TEXT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S AUG. 22 NEWS CONFERENCE

Following is an unofficial text of President Nixon's Aug. 22 news conference at San Clemente, Calif:

Opening Statement

First, gentlemen, I have an announcement before going to your questions. It is with the deep sense of not only official regret but personal regret that I announce the resignation of Secretary of State William Rogers, effective Sept. 3. A letter which will be released to the press after this conference will indicate my appraisal of his work as Secretary of State.

I will simply say at this time that he wanted to leave at the conclusion of the first four years.

He agreed to stay on because we had some enormously important problems coming up including the negotiations which resulted in the end of the war in Vietnam, the Soviet summit, the European Security Conference as well as in other areas, Latin America and in Asia where the Secretary of State as you know has been quite busy over these past eight months.

As he returns to private life we will not only miss him in terms of his official service but I shall particularly miss him because of his having been through the years a very close personal friend and adviser. That personal friendship and advice, however, I hope still to have the benefit of and I know that I will.

As his successor I shall nominate and send to the Senate for confirmation the name of Dr. Henry Kissinger. Dr. Kissinger will become Secretary of State, assume the duties of the office after he is confirmed by the Senate.

I trust the Senate will move expeditiously on the confirmation hearings because there are a number of matters of very great importance that are coming up. There are, for example, some matters that might even involve some foreign travel by Dr. Kissinger that will have to be delayed in the event that the Senate hearings are delayed.

Dr. Kissinger's qualifications for this post I think are well known by all of you and ladies and gentlemen as well as those looking to us and listening to us on television and radio. He will retain the position, after he becomes Secretary of State, of assistant to the President for national security affairs. In other words he will have somewhat a parallel relationship to the White House which George Shultz has. George Shultz as you know, Secretary of Treasury but he is also an assistant to the President in the field of economic affairs.

The purpose of this arrangement is to have a closer coordination between the White House and the departments and in this case between the White House and the National Security Agency, the N.S.C. and the State Department, which carries a major load in this area.

And also another purpose is to get the work out in the departments where it belongs and I believe that this change in this respect of Dr. Kissinger moving into as Secretary of State and still retaining the position as Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs will serve the interest not only of coordination but also of the interests of an effective foreign policy.

I will simply say finally with regard to Secretary Rogers that he can look back on what I think and I suppose it is a self-serving statement, but I will say it about him rather than about myself at the moment, one of the most successful eras of foreign policy in any Administration in history, an era in which we ended a war, the longest war in America's history, an era in addition in which we began to build a structure of peace, particularly involving the two great powers, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, where before there had been nothing but conflict and where there were many very difficult conversations.

We still have a long way to go. There are trouble spots in the area of the Middle East, other areas in Southeast Asia which we could go into in detail. But as Secretary Rogers looks back on his years, four and a half years as Secretary of State, he can be very proud of what he was one of the principal architects of what I think was a very successful foreign policy.

And now we'll go to the question. I think, A.P.

Questions

White House Tapes

Nixon: A.P., Miss Lewin, has the first question.

Q. On Watergate, you have said that disclosure of the tapes could jeopardize and cripple the purpose of the presidency. Question. If disclosure carries such a risk, why did you make the tapes? What is your reaction to surveys that show three out of four Americans believe you were wrong to make the tapes?

A. Well, with regard to the questions as to why Americans feel we were wrong to make the tapes, that is not particularly surprising. I think that most Americans do not like the idea of the taping of conversations and, frankly, it is not something that particularly appeals to me. As a matter of fact that is why when I arrived in the White House and saw this rather complex situation set up where there was a taping capacity not only in the President's office, the room outside of his office, but also in the Cabinet room and at Camp David and in other areas, that I had the entire system dismantled.

It was put into place again in June of 1970 because my advisers felt it was important in terms of particularly of national security affairs to have a record for future years that would be an accurate one, but a record which would also be disclosed at the discretion of the President, or according to directives that he would set forth.

As you know, of course, this kind of capability not only existed during the Johnson administration, it also existed in the Kennedy Administration, and I can see why both President Johnson and President Kennedy did have the capability because, not because they wanted to infringe upon the privacy of anybody but because they felt that that had been the case in the field of foreign policy and some domestic areas to have a record that would be accurate.

