			78
	1	UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
	2	FOR THE DIST	TRICT OF COLUMBIA
	3		
	4		• 000 an : an out
	5	RICHARD M. NIXON, Individuall as the former President of the United States,	y and le
<b>`</b> .	6	Plaintiff,	÷
	7		No. 74-1852
	8	VS.	Deposition of
	9	Administrator of General Servi et al.,	ices, RICHARD M. NIXON
	10	Defendants.	VOLUME II
	11	aan aa, aa and aa an an aa aa aa aa aa ba ba aa aa	v € € ©
	12		
	13		
		<u>APPEAR</u>	ANCES
	14	For the Plaintiff:	Miller, Cassidy, Larroca and
	15		TCMTI
	16		by: Herbert J. Miller, Jr. R. Stan Mortenson
	17	For Intervening	
	18	Defendants:	William Dobrovir Andrew S. Krulwich
	19		Mark J. Spooner
-	20	For Defendant United	Leonard B. Simon
1		States of America and	
	21	Administrator of General Services:	United States D
	22		United States Department of Justice.
	23		Irwin Goldbloom David J. Anderson
	24	For Special Prosecutor,	
	25	Intervenor:	Watergate Special Prosecution
	26		Kenneth S. Geller, Assistant
2	27		Special Prosecutor
. 2	8	Also in Attendance: A	Andra Oakes
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
-,			
÷.			

1.15

man human fritten fan en

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, JULY 25, 1975, 1:00 p.m. 1 2 THE NOTARY: Mr. Nixon, this is a continuation of your 3 deposition that was commenced this morning, and you have been 4 previously duly sworn, and you are still under oath. 5 MR. NIXON: I understand. 6 7 RICHARD M. NIXON, 8 plaintiff herein, and having been previously first duly sworn, 9 testifies further as follows: 10 11 FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR. DOBROVIR: 12 Q Mr. Nixon, when you were in the Office of the 13 President of the United States, did you have, an aide by the 14 name of Gordon Strachan, S-t-r-a-c-h-a-n? 15 He was an assistant to Mr. Haldeman and would be A 16 one of my assistants. 17 He was one of your assistants? Q. 18 A Yes. 19 And were you aware that Mr. Strachan was preparing Q. 20 political matters; memorandums for Mr. Haldeman? 21 A Oh, he did prepare political memoranda; yes. 22 And you were aware of that at the time that he was Q. 23 preparing them? 24 A Yes, I was aware that he was working on political 25 matters. 26 All right. Was that part of his official duties 0 27 as a member of the White House Staff? 28

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, are you using the term "official" in the context as it was defined earlier in this deposition, as it pertains to constitutional or statutory obligations or are you using it in a different context?

5 MR. DOBROVIR: I will strike the word official from the 6 question.

8 BY MR. DOBROVIR:

7

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

9 Q Was that part of his duty as a member of the White 10 House Staff?

A During the election campaign members of the White House Staff, when it does not conflict with their primary responsibility on official matters, have been traditional and were in my administration assisting in campaign activities.

Q So that do you therefore claim the political matters, memoranda that Mr. Strong prepared, as part of your presidential materials?

. . .:

A Yes.

Q I am going to show you, Mr. Nixon, a pamphlet, it is A statement of information, Appendix IV, Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives, 93rd Congress, Second Session, pursuant to House Resolution 803, Political Matters Memoranda, September 18, 1972. And there are included in here some nineteen separate documents. I would like to ask you if you would look at these documents, please, and tell me which ones you personally had seen earlier.

A I can't recall.

MR. MORTENSON: What pages, Counsel?

1 MR. DOBROVIR: I am asking the witness to look at everything and tell me if he can recall which of those he has 2 3 seen earlier. 4 THE WITNESS: I can't recall. 5 MR. DOBROVIR: All right. THE WITNESS: In a quick perusal of the documents, and I 6 haven't -- I mean it takes a little time to read it all, it does 7 not show my initials on them. Normally when I looked at a 8 document when it came to my attention either it had my initials 9 or a check mark. These were documents that Mr. Strachan and --10 I see Mr. Haldeman's initials and his notes throughout. 11 12 BY MR. DOBROVIR: 13 Now, in seeking exclusive control over disclosure of Q. 14 those documents, which of the interests that we earlier discussed 15 are you seeking to protect? 16 MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, you have given the witness here 17 a book of, as you have described them, nineteen documents and 18 if you propose that we spend three or four or five hours 19 necessary to review and in detail the nineteen documents covering, 20 I don't even know how many papers, and to line by line which is 21 necessary to determine which interests are being protected, I 22 don't think that it is reasonable to request that time be spent 23 here. I think that the record reflects that plaintiff is claiming 24 those as part of the presidential materials and that the 25 pleadings in this case reflect the interests to be protected as 26 challenge to the suit. 27 THE WITNESS: 151 pages. 28

MR. DOBROVIR: All right.

MR. MORTENSON: I think the record should also reflect, since those are public matters of public knowledge at this point, that plaintiff does not seek to maintain the exclusive right to control disclosure thereof.

MR. DOBROVIR: I will show you, Mr. Nixon, a one-page document called Memorandum for H. R. Haldeman from Gordon Strachan on White House stationery. And I would like the reporter to mark this as Intervenor Defendants' Exhibit A.

THE NOTARY: The one-page document handed to me by counsel, consisting of a memorandum for H. R. Haldeman from Gordon Strachan, dated May 11, 1971, subject Timmons' Investigation of San Diego as 1972 Convention Site, will be marked Defendants' in Intervention Exhibit A, to the deposition, for identification.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

25

27

28

Q My first question is: Have you ever seen that particular document before?

A I can't recall having seen the document. I can recall discussion of the substance of the document.

Q All right. Now, do you claim that document to be, or the original of that document to be part of your presidential materials?

A Yes, I do.

Q What is the basis for that claim?

MR. MORTENSON: I object on the legal conclusion basis. The claims are set forth in the pleadings in this case.

1 MR. DOERIVIR: Is the basis for your claim that that is a 2 matter of personal privacy?

MR. MORTENSON: I object to the question on the ground just stated.

MR. DOBROVIR: The witness has stated in his Affidavit COURSE and earlier in the questions of this deposition has defined where it is personal and private. I don't think that those are legal conclusions. If, however, you instruct the witness --

MR. MORTENSON: You have not asked him whether he considers this a political document. You have asked whether he claims this and what interests it is to protect.

MR. DOBROVIR: I just asked him if that is, that document is a personal or private document.

MR. MORTENSON: I didn't hear that question. But that is a question I think he can respond to.

THE WITNESS: It is not personal nor private.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q That is political? That is political?

Q Does that document have anything to do with the performance of your official duties as President?

A As what?

Q As President?

A No.

26 MR. DOBROVIR: Now, this will be Defendants' Exhibit 27 next in order.

THE WITNESS: If I might project here, for purposes of

24 25 26

28

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

clarification of perhaps Counsel's line of questioning, that as 1 we pointed out throughout this suit and pleadings and the 2 Affidavit and like the President of the United States traditionally 3 serves in many capacities, his primary responsibility, of course, 4 is what has been termed official. He is Commander in Chief of 5 the Armed Services and he has constitutional duties. Another hat the President wears is that of being the leader of his political party and, of course, connected therewith is the President's own personal political activities that he may be engaged in. For example, when he is running for reelection. Then in addition to that a President also is a citizen with personal contacts and private contacts. He is also a family man and if he has children a father as well as a husband.

This is in the category of what we would call political information and I claim that that is part of it. I claim it is part of the subject matter of this suit.

THE NOTARY: The document handed to me by counsel, consisting of 124 pages listing names and contributions, will be marked Defendant Intervenor's Exhibit B, to the deposition, for identification. 1 carpone and

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Exhibit B is a list of names and numbers which is 0 described in another lawsuit by a witness as a list of campaign contributors that was maintained by Rose Mary Woods.

