you investigate anybody, there's going to be unfortunate incidents such as this that happen. But there is no way to prevent it. Now, if you want to throw out the baby with the bath water, you can do it.

But I think it is a necessary function -
QUESTION: You think writing a letter, by anyone,
whether she's 16 or 60, to a political party, is something
that ought to be investigated?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: If you are trying to make a complete file on it. Obviously, this was a mistake. But mistakes will happen.

QUESTION: Well, you still got the mail cover on that outfit, then? I mean, this girl happened to be 16 and it got in the papers. So the mail cover continues even though this outfit is a very pathetic, powerless group. How

4 5

6.

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23

24

25

long do you keep watching this crowd?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, again I say you are faced with whether to run any investigations.

QUESTION: Well, I am wondering about the Constitutionality of this. I wonder what the basis for investigating anybody that writes a letter to a political party. What's the basis? You're the Attorney General.

Doesn't a citizen have a right to write to a political party without being investigated?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Sure.

QUESTION: Have you told the FBI that this is not a proper area of investigation?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, they are well aware that this was a mistake.

QUESTION: This particular case or this particular party?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think both. But, you know, it is the tenor of the times. Ten years ago, you couldn't do enough of it. 20 years ago. Now, any is too much. But I do think that -- well, for instance, we are involved in this terrorist thing now, not only the Irish terrorism, Arab terrorism, Palestinian -- and now we have got a new group of these Japanese. As you know, they are operating in Kuwait. There are a whole lot of fanatics in

this world. This Symbionese group and all of this.

Well, now, I think the people of this country want somebody to try to find out what's going on with these outfits. Now, you are going to follow a thousand false leads to get one bit of information that might save an airplane or save the life of a prominent person; a senator, a President.

Now, if you want to pick the least of the thousand failures and say, why, this is the worst thing that can happen in this country, you are going to blow the whole thing out.

Now, Congress has got this privilege. I had an argument with a senator the other day on wiretaps and we are talking about consentual wiretaps. Now, if you agree that your phone can be tapped for the purpose of maybe no more than catching a dirty talking guy who is calling at odd hours of the night, or something like that. This is legal. You can authorize the telephone company to do it.

And he thinks that this is illegal. You can bug your own office. You can carry your own tape recorder in your pocket. You are not violating any law. You don't have to carry around a placard saying I have got a tape recorder in my pocket.

Now, there are those who think that you should have

.

to have a warrant to tap your own telephone. And one of the amusing things about it, it was a social evening and he and his wife were there; and I said, if your wife is kidnapped and the police come in, you are going to expect a ransom call, would you authorize them to tap your telephone to catch your wife's kidnapper?

Hell, nc.

His wife said, the hell you wouldn't.

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They had a family fight;
I got up and walked away.

QUESTION: Sounds like Alioto's problems.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: Could we get back here for a moment to the Hearst situation. You said there are overtones to that that suggests, at least to some police officers, that it might be a part of terrorist activity in the Bay Area.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And not kidnapping for money.

QUESTION: What hard or soft evidence, or what indications are there, aside from, I presume, the fact that there were black people involved with a white woman and there had been that activity in the Bay Area. Is there any other information?

- 10

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: None that I have. I just have -- it comes over the wire; it says veteran police officers feel that this could be related to the eight murders of last week.

QUESTION: How many? Eight?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Five, and then three in the morgue, or four in the morgue -- I think the number is -- QUESTION: Have they actually linked the first three with the five recent ones?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. And then the shootout in this mosque in New York, you know, Brooklyn, yesterday.

They don't know whether that is tied in or not.

QUESTION: To get back to the privacy thing, Mr.

Attorney General, you know, people are pretty paranoid about
this whole question of being bugged and electronic surveillance and that --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Sure.

QUESTION: -- and it doesn't seem to me that you are coming down very hard on the right of personal privacy.

I mean, there are constitutional guarantees that people will have privacy.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Now, you are talking about bugging.

QUESTION: All right. I am talking about any kind of electronic surveillance by the government.

24

25

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: All right. Now do you think that it is excessive now?