As far as the concern, we now do not have that capability and I am just as happy that we don't. As a matter of fact, I have a practice whenever I'm not too tired at night, of dictating my own recollections of the day. I think that perhaps will be the more accurate record of history in the end. I think we'll go to the L.P. now and then we'll come to the television.

Gray Warning

Q. On July 6, 1972 you were warned by Patrick Gray you were being specifically wounded by some of your top aides. Can you explain why you didn't ask who they were and why, what was going on?

A. Well, in the telephone conversation that you refer to that has been, of course, widely reported in the press as well as on television, Mr. Gray said that he was concerned that as far as he was concerned that he had responsibility for that aspect of my life that was not new or non-existent. Whether the term used was "morally wounded" or not, I do not know. Some believe that it was. Some believe that it wasn't. That is irrelevant. I could have said that.

The main point, however, I asked him whether or not he had discussed this matter with General Walters because I knew that there had been meetings between General Walters and...
Haldeman's Access

Q. Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen has testified that on April 15th of this year he met with you and warned you at that time there might be enough evidence to warrant indictments against three of your top aides, Messrs. Ehrlichman, Haldeman, and Dean. You accepted their resignations on April 20 calling Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman two of the finest public servants you have known. After that you permitted Mr. Haldeman after he had left the White House to hear confidential tapes of conversations you had had in your office with Mr. Dean. My question is why did you permit a man who you knew might be indicted to hear those tapes which you now will not permit the American public or the Federal prosecutors handling the case to listen to.

A. The only tape that has been referred to, that Mr. Haldeman has listened to, he listened to at my request and he listened to that tape was the one on Sept. 15th, because he had been present and was there. I asked him to listen to it in order to be sure that as far as any allegations that had been made by Mr. Dean with regard to that conversation, we wanted to be sure that we were absolutely correct in our response.

That's all he listened to. He did not listen to any tapes in which only Mr. Dean and I had participated. He listened only to the tape on Sept. 15th, this is after he left office, in which he had participated in the conversation throughout.

Firm on Tapes

Q. Mr. President, one of the lingering doubts about your denial of any involvement in (Watergate), is conceming your failure to make the tapes available, either to the Senate committeee or to the Special Prosecutor. You've made it perfectly clear you don't intend to release those tapes.

A. Perfectly clear.

Q. A. Perfectly clear, but is there any way that you could have some group listen to tapes and give a report so that that might satisfy the public mind?

A. Absolutely believe first that it would satisfy the public mind, and it shouldn't. The second point is that as Mr. Wright, who argued the case, I understand, very well before Judge Sirica this morning, has indicated to have the tapes listened to— he insisted in his brief—either by a prosecutor or by a jury or by camera or in any way would violate the principle of confidentiality, and I believe he is correct.

This is why we are standing firm in the proposition that we will not agree to the Senate committee's desires to have, for
tion that Mr. Hogan was unable to conclude, having spent a week at Camp David and unable to finish the report.

The meeting was adjourned to another date, and no record of its proceedings was made. However, it is known that Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Ehrlichman, Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Dean, Mr. Mitchell on the 22d, discussed the whole matter with them. I kept pressing for the view that I had had through-going in my mind that, if they were to go, they were to go. Whatever it was that Mr. Mitchell insisted that all the individuals involved in the White House counsel before the counsel had said on before the Ehrlich committee.

We never got that far. But at least that was, that's an indication of the extent of my own investigation.

I think we'll go to Mr. Lisagor now.

**Mitchell Testimony**

Q. Mr. President, you have said repeatedly that you tried to get all facts and just now you mentioned a March 22nd meeting. Yet former Attorney General John Mitchell said that if you had ever asked him at any time about the Watergate matter he would have told you the whole story chapter and verse. Was Mr. Mitchell not speaking the truth when he said that before the committee?

A. Now Mr. Lisagor, I'm not going to question Mr. Mitchell's sincerity. And I will only say that throughout I had confidence in Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Ehrlichman, in a telephone call that I had with him immediately after it occurred, expressed great concern that he had not run a tight enough shop and that some of the boys, so he called them, got involved in this kind of activity, which he knew was very, very embarrassing to—apart from its legality to—us.

Throughout I was expecting Mr. Mitchell to tell me in the sense that he was involved or that anybody else was. He did not tell me that. I don't blame him for not telling me. He's given his reason for not telling me. I regret that he did not; because he's very close to me. I think I would have had more of his help. Just as I did at Ziegler the other day.