The first question is: Have you ever seen this document?

A

I do not recall having seen the document. It is

possible that I, however, could have seen the list of names 1 because it was Miss Woods' function, among many other functions, 2 to, after the campaign, because I had no contact when I could 3 possibly avoid with contributors, after the campaign election 4 it was her function to set up various events to where I could 5 express my appreciation. In that connection I might have seen 6 this document. My best recollection, however, was what I saw 7 was a list of names which we had dinners, receptions, et cetera, et cetera, which covered most of the major political contributors and some who didn't contribute very much.

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

28

8

9

10

Did you instruct her to maintain that list? Q

MR. MORTENSON: Objection. That calls for the substance 12 of discussions between plaintiff and members of his staff, which 13 we claim privileged in the suit. 14

MR. DOBROVIR: I am not asking, Mr. Mortenson, if there was a tape of such instructions.

MR. MORTENSON: I know you did not ask that.

I will object to that question or any other question that calls for substance of plaintiff's conversation with members of his staff.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Was that document prepared by her in the course of 23 Q her duties as your secretary or maintained by her if it wasn't prepared by her in the course of her duties as secretary?

She, like other members of the staff, whatever A Yes. 26 was within her ability to work on the campaign, where that did 27 not interfere with her primary responsibility to do work

involving official responsibilities with my official responsibilities as President.

MR. DOBROVIR: Would you mark this, please.

THE NOTARY: The six-page document handed to me by counsel, consisting of a memorandum dated April 23, 1969, from Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General, to John Erlichman, Counsel to the President, Re: ITT-Canteen Merger, will be marked Defendants in Intervention Exhibit C, to the deposition, for identification.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Now, Mr. Nixon, I am showing you a memorandum from Richard Kleindienst and Richard W. McLaren to John Erlichman titled ITT-Canteen Merger. And my first question is: Have you ever seen that document before?

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

26

27

28

A I have no recollection of ever seeing it.

Q Now, is that document claimed by you as part of the presidential materials involved in this lawsuit?

A Well, to the extent in view of this line of questioning, that memoranda are prepared and sent to members of the White House Staff from the Executive Agencies or a member of the White House Staff to a member of the White House Staff, to the extent that those have traditionally been considered to be the presidential material, I claim that this is presidential material. And it has been the case in the past, as I understand.

MR. DOBROVIR: I am showing you a memorandum dated July 20, 1971, for Bud Krogh from John Dean. I will ask the reporter to mark it.

THE NOTARY: The ten-page document handed to me by 1 counsel, consisting of a memorandum for Bud Krogh from John Dean dated July 20, 1971, with attachments, will be marked Defendants in Intervention Exhibit D to the deposition, for identification.

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, I am going to ask what the source of these documents are? Are they documents that came from the White House files? Were they produced from other sources? Because the Complaint here encompasses the materials that have been impounded under Court Order, as part of the materials of the Nixon Administration.

To the extent that these are not documents that are included among those materials which did not originate from those sources, it is impossible for us to make a determination of whether they are encompassed by this litigation.

MR. DOBROVIR: All of the documents which I have are documents which I understand are copies of documents that are in the presidential materials that were subpoenaed either by the Special Prosecutor's Office and turned over to the Special Prosecutor's Office by the White House during the incumbancy of Mr. Nixon or were subpoenaed by the House Judiciary Committee and were turned over to the House Judiciary Committee during the incumbency of Mr. Nixon.

MR. MORTENSON: Is there anything in the record which indicates that the original, or at least the carbon copy from which you have obtained a carbon copy of the memorandum marked, I believe it is, Defendants! in Intervention C, came from the White House files as opposed to the files of the Deputy Attorney

and the state of the second second

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

General? 11

2 If there is no basis other than your assumption, is impossible for the plaintiff to speak with any assurance a 3 to whether or not that is a document which we claim ownership 4 under this litigation. 5 6 MR. DOBROVIR: I cannot say with assurance, of course, Where whether we possess the original from which that copy was made. 7 8 MR. MORTENSON: Well, if that is the case, I have no way of knowing whether or not John Erlichman received this document placed in his files or received this document and returned it

to the Deputy Attorney General. I have no basis for knowing whether this document is included in the presidential materials 12 and therefore it is impossible for me to permit the witness here to speculate as to whether or not that document is the document which is claimed under this litigation.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

A

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 $\sim \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j$ 

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum$ 

104

:

Do you have before you the Krogh-Dean memorandum? Q A Yes.

Q That is Exhibit D.

,Have you ever seen that document before?

No, I can't recall having seen it. Q

Do you claim the original of that document as part of your presidential materials involved in the lawsuit?

MR. MORTENSON: Again, Counsel, I have to interrupt to say that that is a document where the original reposes in the 26 presidential materials that are now impounded as part of this 27 lawsuit. That will influence the answer. 28

--- John Vik: I believe it is. MR. MORTENSON: Well, if you have a basis for that I 2 will accept the basis for your belief. And with that we can 3 answer your question. If you are assuming that it is, all we 4 can do is assume that if it were there we might take position 5 one way or the other. 6 MR. DOBROVIR: Perhaps I can ask the question 7 53 hypothetically. 8 9 BY MR. DOBROVIR: 10 Q If the original of that document still is in the 11 White House, would you claim it as part of your presidential 12 materials? 13 14 A Yes. 15 Q Yes? This is distinguished from the document Mr. Mortenso 16 A was referring to earlier, communication within the White House 17 itself. 18 19 Q Thank you. NY. Martin Maria Is that a personal or private document? 20 21 This document? A 22 Q Yes. MR. MILLER: To whom, Counsel? 23 MR. DOBROVIR: To Mr. Nixon as defined by him earlier 24 today. 25 MR. MORTENSON: Are you talking about the first page, 26 Counsel? 27 MR. DOBROVIR: The entire document. 28

THE WITNESS: It would depend after a very quick persual of a very long document, for context.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Why don't you focus on the very first page and Q have the testimony reflect only as to the first page.

(At this time plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel confer.) THE WITNESS: I would consider this primarily a political

document.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

.....

Chestran and States and provide

-

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

That is primarily a political document. Q

Is there any other aspect to it that relates as to why you would claim this as part of the presidential materials?

Well, it was obviously not written, the memorandum, A for the private purposes of Mr. Dean or Mr. Krogh, it related to general policy of the Administration. I would consider it to be political, a political document and within the claim that we are making in this suit.

Does it relate at all to their official functions Q as members of the President's staff?

A

Without knowing the background I couldn't say. MR. DOBROVIR: Would you mark this, please.

THE NOTARY: The four-page document handed to me by counsel, consisting of a memorandum from George Bell dated June 24, 1971, for John Dean, Jerry Warren and Van Shumway entitled Subject: Opponents List, will be marked Defendants! in Intervention Exhibit E, to the deposition, for identification. BY MR. DOBROVIR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Have you ever seen that document before? Q

I have no recollection of having seen it; no. A

Were you aware, at the time of the preparation of Q that document, that a list of twenty opponents was being prepare by Mr. Bell?

> By Mr. Bell? A

Or by anyone in your staff? Q.

I can answer the question only in a broader sense, 9 A that in campaigns there is always the custom to determine those 10 who are supporters and in the various areas that might affect 11 the outcome of a campaign in the business world, political world 12 and needless to say, we, of course, not only prepared -- there 13 were prepared, certainly for the campaign organization, not only a document of this sort but also a document indicating those who were supporters. We have both.

17

14

15

16

18

Excuse me?

Q

Q

We have both. A

Yes. Was that document prepared by Mr. Bell in the 19 Q course of the performance of his duties as a member of your 20 21 staff?