QUESTION: I don't know. I just know that there are certain safeguards or guidelines that have to be observed; right?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's right.

QUESTION: I don't know that--

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And they are very strict.

QUESTION: Are they being observed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They are being observed.

QUESTION: Is our right to privacy still being

protected --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes; it is.

QUESTION: -- despite the occasional abuses like this girl whose letters were being --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: You are not talking about electronic surveillance. I mean --

QUESTION: All right, let's put it in the broad category of intelligence.

In other words, it is the citizen's right to express his views and have his personal privacy, is that being protected under your tenure as Attorney General?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I hope to. I hope to protect it.

QUESTION: Okay. Now, you got --

. 5

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And I hope to make it more difficult, keeping in mind, however, that we do have to have intelligence gathering in this country. I think it is a public purpose that we keep intact our intelligence-gathering activities to protect the public; that there be as little invasion of the privacy of law-abiding citizens as possible. Now, mistakes will happen; but it is going to be my effort to guard it as zealously as I can.

QUESTION: You mentioned the Hoffa thing a moment ago. What is going to be done on that?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Nothing.

QUESTION: Nothing will be?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I know of nothing. There is only -- the only way that that can be removed is the way it was put on there and that is by the President.

QUESTION: Well, I think the Attorney General is listed as the one who could or could not remove it if the President approved it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, sir. I can't sign any pardon.

QUESTION: Well, this is a restriction that's part of the parole.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It is a restriction on the clemency.

QUESTION: I see.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And the clemency is only handled by the Pardon Attorney and the President.

QUESTION: You don't see any role for the Attorney General in lifting or not lifting it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The only thing is we would have a role in preparing such a thing if they were about to do it.

QUESTION: But not in decision-making.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

Let me tell you what I -- this is a letter from

Hoffa, Jr. And we already received one in January, demanding
that -- saying that this was an illegal restriction and that
it couldn't be enforced and --

QUESTION: From his son?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: From his son.

QUESTION: He is a lawyer?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: He is a lawyer.

-- and they -- we treated it as a preliminary step to filing court action. In other words, to keep from getting thrown out of court, you would exhaust your administrative procedures first; and that is what we anticipated.

Now, if on the other hand he does as he says he is going to do, that he is going to just disregard it and run for office, my instructions are that they arrest him and put him back in the penitentiary.

QUESTION: How long does he have to run? Do you happen to know that offhand, on his parole?

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, you said that we need to keep the intelligence-gathering system going, functioning, as it is. Does that include the FBI's request for telephone records of newspapers? Do you see that as a continuing part of the intelligence gathering system? I ask that specifically because our newspaper apparently has --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Under the order that was put out by -- let's see, was it -- AT&T last week-- you are going to have to go to court to get a subpoena to get those records.

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, what other groups besides Socialist Workers are under surveillance?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't tell you. I don't know.

And I wouldn't if I did know.

QUESTION: One other thing. My understanding is the IRS is investigating the situation in the propane industry. There have been some letters written on it. Is the Federal Energy Office sending any information on to Justice?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We are investigating this area. It just seems an unconscionable raise of propane gasalmost 400 percent in some regions. And if there is antitrust; if there is any violation, why we are trying to find it. This is true.

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, do you have any

policy on political involvement -- that is your own personal political -- the involvement in campaign appearances or fund-raising speeches at fund-raising dinners?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, I have rejected all of that.

QUESTION: You are not going to make any -ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: -- appearances for friends?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: General, sir, to what extent is the Department involved, other than the U. S. Attorney in New York, in the trial of John Mitchell and Maurice Stans?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't tell you that.

I don't know.

QUESTION: This is going to be about the last question. It is $10\ o$ clock.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

QUESTION: I was going to ask what I attempted to ask a while ago and I guess maybe you didn't understand what I was asking. Do you think the country is becoming a lawless society?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; I don't. I think that the people of this country are law abiding and who want to feel that their police, courts and lawyers are competent and honest; and I believe they are. But I think that we have been through an experience in this country that we have

to reestablish ourselves and reaffirm this with the people; and this is part of my job.

I think that we want to live under law. And that we can best do this by cultivating a respect for the law, based upon fairness and competence.

