## Be Removed

sing White House tapes: Nixon yesterday on the mis-Statement by President

and why they were not re-corded. The purpose of this statement is to help dispel sorded on the White House public disclosure, two weeks As a consequence of the Court. offer information to the Court that will help determine the certain steps I will take to agisen about just what haphe President were not resubstance of all nine conver-sations subpoenaed by the Hose doubts and to spell out pened to these conversations recording system, doubts have igo, that two conversations of

torney General, John Mitch-ell, on June 20, 1972 The First, there are no missing minutes with John Dean, late which were not recorded. The Sons requested by the Courts Spril 15, 1973. second first is a four-minute converapes. There are two conversathe evening of Sunday, with the former Atis a meeting of 55

affirmative evidence to eorded. In fact, there is no will demonstrate to the Court's mearing, now being conducted, There is no question in my mind but that the open Court documentary evidence, public ation of the testimony and contrary. I believe that when the Court concludes its evaluconversations were never restratements that these two satisfaction the truth of our

> doubt on this issue will be removed. completely and satisfactorily

American public. simply because certain basic so that misconceptions about facts are not presented to the this matter do not persist ment about this proceeding important to make a state-In the meantime, I believe it my conversations with

recorded conversations. That prior to March 21, 1973. gate investigation. for completion of the Water tion of time. My primary purconversations was necessary present for a substantial porthe substance of the two un- ported certain facts to me Committee did not subpoena ollection that he had First, the

versation is being submitted; 1973. For all in which John Dean partici-March 13, 1973, two on March pated—September 15, this includes 5 conversations notes and memoranda as made of the conversations cordance with the Court orare being provided in na, such contemporaneous tions covered by the subpoe-1973, one on March 22, nine conversa-1972,

logical perspective tions were listened to by me, why the recorded conversashould be place in chronoand by others on my behalf, Before discussing these mat-

with John Dean in order to to the tape recordings of a in reviewing the recordings of that day had taken place prior versations to which I listened discussions. All of the conrefresh my memory of those number of conversations I had to March 21, 1973. My purpose On June 4, 1973, I listened

material was requested only late April, 1973, I asked H.R. by the Special Prosecutor, and Haldeman to listen and report the Court, who believed the on the conversation of March substance of nine presidential 21, 1973, in which he had been the Federal Court decision. In firm my recollection that seven of nine instances, the March 21, 1973, was the date actual recording of the con- on which John Dean had first We are complying fully with listen to this tape was to con-ne Federal Court decision. In firm my recollection that Senate Select Dean was to confirm my recreported certain facts to me. pose in having Mr. Haldeman not re-In

met 30 or 40 times to discuss and reports to the contrary entire truth. that John Dean and I had - one of them suggesting to what was the precise and to refresh my recollection as Watergate - and I wanted There had been rumors

Supreme Court, if necessary, to protect the right of recordings subpoenaed began a review of the tape litigate the matter up to the my deliberate The reason was, it had been Senate Select the grand jury and by the the Special Prosecutor for On September 29, intention to Committee. 1973, T

of powers. By late Septem-ber, however, I had come to compromise. confidentiality and the relater served by a reasonable tional interest would be bet the conclusion that the nated principle of separation

mise" corded conversations, leavas the "Stennis Comprobegan to consider various unacceptable to the Special and Vice Chairman, offer, accepted by the Sen-Stennis. That compromise precision and accuracy of ing the verification of the stance of the relevant reand the Court the full submise" - turning over to both the Senate Committee what has come to be known approaches which led to Prosecutor. that substance to Senator Thus, in late September, I Committee Chairman

corded. question had not been rethe possibility that two the ten conversations that I first became aware It was during this process 9 0 in

completed until October 27. cumstances which caused recordings of the two conordered a further search for of the eight recorded convestigation were not finally the conversations not to be an investigation into the cirversations in question versations and subsequently recorded. The search and in-I proceeded with a review and

for which One of the conversations no recording

> quently it was not recorded. quarters just before going made to John Mitchell on minute telephone call I could be found was a fourin to dinner, and consewhich I use as an office. Telresidence of the White which were recorded in the the evening of June 20, 1972. the telephone in the family ell was one that I made on phone call with John Mitch-Administration. been recorded during this family quarters have never epnone conversations in the the Lincoln Sitting Room House were those made in The only telephone The calls tele-

Mr.

John Dean on Sunday eve-ning, April 15, 1973, was not Saturday, April 14, 1973. It on the recording machine out. Normally, I see very in that office on Sunday, versations in my Executive tains recordings of the con-Sunday, April 15, 1973, and ran out earlier in the Office Building office on the conversation the tape Kleindienst. April 15, the first conversation I had also contains a portion of Office Building office day. The tape which was on weekends. However, on the few people in my Executive the operating recorder on Building office was used up for my Executive Office conversation with Attorney 1973, which was During that General conno

weekend of April 14 and 15, the activity in my Executive Office Building office was unusual and unanticipated. Certain reports made to me by my staff early in the morning of April 14, 1973, led me to have lengthy discussions with staff members during the day in my office in the Executive Office Building. In addition, international developments required a lengthy meeting with my Assistant for National Security Affairs late that morning.