As I have pointed out before, a staff member of 22 Α any public elected official who is running for re-election can 23 and almost invariably does to the extent that he does not 24 interfere with his primary responsibility in official government 25 business, work during a campaign for the success of whoever is 26 his superior.

28

27

Now, is that the kind of document disclosure of

which would have a chilling effect on advice to be given to you by members of your staff in the future or by members of a President's staff to a President in the future? (92)

A It very well might; yes.

Q In what way? Can you expand on that?

A Because the fact that the individuals who are named in the document were considered by a staff member to be opponents of the Administration, may or may not have been individuals -as a matter of fact, on the other side of the coin, individuals who were listed as supporters might have been concerned about being so listed. And in view of the fact that it would inhibit their opportunity to change their minds the next time around, which many people do. And I would say therefore that this type of document is one that could well inhibit their freedom of action. Well, if you want to put it, freedom of expression and association and so forth in the future. I am referring to people that are named.

Q Excuse me?

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

26

27

28

der.

A I am referring to people that are named, I said.

MR. DOBROVIR: We will mark this as Exhibit F.

THE NOTARY: The three-page document handed to me by counsel, consisting of a transcript of September 15, 1972, meeting will be marked Defendants' in Intervention Exhibit F, to the deposition, for identification.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q This is an exhibit which is a copy of Pages 614 through 616 of Book 2 of the Statement of Information of the House Judiciary Committee pursuant to House Resolution 803. This consists of a portion of the transcript of the September 15th, 1972, meeting, a portion of the transcript of a tape recording of such a meeting.

I would like you to focus in particular on the portion at the bottom of Page 614, which is ascribed to President and from there on down through to the bottom of Page 616, the words "That's right" are ascribed to Dean.

I would like to ask you first if you recall that conversation?

A Oh, I recall having a conversation; yes.

12 MR. MORTENSON: Which portion did you direct him to look 13 at?

MR. DOBROVIR: Starting at the bottom of the first page where it says "President" and then about eight or nine lines and then the rest of it to the bottom of the last page where it says "Dean: That's right."

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, is this the entire transcript of the entire conversation?

MR. DOBROVIR: Of course not, counsel.

MR. MORTENSON: Do you have the entire transcript?

MR. DOBROVIR: I do not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

MR. MORTENSON: What is your question?

MR. DOBROVIR: First of all, does the witness remember the conversation that I have designated?

26 MR. MORTENSON: The portion of the conversation that 27 you have designated?

MR. DOBROVIR: That is right.

THE WITNESS: I can recall it in general, not specifically.

94

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

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

26

27

28

7

14.47

and the second second second .

Q Now, is that conversation claimed by you, is the tape recording of that conversation claimed by you as part of the presidential material involved in the lawsuit?

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, we have stipulated every one of the White House tape recordings and everything contained thereon is a part of the presidential materials claimed under the statute.

MR. DOBROVIR: Fine.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Is that conversation, do you consider that conversation personal and private?

MR. MORTENSON: Unless Counsel can produce the entire transcript so the witness can evaluate that portion of the conversation, Counsel, in light of the entire conversation I don't think the witness can respond.

MR. DOBROVIR: Very well.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q I have here a pamphlet entitled Transcript of the Eight Recorded Presidential Conversations September 15. This is a printed version rather than a typewritten version, which is the document I have handed you, and it covers from Pages l through 19.

Yes.

A

MR. DOBROVIR: Would you like me to show that to the witness, Mr. Mortenson?

MR. MILLER: The entire conversation?

MR. DOBROVIR: Yes.

MR. MORTENSON: If you have it.

MR. DOBROVIR: It is the transcript of that entire tape as published by the House of Representatives.

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, do you know who prepared the transcript?

MR. DOBROVIR: I believe that the record shows that that transcript was prepared by the staff of the House of Representatives.

MR. MORTENSON: Then we can't vouch for the accuracy and I am not prepared to have the witness speculate as to whether something is personal, private or official.

The material that I see here on the first page, Page 614, is marked "unintelligible," and that conversation, that portion which was unintelligible to whoever transcribed this for the House Judiciary Committee, may very well be a private reference or political reference or official reference. And for this witness to speculate as to what this conversation is or what this portion of the conversation is without having the recording to review it is impossible and I will direct him not to answer.

MR. DOBROVIR: You are challenging the authenticity of the House of Representatives transcript?

MR. MORTENSON: What I am saying, we have no basis to establish the authenticity.

Sec. 1

A P. - Market & Market

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

MR. DOBROVIR: Are you familiar with the new Federal Rules of Evidence, Mr. Mortenson? 96-97

MR. MORTENSON: Maybe you can read them to me.

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

26

27

28

に、一部 武憲法

MR. DOBROVIR: I don't have them with me but they do provide that official documents of the United States are evidence in their published printed form.

MR. MORTENSON: I am not sure that is an official document of the United States. It is a Congressional document. If you want --

MR. DOBROVIR: You are challenging the authenticity of that pamphlet as an official publication of the House Judiciary Committee?

MR. MORTENSON: I am saying it very well may be a document of the House Judiciary Committee.

If you are asking this witness to speculate or to draw a conclusion as to whether that conversation is personal, private, or official, the only way he is prepared to do that is to review the recording, to hear the conversation and make the determination and not to base that speculation on a document prepared by the House Judiciary Committee.

I have no basis whether it is an official document or not, to know that portion marked "unintelligible" is in fact unintelligible. It may have been unintelligible to the person who prepared the transcript but it may not be unintelligible to the witness, which would directly influence as to whether he could respond to your question.

THE WITNESS: A very good example of that occurred when during the course of the tortuous proceedings the story appeared

1 PICH - WAP

in major newspapers to the effect that on a conversation with Mr. Dean, a taped conversation on February 28th, that he had said, had told me that according to the transcript Judge Sirica was a very, in effect, tough judge and that I responded by saying "He is a gol' darn Wap." That was not only printed in the New York Times, it was on television and on radio. It was never adequately retracted.

97

What the tape actually was when I listened to it, because I recall, I knew that I had never used that term, I knew I didn't have that opinion. What the tape actually said when he said "He is a tough judge" was that "That is the kind I want."

Now, I am not indicating that the individual, whether Special Prosecutor's Office, because here, whether the leak came from there to the House Judiciary Committee, I don't know, I am not indicating that it was done deliberately, but I am indicating that these tapes, having listened to a few and particularly those where conversations run together, these tapes in many cases are read and in different ways and the transcripts therefore may not reflect accurately what was said.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

A

Now, let's see if perhaps we can resolve this. Q. In connection with this conversation, Mr. Nixon, do you remember the reference to Edward Bennett Williams, which the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee Transcript indicates you made?

1

2

3

4

5

6

÷.

1.5

- 7

8

9 

10 1

11 52

12

13

14

15

16

17

-18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

10

Yes. Yes, I remember a reference to him.

Q You do remember that?

A I don't --

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

- 12

14

15

16

17

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

13

1

Q You do not remember? I am sorry.

A I said I remember a reference to Edward Bennett 5 Williams.

Q Thank you, sir.

Now, Mr. Nixon, I am showing you once again the blue volume, the "Submission of Recorded Presidential Conversations to the Committee on the Judiciary," which was issued. in your name on April 30, 1974. And I am showing you the pages that correspond to those pages and you will notice that the reference to Edward Bennett Williams does not appear there.

A Yes, I note that.

Q All right. Now, on April 29, when you made your speech to the nation, did you say: "For many days now I have spent many hours of my own time personally reviewing these materials and personally deciding questions of relevancy"? A Yes.

Q Had you personally reviewed the transcript of the September 15 tape for the purposes of the submission of April 30?

MR. MORTENSON: Objection. As irrelevant and I will direct the witness not to answer unless you can explain to me the relevancy.