QUESTION: Watergate, for one thing --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, Watergate, the things like -- the Maryland thing; things that are popping up in other states, kickbacks and now we have got a -- there appears to be a scandal out in Ohio. And this is certainly-undermines the respect for the system and --

QUESTION: Does the one out in Ohio involve Gilligan?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know. It is a

GAO investigation, campaign _/spending and activities, and
does involve, I would guess, the Gilligan Administration.

It has to do with hiring and kickbacks and things like this.

QUESTION: The Democratic Party has been cited; and the GAO has recommended that the U.S. Attorney General look into the possibility that State Highway Department employees were partially paid with Federal funds -- be investigating ated. Have you looked into that yet?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We are working on it.

QUESTION: Last Question?

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I am not taking an active personal part in it. It is like anything else; I put it over in the proper division and cut them loose.

QUESTION: You have said that you were going to maintain an arm's length relationship with Jaworski. What kind of a relationship are you going to maintain with Jack Chester, your good friend with the White House defense counsel?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, he's a lawyer over Socially, I'll talk to him and hope I'll see him. When he's doing his job, why he's doing it.

You know, this is a funny attitude. It seems to prevail down here that the only people that you can litigate with are strangers or enemies. And if that attitude prevailed in my county, nothing would ever get to court, because all the lawyers in the county sit down at a table like this for lunch every day. And even in a town the size of Columbus, the litigants belong to the same country club, travel in the same social circles. It doesn't seem to impair their effectiveness. Down here, if you get a post card from a guy, all at once, you can't negotiate with him.

QUESTION: Were you asked about Chester by the White House before he was hired?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. I gave him a good report.

QUESTION: Last question.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: He's a damn good lawyer.

QUESTION: Did you know he was going to serve as
liason with the Justice Department for the White House?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know it. Is
he? I haven't been informed of that. I don't recommend that.

QUESTION: There has been for over a year now, a widespread investigation of kickbacks and so forth in connection with FHA operations. We had a grand jury going in New York; a number of people have been indicted --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Philadelphia.

QUESTION: Philadelphia. There hasn't been much said about this recently. I haven't seen much activity.

Is this a major problem? Is it being worked on by your Department; and how widespread is it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Just hold on a little bit.

QUESTION: Do you expect to be in court?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know how wide-

spread it is. I assure you it is being investigated every place.

QUESTION: 'When are you going to get a Deputy and who is he or she going to be?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Larry Silberman. It looks like his hearings will come up a week from Monday.

QUESTION: Has the nomination been set up for hearings?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. Last Friday.

QUESTION: One last question.

Did you throw Candy Stroud out of your house?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes.

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: What did she ask you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Some questions that I couldn't answer. You know, do you think Nixon's guilty?

Are you still beating your wife?

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: She said I have never been thrown out in five years in Washington; I said, well, you have now.

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: Since you are still drinking your coffee, I would like to ask you what is going on vis-a-vis organized crime?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I would rather do this than

1 go back to work.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: 'It's all right with me.

What are you doing with organized crime? Kleindienst made a big point of saying that he had this big drive against organized crime but it didn't have much effect. Are you making a big push against it, or is that a priority consideration right now?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, it is certainly priority. The pattern of organized crime has changed. I have learned that you get preconceived ideas of what is going on and then you find out it is not exactly true.

Organized crime is alive and well in this country. That's why it is a priority. But in the drug racket it is not; it is falling off in drugs; because the nickel-dime people are putting them out of business. So it is just one of these things -- it's like prostitution. Prostitution is not such much a big organized crime moneymaker as it once was.

> OUESTION: What is?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, the juice racket is very lucrative now.

QUESTION: Juice -- exorbitant interest?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Exorbitant interest; and

5

6

8

7

Ş

10

11

13

14 15

16

..... 17

18

20

21 22

23

24

25

loan sharking; and they go where the money is; and for gambling, of course, is still the backbone; but with more and more legalized gambling coming it, it isn't the syndicated problem that it once was.

QUESTION: Did you say loaning money or exorbitant money?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Loan sharking.