We'll get you next, Mr. Rather.

**Responsibility**

Q. Mr. President, how much personal blame do you accept for the White House and the re-election committee for the abuses of Watergate?

A. I accept it all.

**Judge Byrne**

Q. Mr. President, I want to state this question with due respect to your office but also as directly as...

A. That would be unusual.

Q. I'd like to think not. It concerns...

A. Only, you're always respectful, Mr. Rather.

Q. It concerns the events surrounding Mr. Ehrlichman's contact and on one occasion your own contact with the judge in the Pentagon papers case. Judge Byrne. As I understand your own recollection of events in putting together your statement with Mr. Ehrlichman's testimony and what is currently said, what happened here is sometime late in March, on March 17, I believe in, you first found out about the break-in at the prosecutor's office of Mr. Elsbick. That you asked to have that looked into and that you later, I think in late April, talked with Attorney General Ehrlichman to inform the judge. Now, my question is this, that while the Pentagon papers trial was going on, Mr. Ehrlichman secretly met once with the judge in that case, you never got another time the judge with Mr. Ehrlichman, now.
Confidence in Agnew

Q. Mr. President, what is the state of your confidence in your Vice President at this point in time?

A. I formed some general speculation to the effect that I have not expressed confidence in the Vice President and therefore I welcome this question, because I want to set the record straight. I had confidence in the integrity of the Vice President when I selected him as Vice President when very few knew him, as you may recall, back in 1968, knew him nationally. My confidence in his integrity has not been shaken, and in fact it has been strengthened by his courageous conduct, his ability even though he's controversial at times, as I am, over the past four and a half years and so I have confidence in the integrity of the Vice President and particularly in the performance of the duties that he has had as Vice President, and as a candidate for Vice President.

Now obviously the question arises as to charges that have been made about activities that occurred before he became Vice President.

I would consider it improper, I would consider it improper for me to comment on those charges, for me to comment on those allegations made. But I will make a comment on another subject that I think needs to be commented upon and that is the outrageous leak in information from either the grand jury or the press will be the Department of Justice, or the Justice Department, or all three—and incidentally I am not going to put the responsibility on all three till I have heard from the Attorney General who at my request is making a full investigation of this at the present time.

I am not going to put the responsibility—but the leak of information with regard to the charges that have been made against the Vice President, that is something that I must address, and put it in the press, convolting as an individual, not only trying him but convicting him in the breach and on television before he's had a chance to present his case in court is completely contrary to the American tradition. Even a Vice President has a right to some, shall I say, consideration in this respect, let alone the ordinary individual.

And I will say this, and the Attorney General I know has taken notice of the fact, any individual in the Justice Department, or in the prosecutor's office who is in the employ of the United States, who has leaked information in this case, to the press or to anybody else will be summarily dismissed from Government service. That's how strongly I feel about it and I feel that way because I would make this ruling whether it was the Vice President or any individual.

We have to remember that a hearing before a grand jury and that determination in the American process is one that is supposed to be in confidence, because all kinds of charges are made which will not stand up in open court, and it's only when the case gets to open court that the press and the TV have a right to cover it. Well, they have a right to cover it, but I mean, have a right, it seems to me to give such broad coverage to the charges.

Resignation Possibility

Q. Mr. President, did at any time during the Watergate period have you ever considered resigning? Would you consider resignation if you felt that your capacity to govern had been seriously weakened? And in that connection, how much do you think your capacity to govern has been weakened.

A. The answer to the first two questions is no. The answer to the third question is that it is true that as far as the capacity of power is concerned, that to be under a constant barrage—15 to 10 minutes a night on each of the three major networks for four months—tends to raise some questions in the people's mind, with regard to the President, and it may raise some questions with regard to the capacity to govern.

But also, I know this; I was elected to do a job. Watergate is an episode that I deeply deplore, and, had I been running the campaign—other than trying to run the country, and particularly the foreign policy of this country at this time—it would never have happened. But that's water under the bridge. Let's go on now.

The point that I make now is, that we are proceeding as best we know how to get all those guilty brought to justice in Watergate. But now we must move on from Watergate to the business of the people—the business of the people is continuing with initiatives we began in the first Administration.