On Sunday, April 15, 1973, I began another series of meetings in my Executive Office Building office at about one o'clock, p.m. The first meeting was with Attorney General Kleindienst. Thereafter the meetings continued until late in the evening with the exception of a break of about two hours for dinner. I did not meet with John Dean until approximately nine o'clock that evening. Since the tape on the recorder for my Executive Office Building office had run out during my afternoon meeting with Attorney General Kleindienst, the Dean meeting was not recorded.

It should be pointed out that the Court order calls for evidentiary materials such as notes and memoranda in addition to recordings of specified conversations. The Court order spells out a detailed procedure for turning materials over for Judge Sirica's private review. In recent days, in an effort to locate materials for the Court, a diligent search has been made for materials that might shed further light on the substance of the conversations in question. including the unrecorded conversations with John Mitchell on June 20, 1972, and with John Dean, on the evening of April 15, 1973.

Since I have been in office, I have maintained a personal diary file which consists of notes which I have personally taken during meetings and of dictation belts on which I record recollections. The dictation belts and notes are placed in my personal diary file by my secretary. They are sealed under specific instructions that they not be transcribed.

In the course of searching my personal diary files, I

have located a dictation belt that I indicated at 8:30 p.m. on June 20, 1972, on which, among other activities of the day, I referred to a telephone call with John Mitchell. The portion of the belt relating to the conversation with John Mitchell will be submitted to the Court.

We have also located the dictation belt of my recollections of the conversations in question for March 21, 1973 and the relevant portions of these recollections together with the actual recordings of the conversations, of course, will also be submitted to the Court in compliance with its order.

Over the weekend of November 4 and 5, 1973, upon checking my personal diary file for April 15, 1973, to locate information to be produced in accordance with the Court's order, I found that my file for that day consists of personal notes of the conversation held with John Dean the evening of April 15, 1973, but not a dictation belt. My original handwritten notes, made during my meeting with John Dean on the evening of April 15,

On June 11, 1973, the Special Prosecutor requested a tape of a conversation I had with John Dean on April 15, 1973, (which I had previously offered to let Assistant Attorney General Petersen hear).

1973, will be submitted to

the Court.

As has been pointed out, my personal diary file consists of notes of conversations and dictation belts of recollections, and I believed in June that I had dictated my recollections of April 15, 1973, of conversations which occurred on that day. The response to the Special Prosecutor made on June 16, 1973, referred to such a dictation belt. At that time, however, I did not review my file to confirm that it contained the belt.

I have made a diligent search for other evidentiary materials that might shed light on the substance of my conversation with John Dean on the evening of April 15, 1973. Other than my contemporaneous notes of that meeting mentioned above, I have found no such evidence. However, I did meet with John Dean on Monday, April 16, 1973, on

two occasions. The first was in the morning in the Oval Office; the second was in the afternoon in the Executive Office Building office. This was my final meeting with Mr. Dean before he left the White House staff. Both of these conversations were recorded on the White House recording system. I recently reviewed the recordings of these conversations. A comparison of my notes of the April 15, 1973, meeting and the recording of the conversation with Mr. Dean on the morning of April 16, 1973, shows both conversations covered much the same subject matter. There are references throughout the conversation on the morning of April 16 to the conversation held the evening before.

I shall voluntarily submit to the Court, under the procedures applicable to recordings of conversations already covered by the Court order, these recordings of my two conversations with John Dean on April 16, 1973.

In addition, as stated above and consistent with the Court order, the Court will be provided with:

(1) The portion of the dictation belt containing my recollection of the June 20, 1972 conversation with Mr. Mitchell.

(2) The portion of the dictation belt of my recollections of the meetings with Mr. Dean on March

21, 1973.

(3) Contemporaneous notes from the April 15, 1973 conversation with Mr. Dean.

(4) All other materials covered by the Court order.

I have also authorized my Counsel to make available to the Court certain tape recordings not covered by the Court order to assist the Court in verifying that the two conversations in question were not recorded. The additional tape recordings to be provided are (a) the full reel of telephone recordings covering the period of June 20, 1972, and (b) the two reels of tape which were on the recorders for my Executive Office Building office on April 15, 1973. This will permit the Court to check the sequence of the conversations against my daily logs of meetings and telephone conversations already provided to the Court, and thus further demonstrate that the Mitchell and Dean conversations in question were not recorded.

I have also agreed that a group of Court-approved independent experts employing the most advanced technological methods shall examine all tapes in question for any evidence of alterations to the tapes.

It is my hope that these steps will clear up this aspect of the Watergate matter once and for all.