QUESTION: Are they preying on the legalized gambling customers? In other words, we hear about people --

QUESTION: -- New York off-track betting and they wait for them at the counter --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We get reports of that --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes; but this is nickel-dime stuff. Loan sharking on the big scale is industrial, business; yes, you know, \$100,000, \$200,000.

QUESTION: Is that very, very big now? Are they moving in?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: A desperate man, losing his business, seeing big orders coming around; he will get involved in these things.

QUESTION: He's going to lose his business for sure then; isn't he?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's right.

QUESTION: I mean, they take it over; they move in

to take it over.

 up and the syndicate had bought some major apartment buildings in Houston. Later on they were in Las Vegas and they woke up one morning and they had bought different apartment buildings in Vegas. Is the Justice Department trying to keep track . . . ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Legitimate business activity; yes, sir.

told me that they were in Houston once and one night they woke

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: But they are desperate men.

QUESTION: Senator, friends of mine out in the West

QUESTION: (Inaudible).

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, sir.

QUESTION: General, are they into anything except real estate?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Oh, yes. They are into manufacturing. You name it, they're in it, trying to find outlets for money. If they can launder this money through legitimate businesses, they do it. But, I'll tell you, Internal Revenue does a whale of a job in this and the strike forces have moved into this organized crime area and we are getting good records of indictments and convictions and it is a combination across the board of taxes, of violence, of everything.

QUESTION: What do you recommend for the desperate businessman who seems to have no other alternative?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, it certainly isn't getting involved with these people. I mean, if the guy is broke, he's broke.

QUESTION: A legitimate businessman with say \$100,000 that they need to invest for a tax shelter, how are they to

know that their real estate development over here is shabby?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That isn't hard to find

out. I mean, you do it just like you do on every other

investment: you check the history of it and you check the

records and the character of the people involved and if

you will take the time, you can get a readout on practically

all of these things. There are organizations in every city

for the purpose of giving you this information. And your

best way is to rely on reputable brokers, people whose

names are at stake and the businesses are at stake; if you

deal with fly-by-night people, you are going to get just

about what you would expect.

QUESTION: Is organized crime any stronger or any more extensive in this country than it was five, ten years ago?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They are in different businesses with a lower visibility. And we have seen some entering into the oil business, for instance.

QUESTION: They were in it all the time.
(Laughter.)

QUESTION: General, there have been some stories from time to time that strike forces are on their way out.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: As long as they are producing, they will stay in business.

QUESTION: General, as a former politican, what kind of advice would you give to --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I am no former politician,

I am a politician and proud of it.

1°

QUESTION: What kind of advice would you give, privately, perhaps, to members of Congress, Republican members of Congress as to reelection; how they could tune their campaign or attune it to the Administration?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I am in no position to give them advice right now.

QUESTION: Could you give us some idea of what cities are being looked at now for possible antitrust action, vis-a-vis newspaper owners and television, radio, --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Just the ones that have been filed are all I know about.

QUESTION: Is that something you are really going to press or was that just kind of a one-shot deal?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't tell you.

There has been no policy decision on that at the top. That is an area of antitrust law. I urge them to exercise all the ingenuity that they can to enforce the antitrust laws. And the only way they can do this is by exploring those areas and hassling them out. These cases have kicked around over there for a long time.

QUESTION: I mean is there an off-the-cuff feeling about whether it is good for a city to have a radio -- TV and radio and newspaper all owned by the same company?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, that's what the cases

. 13

. 14

are about, isn't it?

QUESTION: Yes; but what is your personal feeling?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, obviously, if we file a case, my feeling will be in support of that case; if we think it is in violation of antitrust laws.

QUESTION: I am talking about the idea --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I know what you want. And it is not my job to put my philosophy -- substitute my philosophy for what the law says and what the court says. And for me to come here and make a political speech about what's good and what's bad wouldn't necessarily comply with what the law says and what the court says. And it puts me in an area that restricts my freedom to shoot off my mouth quite a bit.

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: I mean your feeling of what the law says.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: My feeling of what the law says is in that petition. I will get you a copy of it.