MR. DOBROVIR: Well, there are two matters of relevance, Mr. Mortenson. One is you have been challenging the authenticity of the House of Representatives transcript.

MR. MORTENSON: I did not challenge the authenticity. I

said portions of that, which are indicated as unintelligible, and I am saying that I don't know whether that is unintelligible or not, the portions that are written may very well be intelligible.

MR. DOBROVIR: Can we stipulate, Mr. Mortenson, I am not asking the witness about that portion?

MR. MORTENSON: What you have asked is whether this conversation was political, private or official. And I told you unless we have the recording he is not in a position to characterize a conversation or a portion of the conversation. A lot of factors go into characterizing a particular conversation, some of which pertain to conversations that took place before that conversation or after that conversation. We don't have those, we don't have the tape recordings.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

1

2

3

34

- 11

12

13

14

14

16 ----\_\_\_\_\_17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Would any interest in confidentiality be damaged 0 by the disclosure of your reference to Edward Bennett Williams in that conversation?

MR. MORTENSON: I object to that, Counsel. We have contended in this lawsuit that the statute provides for the total review of these recordings by a group of government personnel and we have consented that that is the breach which would have a damaging effect upon the Office of the President and upon plaintiff in the suit.

To my mind it is irrelevant and totally immaterial whether a particular revelation as to Edward Bennett Williams would have a damaging impact. This litigation is about a statute

フフ

which requires for the total disclosure of such materials. If the statute provided for the disclosure of all reference to Edward Bennett Williams, that alone we would be challenging, deciding whether to challenge the statement on that basis.

MR. DOBROVIR: Are you instructing your witness not to answer?

MR. MORTENSON: Yes.

MR. DOBROVIR: Are you accepting that instruction, Mr. Nixon?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

11

Q Very well.

Mr. Nixon, did you personally approve the deletion of the reference to Edward Bennett Williams from the text of the transcript as published in the blue volume I have before you?

MR. MORTENSON: I object on the grounds of relevancy and instruct the witness not to answer.

MR. DOBROVIR: Let me explain for the record, what additional relevance it has then.

MR. MORTENSON: All right.

MR. DOBROVIR: You have claimed in your Complaint that this statute is in effect a Bill of Attainder; that Mr. Nixon is in violation of the Constitution and being treated differently from all other Presidents. It is our defense to that claim that Congress had ample justification for its action in seeking to place and retain control of the materials at issue here within

Federal governmental establishment. One of those grounds was 1 that when the plaintiff was in control of these materials he 2 issued them in a deleted and changed form. I am now pursuing 3 the line of examination intended to obtain evidence in respect to that issue raised in your Complaint.

MR. MORTENSON: I still disagree with the relevance and 6 instruct the witness not to answer and state that if that is the justification of the statute you have a real problem, because Congress did not limit itself relative to Watergate or those which were turned over and whether they were turned over in complete form or not. And if you recall, Counsel, at the time these materials were turned over to the House, in the form of the Blue Book, the Committee, the ranking committee members were invited to come and listen to the recordings in their entirety. I don't believe that they deemed it necessary from their vantage point to do so.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Mr. Nixon, on May 22, 1974, you wrote to Mr. Q Rodino, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and I quote from your letter: "The committee has the full story of Watergate insofar as it relates to presidential knowledge and presidential actions. Production of these additional conversations would merely prolong the discovery without yielding significant additional evidence."

On June 9, once again you wrote to Chairman Rodino and said, "The voluminous body of materials that the committee already has and which I have voluntarily provided,

apparently in response to the committee requests and apparently in an effort to round out the record, does give the full story of Watergate insofar as it relates to presidential knowledge and presidential actions."

On August 5, 1974, in a public statement you said: "On April 29, in announcing my decision to make public the original set of White House transcripts, I stated that 'As far as what the President personally knew and did with regard to Watergate and the cover-up is concerned, these materials together with those already made available will tell it all.' Shortly after that, in May, I made a preliminary review of some of the sixty-four taped conversations subpoenaed by the Special Prosecutor. Among the conversations I listened to at that time were two of June 23."

My question is: Had you listened to the tape of June 23 prior to writing the letter of May 22, 1974, to Chairman Rodino?

MR. MORTENSON: Objection on the ground of relevance and I will instruct the witness not to answer.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:'

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

26

27

28

in his way and

W. A. B.

<u>.</u>..;

A Sugar

Q Had you listened to the tape of June 23 prior to the letter of June 9 to Chairman Rodino?

MR. MORTENSON: The same objection. I will instruct the witness not to answer.

MR. DOBROVIR: Mr. Mortenson, I have just received a suggestion from one of my co-counsel and I will adopt the suggestion.

My question to you is: Are you claiming that it is irrelevant for the purposes of this lawsuit whether or not Mr. Nixon, in any of those published statements, misrepresented the record deliberately?

MR. MORTENSON: Are you asking the question of whether he misrepresented the record deliberately?

MR. DOBROVIR: I am asking you whether it is your contention that is what is irrelevant?

MR. MORTENSON: Yes.

MR. DOBROVIR: Thank you. Bear with me for a moment and I will find Mr. Nixon's affidavit again.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

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

26

27

28

-

-----

and different of the

بر این می فول

Q On Page 5, Paragraph 8 of your Affidavit, you state, and I quote --

MR. MORTENSON: If I may, Counsel. Let me expand upon my answer.

MR. DOBROVIR: Certainly.

MR. MORTENSON: But I do believe that it is totally irrelevant to this suit and the issues raised by the statute.

The plaintiff's actions in regard to the preparation of the tape recordings that were reported, the transcript which was reported to the committee, and it is that entire line of questioning that I have instructed the witness not to respond to.

I have informed you, as I am sure you are probably aware, that the full text of those recordings, the actual recordings themselves, were offered to members of the committee to respond to and I think that in itself is a complete

-1

demonstration that there was no effort to misrepresent the 1 ()record deliberately or otherwise when the committee to whom 2 the material was submitted that the source available. 3 Beyond that and even in that regard I consider the whole line of 4 questioning irrelevant to this lawsuit. 5

6 MR. DOBROVIR: Since we are putting material on the record you should note that my last question related to the 7 June 23 tape which was not offered to the Judiciary Committee 8 on April 30 in connection with the submission. Moreover, that 9 my questions relate to public statements made to the people of 10 the United States and, of course, Section 104-Al of the statute 11 relates to the desire of the Congress and the President that the full story of Watergate be made public to the people as soon as reasonably possible.

.....

124

19

Filtrada

23 12

13

14

15 :..

15

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

28

I should add that I am not going to burden the record with it.

MR. DOBROVIR: I was also planning to ask similar questions with respect to the President's news conference of October 5, 1972, as compared with the June 23, 1972, conversation -- excuse me, the March 6th, 1974 news conference as compared with a March 22, 1972, conversation, the particular portion of which was not disclosed in the April 30 submission.

I had a question with respect to the news conference of August 22, 1973, and I had a question with respect to the news conference of September 5, 1973.

As I said, I won't ask the questions merely for 26 purpose of having you interpose your objection. I will assume 27 you will interpose for the same.

()0 MR. MORTENSON: I will object and particularly to the 1 extent that you request plaintiff to respond to what action he 2 had taken, whether he had reviewed recordings and in the process 3 of reviewing recordings and in the process of reviewing re-4 cordings I imagine there must have been discussions and so forth. The actions of the President are claimed in this suit to be privileged, at least in the context of a Congressional act trying to seize the public disclosure of presidential materials. And to the extent that you were requesting this witness to put upon the record in the case the substance of his actions or discussions or anything else we object on the ground that this is what the whole lawsuit is about, protecting that privilege of confidentiality as well as other privileges involved in the claim.