Watergate Obsession

Q. Mr. President—

A. Just a moment. We've had 30 minutes of this press conference. I have yet to have, for example, one question on the business of the people. Which shows you are—how we're consumed with it.

I'm not criticizing the members of the press, because you naturally are very interested in this issue. But let me tell you, years from now people are going to perhaps be interested in what happened in terms of the efforts of the United States to build a structure of peace in the world. They are perhaps going to be interested in the efforts of this Administration to have a kind of prosperity that we haven't had since 1955—that is, prosperity without war and without inflation.

Because the basic problems facing the Johnson years, whatever prosperity we had was at the cost of either inflation or war, or both.

I don't mean to be critical of them. I'm simply saying, we've got to do better than that.

Now our goal is to move forward then—to move forward to build a structure of peace. And when you say, have I done this, I consider resigning; the answer is no. I shall not resign. I have three and a half years to go, or almost three and a half years, and I'm going to use every day of those three and a half years trying to get the people of the United States to recognize that whatever mistakes we have made that in the long run this Administration, by making this world safer for their children, and this Administration, by making their lives better at home for themselves and their children, deserves high marks rather than low marks.

Impeachment

Q. Mr. President, as long as we're on the subject of the American tradition and following up Mr. Ruther's questions, what was authorized even if the burglary of Dr. Fielding's office wasn't, what was authorized was the 1970 plan which by your own description permitted illegal acts. Illegal breaking and entering and illegal wire tapping and wire surveillance and the like. Now under the Constitution you swore an oath to execute the laws of the United States faithfully. If you were serving in Congress, would you not be considering impeachment proceedings and discussing impeachment possibility against an elected public official who had violated his oath of office?

A. I would if I had violated the oath of office. I would also, however, refer you to the recent decision of the Supreme Court or at least an opinion that even last year which indicates inherent power in the Presidency to protect the national security in cases like this. I should also point to you that in the three Kennedy years and the three Johnson years through 1966 when burglary of this type did take place, when it was authorized, on a very small scale there was no talk of impeachment and it was quite well known.
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Conversation With Dean

Q. Mr. President, could you tell us your recollection of what you told John Dean on March 21 on the subject of raising funds for the Watergate defendants?

A. Certainly. Mr. Haldeman has testified to that, and his statement is accurate.

B. Basically, what Mr. Dean was concerned about on March 21 was not the raising of money for the defendants but the raising of money for the defendants for the purpose of keeping them in.

C. In other words, soliciting funds for expenses of any group, any individual, as you know, is perfectly legal and proper in the law.

D. But you raise funds for the purpose of keeping an individual from talking, that's obstruction of justice.

E. Mr. Dean said also, on March 21, that there was an attempt to be put in, to blackmail the White House to, blackmailed the White House by one of the defendants, incidentally, that defendant has denied it, but at least this is what Mr. Dean declared, and that unless certain amounts of money were paid, I think it was $120,000 for attorneys' fees and other support, that this particular defendant would make a statement, not with regard to Watergate but with regard to some national security matters in which Mr. Ehrlichman had particular responsibility.

F. My reaction very briefly was this: I said as you look at this, I see it's not quite obvious, first, that if it is going to have any chance to succeed, that these individuals aren't going to sit tight for four years, they're going to have clemency.

G. He said yes.

H. He said we can't give clemency.

I. He agreed.

J. Then I went to another point. The second point is that isn't quite obvious, as far as this is concerned, that while we would raise the money, and he indicated in answer to my question that we simply could take a million dollars over four years, that care of this defendant and others is on this kind of a basis.

K. This problem was: how do you get the money to them. And also, how do you get around the problem of clemency because they're not going to stay in jail simply because their families are being taken care of.

L. And so that was why I concluded, as Mr. Haldeman recalls, perhaps, and did testify very effectively, when I said "John, it's wrong, it won't work, we can't give clemency, and we've got to get this story out. And therefore I direct you and I direct Haldeman and I direct Ehrlichman and I direct Mitchell" to get together tomorrow and then meet with me as to how we get this story out.

M. And that's how the meeting on the 22nd took place.

Coordinating Defense

Q. Mr. President, earlier in the news conference you said that you gave Mr. Haldeman the right to listen to one tape because you wanted to be sure "that we are correct." And I think I'm quoting you correctly. Now, you have indicated that you still feel that Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman are two of the finest public servants that you've ever known. You have met with their lawyer at least twice that we know of. Are you and Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman coordinating their and your defense and if so why?