QUESTION: Well, is that applicable in general?

Or is that applicable --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It is applicable on the case that it is filed on and will be applicable on those cases where it fits. But there is no policy that says all

of this is bad. If we think it is bad, we will file a case.

And if we don't file it doesn't mean that we say it's good.

Maybe we just haven't got around to it.

QUESTION: Well, would it be reasonable to await the outcome of these cases to see how the law develops on -- in this area before you go ahead on a broader scale?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Perhaps. Perhaps. You can only get so much hay down at once. And to start wildly filing cases until you know the direction isn't too wise.

QUESTION: Use these as test cases?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Maybe we haven't got the best test case yet.

QUESTION: General, the investigation of the FHA came up, and you said to wait a while on that one. Do you know if there is any -- we had some cases out in St. Louis about that. Is St. Louis one of the areas that you are looking into?

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

One thing I want to get across to you is that I don't get down in that Antitrust Section and say, now this is the target for the week.

(Laughter.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: And you hire good, competent lawyers and, like an inventor, you put him in that room with the law books to investigate a problem. It is

.

his job to determine if somebody is violating the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

Now, when he uncovers one that is obvious, clear sailing, -- here's a set of circumstances you walk into that is obvious on the face of it -- which are getting harder and harder to find, I might add -- but this is a routine case; this is what 75 percent of all the cases are, routine. Stupidity, dishonesty, lead them into a set of circumstances that makes them in violation of the law.

Now, on the other hand, you look at sets of circumstances which are fuzzy and you say, well, this seems to fit; and these are kicked around. It is like on this newspaper and TV, kicked around for a long time. Then people in the Department said, let's go. We think we have got a case. Another guy in the same department says, oh, hell, you haven't got a case; you will get thrown out of court.

Finally, they got enough consensus, they go. And in the Criminal Division, it's the same way. You have got divisions down there, organized crime, used to have internal security -- it's other things now. But most of the things they do are routine. A guy is in violation; there is a pattern; it shows up; it is just a matter of getting a warrant and going out and laying it on him.

There are areas, other areas, where it is fuzzy.

_

You don't know whether you have got a case or not. This is particularly true in the tax area.

There is very little innovation in the tax area.

If you fall into one of the slots, you are caught.

It is less than two percent where you are going out and breaking new ground.

So all I try to do is to provide an atmosphere to get the guy the freedom to perform. If I went down there and said, we are going to lay off everybody in the oil business because it might discourage the production of oil. Half the guys would quit; I would hope they would anyway.

Or if I went into the Criminal Division and say we are going to lay off everybody in the juice racket because we don't want this poor guy that's going under the bedeprived of that 40 percent money. They would run me out.

And they should.

The best thing that I can hope to do is to establish an atmosphere where competent lawyers are exercising their own good judgment. And I think that is the highest way that you can run a department. I ran the Attorney General's office in Ohio this way. And I would have irate people come storming in: did you see what those crazy so-and-so's did? They would file suit against my grandma and we are going to beat hell out of you on the next election, and so

on.

Well, I found out those guys never can beat anybody.

And I felt it was my job to protect that guy. Maybe I

didn't agree with what he was trying to do, but if he had
a concept, unless he was clear out of the ballpark, or it

was obvious harassment, I would cut him loose.

Now, I will not tolerate just harassment for the hell of it. And sometimes you get eager beavers who are mad at somebody or something, or maybe mad at the world at large; and they figure out wild schemes. And of course that's where it sometimes becomes tough, because as soon as you go in and say to this guy, well, now, look, this is unreasonable, why, he says, I am getting political pressure to stay out of this and he may try to get an injunction against the weather, or something like that; I mean something that is ridiculous and wasting your time and making the whole department unproductive.

OUESTION: General, do you think the appointment of federal judges and U.S. Attorneys should be taken out of politics?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't think you would get qualitative people if you did. Our history on career jurists anyway, is not too good. They play everything so cozy that their motto is don't make nobody mad; and they aren't effective and they don't have the independence.

1 2

4 5

Now, when you get right down to it, who is going to pick them? Are you going to let the American Bar pick them? Most people say no. Are you going to let the local bar pick them? Well, hell, they are going to get patsies that they can deal with.