DOBROVIR: Are you contending then that the matter of debate upon which the plaintiff reviewed a particular tape, which he has disclosed he reviewed it in May, are you contending that any more specific information other than that is privileged? I am saying in the context of this MR. MORTENSON:

lawsuit we refuse to answer on both grounds, irrelevancy and privilege.

MR. DOBROVIR: You are instructing the witness not to answer?

MR. MORTENSON: Yes.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Artable of Car

Souther the

MR. DOBROVIR: And the witness is accepting that instruction?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. DOBROVIR: Thank you.

## BY MR. DOBROVIR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

<u>a</u> 19

1

Q Mr. Nixon, on Page 5 of your Affidavit, Paragraph 8, you state "I assumed that such opinions were given in confidence to assist me as President and that they would not be publicly disclosed. Just as important, those who gave me their opinions must have so assumed."

106

On Page 14, Paragraph 20, you say with respect to Foreign Affairs and Domestic Policy, "If the President and his advisors had thought that their discussions were to be published and publicized, they would undoubtedly have been far more cautious and far less frank and free-wheeling."

On Page 16 you say at the time the tape recordings were made, and I am not quoting there but now I am beginning to quote "And my other presidential materials were generated, neither I nor the members of my staff expected that any of my presidential materials, and certainly not the tape recordings of my confidential conversations, would ever be disclosed to the public, at least without my express authorization."

However, you also say in Paragraph 22, that you knew that many Presidents had used their presidential materials to prepare their memoirs.

You also say, in Paragraph 23, that in part the consideration of preparation of your memoirs, and I think you testified to this earlier as well, was one of the bases, one of the reasons for the installation of the tape recording capacity. You also say that you intended to place the tapes in a presidential library.

Now, hearing all those various statements and

bearing all those statements in mind, is it your contention in this case that disclosure of the chilling effect that you refer to if that disclosure is controlled by you?

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

26

27

28

949 10

1. I. I. I.

4.1.

A Press of the

A That is correct. That has been also the practice of previous presidents.

For example, as Counsel is perhaps aware, not only do we have the restriction of fifty years, which President Johnson has placed on his tape recordings, many tapes of some of the material which Truman had and has never been disclosed and may never be disclosed, the same can be said with regard to President Eisenhower. And what I am doing here is adopting the same practice.

I will, however, as I have indicated, follow as generous a rule as possible with regard to the disclosure. But on the other hand, only the President, with regard to presidential materials, generally I am referring now when they are a combination of official, political, private and personal, only the President can make that judgment with all of the considerations in mind. That I think is the essence of basically this suit as I have pointed out earlier. It has many considerations, but when in trying to determine such matters as whether something should be disclosed or not, the time that it can be disclosed, only one who participated, for example, in a conversation or one for whom the material was prepared, knows the total background and can make that decision. It can be adequately made and, as a matter of fact, with no bad intentions whatever or bad faith, it would not be adequately made by government men, bureaucrats.

That is why, for example, I know that President Johnson, and I am sure President Johnson has not allowed review of his tapes except by himself and one intimate member of his staff. That is why, as I understand, President Kennedy, or as far as the tapes in the Kennedy Library, it's my understanding they are not being reviewed by scholars outside of the immediate Kennedy entourage.

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

26

27

28

. . . .

11: 4

÷.,

That is why President Eisenhower, I know, insisted on reviewing his materials. He did not have tapes but he always had a notetaker in his room or virtually always. And only one individual was present and he would ask that individual to make a memoir for his presidential files. President Eisenhower felt it his prerogative and responsibility and upon his death he passed that on to his son to make the decision as to what should be disclosed and when.

All that we are seeking in this suit is that same right, because we believe that the right is not simply a pecuniary one, because memoirs might be more valuable because of the fact that the President had access or at least the first access to materials, but in my view it goes much further than that. It goes to the Office of the Presidency, not just the man who sits here, but the past Presidents and I believe future Presidents as well. Some may disagree, some Presidents may disagree but I know from my experience that that safeguard of confidentiality of privileged communications is indispensable to making the best decisions and if that safeguard is further eroded, it already has been eroded too much in my opinion, but if it is further eroded it will have a very detrimental effect on the ability of future presidents to make the decisions that need to be made for the best interest of the country.

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

26

27

28

AND A CARAGE

Q In that connection I would like to read to you a passage: from the Transcript of Eight Recorded Presidential Conversations Hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to House Resolution 803.

It appears on Page 183 of that volume, and it is a separate volume entitled Comparison of White House and Judiciary Committee Transcripts of Eight Recorded Presidential Conversations, the House Judiciary Committee states with respect to the material from which I am about to quote, it states as follows: "The following portion at the end of March 22, 1973, the conversation beginning on Page 180 of the House Judiciary Committee Transcripts) does not appear in the submission of the recorded presidential conversations of April 30, 1974, nor does it appear in the transcript prepared by the White House for the Special Prosecutor

"In January of 1974 and to the Judiciary Committee in March 1974, and I am reading from Page 183 and it says -let me go back a little bit so it is in context. Presdent: "Dean? Discipline is very high. Mitchell," Parkinson, O'Brien.

"President: Yes, Dean says it is great. Well, you know, I feel for all the people, Nou know, I mean everybody that is involved. Hell, all we are doing the best" (-) to unintelligible and so forth. And then again unintelligible. "That's, that's "That is why I can't let you go down, John? It has alreadycome (-) W.

Dean: "Hun-un: Uh 2 President: Did you find out anything? "Dean: "I was -- I went to Ziegler's office. 3 They have an office over there. O'Brien' will be down here in a 4 little while to see you. I am going over to Ziegler's office 5 to finish this up/ 6 7 Mitchell: Are you coming back? Second and a state of the Dean: Yes, F will come back over here then. 8 °0kay. "Mitchell: 9 "President: Yes. 10 Well, when you come back he can - is that office open for John? now 11 Dean: Yes. 12 President: Then he can go over there as soon as 13 unintelligible. This -14 but - the one thing I don't want to do -- now ) let me make this clear. 15 I thought it was a very 16 a-very cruel thing, as it turned out although at the time. \*\* [Unintelligible] What happened to 17 Adams I don't want to happen with the Watergate matter. 18 I madea F 14 19 2 1 think he made a mistake, but he shouldn't have been sacked and? 19 he shouldn't have been -- and for that reason I am perfectly 20 willing and I don't give a" -- I am just deleting an expletive 21 "what happens. I want you to all stonewall it and 22 them, complete the five amendments, save the plan. cover upon anything Lelse is 23 the whole point. On the other hand un, un 24 ugh I would prefer, as I said to you, that you do it the other way." 25 Would counsel please indicate what the other way A 26 was. 27 I am reading from the transcript. 28 Q.

A Well, Counsel --

Q I don't know.

3 I would interpose here, Counsel, the fact that that A is a rather famous conversation that appeared on the cover of 4 Newsweek and the cover of Newsweek left off what Counsel has 5 just read. I would prefer it the other way. The other way that 6 I preferred, as I had indicated, was that all should go before 7 the Grand Jury and testify freely without claiming any privilege. 8 I am reading the whole page, Mr. Nixon. 9 Q 10 A

111

A I know, but you didn't read it the other way, the other way referred to earlier in the paper. You don't even know what the other way was.

Q No.

MR. MORTENSON: I think it is representative of the facts Counsel, that when you start to take portions of the conversation it distorts the meaning.

THE WITNESS: You don't know what the other way is.

MR. DOBROVIR: No. Would you tell us.

MR. MORTENSON: He just told you, Counsel.

THE WITNESS: I just told you. It seems to me when asking when you say the other way you would have looked back and found what it was. I think it was in reference to going before the Grand Jury. That had constantly been my position.

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MR. MORTENSON: Can I ask you, Counsel, --

MR. DOBROVIR: I was going to ask a question about that, if I may.

MR. MORTENSON: Go ahead.