A. No, no. As far as my defense is concerned, I make it myself. As far as their defense is concerned, their lawyer demonstrated very well before the committee that he can handle it very well without any assistance from me.

Agnew Resignation

Q. Mr. President, a follow-up question on the Agnew situation. You have said in the past that any White House official who was indicted would be suspended and that anyone convicted would be dismissed. Should Vice President Agnew be indicted, would you expect him to resign or somehow otherwise stand down temporarily until cleared?

A. Well Mr. Thetis, a perfectly natural question and one that any good newswoman as you are would ask. But as you know it's one that would be most inappropriate for me to comment upon. The Vice President has not been indicted. Charges have been thrown out by a judge and otherwise, which he has denied to me personally and which he has denied publicly. And the talk about indictment and the talk about resignation even now. I'm not questioning your right to ask the question, understand. But to me to talk about it would be totally inappropriate that I make no comment in answer to that question.

Check on President

Q. Mr. President.

A. I'll take the big man.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

A. I know my troubles if I don't take him—or if I do.

Q. Looking to the future on executive privilege, there are a couple of questions that come to mind.

A. I thought we just passed the point.

Q. Well we speak here of the future.

A. All right.

Q. Where is the check on authoritarianism by the executive that the President is to be the sole judge of what the executive branch makes available and suppresses? And you obey a Supreme Court order if you are asked and directed to produce the tapes or other documents for the Senate committee or for the special prosecutor? And if this is not enough, is there any limitation on the President, short of impeachment to compel the production of evidence of a criminal nature?

A. Is there anything else?

Q. No. I think that will be enough.
Q. Mr. President, sir, last week in your speech you referred to those who would exploit Watergate to keep you from doing your job. Could you specifically detail who those are?

A. I would suggest that those who have the file, people should read it. I would think that some political figures, some members of the press perhaps, some members of the television, perhaps, would exploit it. It isn't imputable, interestingly enough, motives, but it is improper intentions, because here's what is involved.

There is a great number of people in this country who would profit from the fact that I do resign. That is my anxiety. Getting a bit further than Mr. Truman was willing to go when I was on the other side, as you recall, urging that he waive executive privilege. That is what I think to the Supreme Court will do, or say the White House press secretly, as I have secreted—Mr. Warren—has responded to that already. I won't go beyond that. And particularly I won't make any statement on that matter at this time, while the matter is still being considered by Judge Sirica.

I understand his decision will come down on Wednesday, and as far as the President's position relating to the President's position complying with a definitive order of the Supreme Court is concerned, that statement stands.

Exploiters of Watergate

Q. Mr. President, during March and April you received from your staff on several occasions information about criminal wrongdoing and some indication that members of your staff might have been involved. The question is, why didn't you turn this information over immediately to the prosecution, instead of having your own staff continue to make these investigations?

A. Well, for the very obvious reason that in March, for example, the Watergate investigation was my counsel, Mr. Dean. Mr. Dean was telling Mr. Ehrlichman was in charge. I would assume—and, incidentally, Mr. Ehrlichman did talk to Mr. Mitchell—and that is why it was done that way.

The President doesn't pick up the phone and call the Attorney General every time something comes up on a matter. He depends on his counsel, and whoever he's told about it now, and then given that assignment to—to do the job. And that is what I expected in this instance.

Q. Following that, Mr. President—A. You've had one now, you don't—you've had three. Go ahead.

Q. Mr. President, in your Cambodian invasion—In your Cambodian invasion speech of April 17, 1970, you reported to the American people that the United States had been strictly observing the neutrality of Cambodia. I'm wondering if you, in light of what we now know, that there were 15 months of bombing of Cambodia previous to the time you made your statement, whether you own an apology to the American people?

A. Certainly not, and certainly not to the Cambodian people. Because, as far as this area is concerned, the area of approximately 10 miles—which was bombed during this period—no Cambodians had been in it for years. It was totally occupied by the North Vietnamese Communities. They were using this area for the purpose of attacking and killing American marines and soldiers by the thousands.

The bombing was taking—took place against those North Vietnamese forces in enemy-occupied territory.

And as far as the American people are concerned, I think the American people are very thankful that the President ordered what was necessary to save the lives of these men and shorten this war—which he found when he got here, and which he ended.