QUESTION: Does the American Bar have a veto power?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; they don't have a veto power. They have got --

QUESTION: As I understand it, there hasn't been a Federal judge selected without ABA concurrence since 1955.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes; but I might add that sometimes they adjust.

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: General, --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE:

For instance, we had a guy nominated down in Louisiana. Competent man. And the American Bar said, well, he hasn't been practicing long enough. They say he's got to be active practice 15 years. He's a great guy; we all love him; but he just hasn't been practicing long enough. He's the best man down there.

Well, we said, to hell with you; we will appoint him anyway. So they said, let us reconsider. I mean they don't want to lose their batting average. But I think their

input is good, and they should have an input. But not a veto. And I think that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate will tell you the same thing. They are anxious and willing to get the attitude of the American Bar Association. But they also will tell you if the American Bar Association is going to do it, what the hell does it come to our committee for?

So their input like anybody else -- any citizen can go up there and appear against any nominee. Now, on the selection of prosecuting attorneys, district attorneys, U. S. attorneys, whatever you call it. You get ambitious young men who want to use this as a stepping stone for a career in law. You get much better people than you would get if it were a career thing.

Now, the turnover is tremendous. Regardless of politics, the turnover is tremendous, even if you get four years or eight years out of a guy that's a real comer, you are getting better people than you would almost any other way.

Now, the people that work for him tend to reflect this. They are in there to get experience, to get exposure. Now, I wish that we could get people that would stay in these offices on a career basis. But with the impaction of the pay the way it is at the present time, you are not going to get the kind of people you would want

to have in there. You know, this impaction at \$36,000 no matter how smart you are or how long you have been around, well, the kind of people we want could go out in private practice and make a lot more money than that. And you know how difficult it is to get doctors in Federal service, you can imagine how difficult it is to get crackerjack lawyers to come in.

QUESTION: General, why did you raise the -- bring up the topic of the Johnson and Kennedy tapes. It seems that this was brought up by the White House some months ago and your receiving it yesterday seems to indicate you are climbing on the White House train.

ATTRONEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know why I brought it up. I was just talking too much.

QUESTION: I mean is this consistent with the position of neutrality?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. It is just a statement of fact. I have good reason to believe, from an extremely competent source, that they were there.

QUESTION: Was the competent source out of the White House?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

Again, you want me to disclose my source.

QUESTION: Well, not, not necessarily by name, but by some means of identification.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No; he was not connected

with the White House.

QUESTION: Out of the Justice Department?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Do you know where these tapes are now?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They say that the Johnson tapes are in the Johnson Museum. They did an expert job; they were properly catelogued; indexed and cross indexed and filed.

QUESTION: Do you know where the Kennedy tapes are?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't know.

QUESTION: The original question, General, how does this jibe with your position in terms of neutrality on the Watergate tapes?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't see that that has got a damned thing to do with it. I could say it rained on January 1, 1911 as a statement of fact because I believe it.

QUESTION: Are you going to keep all your present assistant AG's, or have you got plans to replace any?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Right now I am still trying to fill up. Once I get full, then I can look at what
I've got. But I still need several people; and I haven't
got any head of the Civil Division and we sent the name up;
I haven't got the Deputy yet; I haven't got my legislate
man; all these names are sent up. I need people.

QUESTION: What is the status of the Kent State reopened investigation? Is that before a grand jury now? Is that out of your lands pretty much now; or is it --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes; but the indication being that if it wasn't Kent State that it somehow would be in my hands. I wouldn't have a damned thing to do with that no matter where it was.

Again, this is an area for the Chief of that section; and he is proceeding on it in his own time and his own way.

QUESTION: Have you had any indications from him yet that there may be indictments?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Or a report?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Have you talked to him about it at all recently?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: What role will you play, if any, if there is another confrontation between the Watergate

Special Prosecutor and the White House?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't see that I would play any role.

QUESTION: I have a feeling that we are holding up the wheels of justice here, but you are free to go.

Thank you.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the press conference was concluded.)

DOJ-1974-02