1 BY MR. DOBROVIR:

----

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

"halles a

and the particular of the

Q Mr. Nixon, did you approve the resolution of that passage from the submission of April 30, 1974 -- January '74 and March 1974?

5 MR. MORTENSON: Objection on the ground he has already 6 stated, and I would like for Counsel to state for the record 7 where in his pleading the accuracy of plaintiff's, or has he 8 stated it before, the deliberate misrepresentation of any 9 record as raised in your pleadings. You said you raised this 10 as a defense to --

MR. DOBROVIR: That is not what I stated, Mr. Mortenson.
It is a defense and it will be argued as a defense.

MR. MORTENSON: Has it been raised in any of the pleadings?

MR. DOBROVIR: It is implied in our denial of the allegations made in your Complaint.

MR. MORTENSON: Point to where it is implied in that. MR. DOBROVIR: In other words, your allegation that this is a Bill of Attainder.

MR. DOBROVIR: Pursuant to that, we have a right to produce evidence in support of our denial.

Let me ask my question, may I?

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Mr. Nixon, what interest would be damaged -- well, let me ask it this way.

26 What interest was damaged by the disclosure of that 27 conversation?

MR. MORTENSON: I object and will instruct the witness not

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

28

to answer this whole line of questioning.

MR. DOBROVIR: I will now turn it over to Mr. Krulwich.

 $\left( - - \right)$ 

MR. MORTENSON: Let us take a brief recess, please.

(A brief recess is taken at this time.)

MR. MORTENSON: Let me state for the record that as counsellor and plaintiff we object to the procedure of the joint Intervenor Defendants to split the questioning of this witness in the deposition, on the grounds that the Court has permitted a joint intervention by the parties in a normal proceeding for taking the testimony of a witness as one attorney for one party. But under the circumstances we are glad to consent to the parties going ahead and splitting it in this instance.

THE WITNESS: I am an American League fan. I don't mind.

MR. DOBROVIR: Let me say for the record, we have conducted the deposition on joint effort and we have cooperated in the preparation. We will not be asking repetitious questions. We have divided up resonsibility for questioning and we think it is appropriate.

## EXAMINATION BY MR. KRULWICH:

Q Mr. Nixon, my name is Andrew Krulwich and we are counsel for The Reporters Committee and Freedom of the Press and the Historical Association and American Political Science Association. Let me state this, that I am in company here with Mark J. Spooner and Leonard B. Simon.

26 Did you conduct governmental business at Key Biscayne 27 and San Clemente when you were President?

Yes.

A

1	Q	Did you maintain or keep any files relating to this	
2	governmental	business in Key Biscayne or San Clemente, while you	
3	were Preside	nt?	
4	A	No.	
5	Q 1	Were any tape recordings made in Key Biscayne or	
6	San Clemente, when you were President?		
7	A 1	No.	
8	Q	When you left the White House on August 9, did you	
9	take with you	u any documents or tapes?	
10	A	What tapes are you referring to?	
11	କ କୃତ୍ୟ	The tapes that you referred to in your Affidavit	
12	and which is	the subject of this litigation.	
13	A	Do you mean the so-called tapes from the Watergate	
14	tapes?		
15	Q I	Tapes made in the Executive Office Building?	
16	A	The ones made under the taping system?	
17	୍ କୃତ୍ତି	Yes.	
18	A 1	No.	
19	Q	Did you take with you any documents?	
20	A	Any documents?	
21	Q T	Yes.	
22	A	What type of documents?	
23	Q	Any documents that would be referred to and you	
24	would conside	er as part of the presidential materials, when you	
25	left the Whi	te House on August 9.	
26	A	None of that sort. Presidential material?	
27	ର୍	Yes.	
28	A I	NO.	

.

\_\_\_\_\_

In connection with your preparation --

A Let me point out.

Q Sure.

Q

1

2

3

114

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

s to this

hile you

A I requested, of course, that as soon as I arrived / re that the tapes and all of the presidential material be >rwarded here. But as a result of a number of events that go on, probably an irrelevant temporary restraining order was obtained and that is why I did not have them. If I had thought such an order would have been issued, I think I might have taken them.

Q In preparation for your possible testimony in the Watergate Conspiracy trial, did you receive any of the presidential materials of your Administration in order to assist you in preparing that testimony?

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, referring to copies of the presidential materials?

MR. KRULWICH: Either copies or materials, taking them one at a time.

THE WITNESS: Excuse me. What testimony do you mean? The deposition that I gave?

BY MR. KRULWICH:

Q No, I am referring to there was a time when there was a possibility that you might testify in the Watergate Conspiracy trial in Washington, D.C.

A Yes.

Q Did you receive any of the presidential materials of your Administration in order to assist you in preparing for

possible testimony at that trial? 1

(At this time plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel confer.) 2 THE WITNESS: We are consulting with Counsel to find out, 3 because at that time, as you remember, I was in the hospital. 4

110

5

MR. MILLER: You may testify you don't recall.

THE WITNESS: Actually I was in the hospital for 6 approximately two months and I don't recall any material ever 7 being sent to me. But my Counsel informs me they got some material and did not send it to me, because I was in the hospital

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

8

9

MR. MILLER: I didn't inform you.

THE WITNESS: I said that is my recollection. I can't 11 tell you whether we did or not. As far as I am concerned, I 12 didn't see any, let's put it that way. 13

BY MR. KRULWICH:

A

A

And if any was sent you you do not know about it? Q. A I do not know about it; no.

Since August 9, have you received any presidential Q materials from your Administration, either originals or copies?

Presidential material?

Yes, Q,

All of that material is presidential, I said. A AS you know, all the presidential material is held in Washington.

Mr. Nixon, I want to show you an article that 24 appeared very recently in the Washington Post, possibly to 25 refresh your recollection and just for your information and so 26 you know what it is I am referring to. 27

28

Who is the author?

Q I don't know. It doesn't say. It indicates that the Saturday Evening Post may be getting some of your papers from your daughter, Mrs. Eisenhower. And my question is first: Is this accurate?

A Let me see what my daughter is up to.

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

26

27

28

MR. MORTENSON: Another example of inaccurate Washington Post reporting.

THE WITNESS: This article refers to letters that were received, incidentally, primarily during the period I was in the hospital.

My daughter Julie, as you know, has been a consultant and I think called an assistant editor of the Saturday Evening Post. When she was here, oh, three, four months ago she came over and worked with volunteers in opening some of these letters and she was particularly interested in the letters that came from children. You know, school children made up cards and all that sort of thing during my illness as well as others. And she said that she would like to do an article on this. And so under those circumstances she contacted our office and these, incidentally, were letters that had already been opened. They were letters that I could not respond to because no allowance, no adequate allowance was provided for responding to over two million letters I received since August 9th. And these letters were sent to the Post, to Indianapolis.

However, while even they were in transit she concluded that she could not and did not want to go forward with the project. As a matter of fact, she has other plans for the future, not that she won't be a consultant to the Saturday Evening Post. Consequently the letters are now on their way
 back and I am donating them all to the presidential letters
 setup.

Q Time Magazine reporting on the same incident, and I am sorry I don't have a copy of the Time article with me, referred to these papers as "presidential papers."

A No.

7

8

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q Is that accurate?

A I would not -- well, it is accurate only in the sense that if a Time editor believes that a former President, letters sent to him is presidential, then it is a presidential paper. I do not, however, consider it to be accurate in terms of presidential papers, in terms of this lawsuit, and I believe they are holding quite a few letters, a number that came in before I left.

MR. MORTENSON: I think the record should be clear that the testimony is that none of these letters referred to in plaintiff's testimony predate August 9, 1974.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR. MORTENSON: And I certainly hope no one claims they should be the owners of them.

BY MR. KRULWICH:

Q I was trying to establish what papers they were. A I understand. And the stories, because of lack of information, would lead you to that conclusion or your line of

27 questioning is fairly proper.

28

Q I want to go back for one minute. I neglected to

follow up before, when I asked about the materials you took with you when you left the White House on August 9th.

You answered that, I believe, you did not take with you any White House tapes. Did you take any other tapes with you?

A All that I was able to take with me and all that I did take with me were some of my personal notes and diaries that had not gone to the White House files. Those, of course, I took with me because they were available, they were in the office and I just took them from my office. But only things that were in my office or in my safe at the White House residence were taken.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q Are you referring there to Dictabelts?

A There were some.

Q Are these the same Dictabelts that you are referring to in your Affidavit on Page 12?

A A portion of them. Most of the Dictabelts, unfortunately I must say in terms of my commitment to meet a deadline with regard to writing, are still in the White House under the Restraining Order. The only ones I was able to take with me and that I did take were ones that were in my office and, as I said, in the President's Office and also in my safe in the White House residence, where I kept notes, Dictabelts whenever they had recently been made.

See, it was my custom, I should point out, that with regard to Dictabelts, not to have them transcribed and they have not been transcribed yet so I don't even know what I have.

]	Q I see.		
2	A And we have not been able to get an inventory from		
3			
4	THE WITNESS: Is that right, Mr. Mortenson?		
5	MR. MORTENSON: Yes.		
6			
7	BY MR. KRULWICH:		
8	Q You just mentioned your commitments for writing.		
9	Do you have a commitment at this time?		
10	A Yes.		
11	Q And does that commitment involve a signed contract		
12	with a publishing agency?		
13	A Yes.		
14	Q And does that signed contract provide for you to		
15	receive a sum of money in return for your memoirs?		
16	A Yes. It is conditioned also on what I am able to		
17	produce, and I confidentially expect that I will be able to -		
18	produce memoirs in due time.		
19	Q All right. On Page 16 of your Affidavit, and again		
20	on Page 17 in Paragraph 21 and then again Paragraph 23, you		
21	referred to "Tape recordings of conversations in the Oval		
22	Office and my office in the Executive Office Building and else-		
23	where," et cetera.		
24	A Yes.		
25	Q What did you mean by "elsewhere"?		
26	A Well, there were tape recordings of my telephone		
27	conversations made from my office in Camp David, what is		
28	called Aspen Lodge. There were no tape recordings in San		

Clemente and none in Florida or on the telephone or in the office. There was a tape recording of telephone calls made from Aspen Lodge, that is what I was referring to "elsewhere."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Do the tape recordings that you just described plus Q the tape recordings in the Oval Office and the tape recordings in your office in the Executive Office Building constitute the totality of the tape recordings that you are claiming as presidential materials in this litigation?

Well, let me explain. You did not mention telephone. 9 A The telephone in the Lincoln Sitting Room was recorded, none 10 That was the one I used as an office in the residence. 11 other. No other telephones in the residence were recorded. 12

The telephones both in the EOB and the Oval Office 13 were recorded. The Cabinet Room also I don't think you 14 mentioned, that was recorded. Beyond that, as far as tape 15 recordings were concerned, there were none, as I said. And I 16 say this only based upon what I have been told and what I have 17 understood.

I understood that during the Johnson Period there were tape recording systems that covered telephones of members of the staff and whether that is true or not I am unable to say. I have understood that but I want the record to be clear here that there were none of the telephones of members of the staff that were recorded, as far as I was concerned. I have no knowledge of that. What they may have done you would have to ask them.

Were any of your conversations with foreign heads 27 Q of state or foreign governmental officials, when you traveled 28

LCL

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

aboard, tape recorded?

A

Oh, by them always.

Q By you?

A Never.

Q On Page 12 of your Affidavit, in Paragraph 19, you give as an example what you term your wife's personal files, "her record pertaining to the White House restoration project which was funded entirely by private contributions and which she voluntarily initiated and supervised."

Is the list of those, as to who contributed to the White House restoration project, a document that you claim as one of your presidential materials in this lawsuit?

A Yes. Well, I don't know whether we want to quibble about it. It belongs to my wife in that instance, but my wife intended to give all of her papers -- she has already expressed that intent to me -- all of her papers to the White House and -could I elaborate a moment with regard to that? This may anticipate the question.

Q Yes.

A I have indicated, for example, that I consider total privilege, and I am sure all counsel would agree with this, any conversations that I have had, private conversations, with my wife, my daughters, my sons-in-law, other members of my family. However, I had a number of official, what I would consider official conversations with my wife and with my daughters. For example, my wife took three good will trips aboard, two to Latin America and one to Africa and I had extended conversations with her in the office and the Oval Office concerning these trips.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

She also was the leader, in terms of a program very close to my heart and hers as a former teacher, that is The Right to Read Program. And I had many conversations with her on that program.

The White House restoration project has already been mentioned. The other programs, which both she and my daughters were involved, was the Legacy of Parks Project. I was unable often to do the dedications and so forth and therefore any conversations in that area were involved.

Both of my daughters worked at varying times as volunteers with retarded and underprivileged children from Washington and I had conversations with them about those projects.

What I am indicating is very simply that my wife and my daughters were very active in those areas. Also I should point out that in addition to what we would call simply official or official family activities, that they were active in the campaigns. They would make campaign appearances and I would discuss that. So they were engaged in political activities. So when I speak not of the privilege but when I say conversations with my wife and daughters would never be disclosed, I would say that any conversation that I would apply the same guidelines to her and I have discussed this with her as with my daughters that I applied to myself.

Q Thank you.

Mr. Nixon, is the Gift Register, which was prepared by the White House Gift Unit listing gifts presented to you or

25

26

27

28

Ander States

family by foreign heads of state or officials of foreign governments among the presidential materials that you claim in the case? Are you familiar with the Gift Register?

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

26

27

28

1.1.1.1.1.1

A I know the Gift Record Unit, because the individual in charge of that said that Mrs. Nixon had been most scrupulous. He was not commenting upon any others in terms of reporting all gifts and turning all gifts in, of course, and having them recorded so that they could eventually be delivered to a library.

Now, if you are referring to the gifts themselves, it would be my intent that they should be put in the library as they are in other libraries, the Johnson Library, the Truman Library, and the rest, particularly the State gifts as well as some from private citizens here in this country. But if you are talking about the lists, I don't quite know what you are talking about.

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, if I might interrupt. There has been discribed as the Nixon v. Sampson matter, of which you are counsel of record. The official register of gifts given under the Foreign Gifts Act, or whatever it is called, have been turned over to the Department of State, which is to be the repository of that registration and therefore not included along with the presidential materials, beyond that material which has been introduced in that case. And because the Register does reside in the State Department, according to that testimony, it obviously is not included in the presidential materials claimed by this lawsuit.

THE WITNESS: Let the record show, however, in view of

125 some of the things that have been written by some of the reporters, for whom I have, of course, great respect, and probably because of lack of information, that every gift received during the period I was President of the United States by me or by my wife has not only been recorded but also will be donated and to the library. None have been sold and none have been appropriated. All stories to the effect of that are to the contrary and totally inaccurate.

MR. KRULWICH: Thank you, Mr. Nixon. I have no further questions.

EXAMINATION BY MR. GOLDBLOOM: 12

Mr. Nixon, I am Irwin Goldbloom and I have with me 0. David Anderson. We represent the Defendants United States and General Services Administration.

I would like to go back briefly over some of the ground that you covered this morning about the scope and nature of the presidential materials.

> I didn't get that. A

The scope and nature of the presidential --Q.

A

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Oh, the scope. I see.

I believe you indicated that in your Affidavit that Q. in many instances there are letters written to the President by citizens concerning matters of national or domestic affairs, such as circumstances involving Lieutenant Calley; is that correct?

A

Q

28

Oh, yes.

Isn't it fair that the White House receives

thousands upon thousands of letters on a regular basis daily from 1 citizens around the country on all matters or many matters of 2 national concern? 3

> A Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18 ÷.,

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Is there in the White House a unit that is designed Q. to prepare responses to these letters from citizens or others who have communicated with the President?

> A Yes.

And for the most part unless there might be an Q. unusual circumstance, most of these letters would not come directly to the President's attention; is that correct?

A One moment. That may have been the case and may 12 be the case with some Presidents but not with me. I had 13 prepared for me on a weekly basis a summary of the mail, the issue breakdown, the number of letters received on one side or the other. In addition to that I wanted to see a sampling of mail that had been received, for example the Calley Matter and wherever the letters involved a major issue it became necessary then to prepare an adequate response. And I took personal resonsibility for preparing that response. Of course, staff members would submit their versions, but I believe I found that in many years of public life people who received letters from the President, you would get them framed. I don't mean my editorial ability was much greater than those in the writing section, but I did a great deal of it myself. And so I saw a considerable amount of mail.

I should also point out in that connection that a great many, a great number of letters were written to Mrs. Nixon,

to which she responded personally. Terrora

2 To some extent some of this mail that was directed t ()the President may have been sent or delegated to the various 3 departments, agencies for response in the event that it referred 4 to a particular matter. And in that instance the White House ma 5 have received a copy of the response that was sent by the answer 6 ing agency or department. Is that a correct understanding? 7

> A Correct.

Now, I believe you said this morning that approxi-9 Q mately, as an estimate, two hundred thousand of the 42 million 10 estimated number of documents may have come to your attention at one time or another while you were President.

2

-

8

11

12 Sec. 6

13

15

15

en.

× 13

の書の

Æ. 22

i B

24

25

16

27

-2

Just a rough estimate.

Is it fair to say that if a matter was brought to 2 14 your attention it had some relative importance as compared say with the documents that didn't come to your attention?

> 2 Of course.

Now, in connection with the papers in which your 2 immediate staff members prepared for you or for each other in connection with matters that you had to act upon, is it correct to say that these matters touched upon some of the most sensitive issues regarding this country?

> We are talking now about papers or letters or both? 3

Fapers. We are talking about memovanda iv papers x which were brought to your astention.

> 1 Z::s.

MCRIPHNSON: Let ne ask founsel to clarity duan te mean's 1.1 ly 'sensitive matters, '

1THE WITNESS: Are you referring to basically national2security matters only?

MR. GOLDBLOOM: No, but that would be included.

THE WITNESS: What else would be sensitive?

MR. GOLDBLOOM: Defense in particular and economic policy.

THE WITNESS: Do you include that as sensitive?

7 MR. GOLDBLOOM: I was using that in terms of national 8 security.

9 THE WITNESS: As you are quite aware, matters in that area, 10 you are talking about classification, and you don't use top 11 secret classification or something in the economic field. It is 12 only used in a national security field. I am not trying to 13 quibble, but I just want to be sure I understand the question.

MR. GOLDBLOOM: I didn't intend to use the term sensitive in any classification.

THE WITNESS: I see.

MR. GOLDBLOOM: But rather --

THE WITNESS: Important.

MR. GOLDBLOOM: -- important to the country.

THE WITNESS: All right.

22 BY MR. GOLDBLOOM:

3

4

5

6

1. 1. 1.

: -----

16

17

19 20

<u>z</u> 21

25

P ......

23 Q This would include national security and foreign 24 affairs matters?

A Yes.

Q And matters involving the administration of laws, the execution of laws by the President, and matters of economic policy, domestic -- A Yes.

1

6

8

9

10

23

24

25

r) T

I believe you testified that the taping system that 2 Q we have referred to was originally installed for national secur: 3 particularly for national security purposes. 4

5 MR. MORTENSON: I don't believe that accurately reflects the testimony given.

THE WITNESS: What I believe I testified to, and this wil 7 save the reporter going back to have to read his notes, was this That the question which was raised as to whether or not the tapi system recorded primarily for purposes of writing my memoirs.

I pointed out that President Johnson had mentioned 11 that particular factor in recommending that one be put in. 12 I said as far as I was concerned I considered it important from 13 the standpoint of making the historical record, having in mind 14 also certainly as a subsidiary but not then the most compelling 15 reason the possibility that sometime in the future I might do 16 some writing and that having available the tapes would be help--17 ful in seeing that it was accurate. I pointed out that as far as 18 I was concerned, too, that I was particularly interested in the 19 national security area but I did not limit it to that because 20 there are other areas which I have also indicated, the matter of 21 Welfare reform, the desegregation issue, the issues which seemed 22 so miniscule but are so important. Some like abortion, et ceteral All of these, of course, are on tape.

BY MR. GOLDBLOOM: 26

Mr. Nixon, I am going to read from a portion of a 27 Q. press conference that you gave on August 22, 1973. A portion of 28

LCY

your answer, which appears on Page 1018 of Presidential 1 Documents, weekly compilation of Presidential Documents, for 2 Monday, August 27, 1973. And I quote: "It was put into place" . 3 this is referring to the tape -- "It was put into place again 4 in June of 1970 (1971) because my advisors felt it was important 5 in terms, particularly of national security affairs, to have a 6 record for future years that would be an accurate one but a 7 record which would only be disclosed at the discretion of the 8 President or according to directives that he would set forth." 9 Do you recall making that statement? 10

I was wrong, incidentally, about the date. A Yes. 11 I thought it had been put in earlier than that. I was wrong. 12 It did not go into place until February, as I recall, of 1971. 13

Is it important in national security affairs to Q 14 have a precise record of our dealings with foreign countries, 15 foreign leaders? 16

> It is very important. A

Is that because our position in foreign affairs Q. 18 depends upon sensitive and important negotiations with foreign 19 leaders of foreign countries? 20

> A Yes, sir.

Is it fair to say that contained --Q

23

25

28

21

22

17

Just a second. A

(At this time the plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel confer 24 out of the hearing of the reporter.)

THE WITNESS: I am sorry. Let the record so indicate I 26 consulted with Counsel on a legal matter. 27

BY MR. GOLDBLOOM:

1

2

3

4

5

JAR PARTA AREA .....

A ......

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Is it fair to say that included, among the presidential documents and in particular the tapes, are matters relating to national security and foreign affairs which might not be found elsewhere in government documents or records?

6 I would say that that would be, if you know the A operations of the White House National Security Staff in our 7 Administration and the current Administration, I assume, that 8 that would not constitute a significant problem, because my 9 relations with Secretary Kissinger and the head of the National 10 Security Council were so close in an official way that there was 11 nothing that he did and nothing that I did or said in our 12 conversations with foreign leaders that we did not report. So as far as anything that occurred during the meetings that I have had abroad or at home, whether they were taped or not taped, they weren't taped abroad, of course, and at home despite my usual -- my desire to have one-on-one meetings from time to time, it was more often the custom for both sides to have a notetaker. So in the files of the National Security Council, I believe Dr. Kissinger is still there as well as being Secretary of State, are all relevant materials that President Ford would need and for that matter the future President might need. And I am sure that continuity would be continued.

You are saying that Dr. Kissinger has access to Q your presidential materials insofar as they relate to national security and foreign affairs matters?

(At this time the plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel

confer outside the hearing of the reporter.)

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

25

- 26

27

28

MR. MORTENSON: Mr. Reporter, would you repeat the 2 question. 3

(The pending question is read by the reporter, as requested by counsel.)

THE WITNESS: No. Anyway, my answer may have been confusing. Dr. Kissinger has his own file and I have my presidential files. Dr. Kissinger's files are complete and all materials that have to do with our negotiations with Russia, with Chou En-lai, with Mao Tse-tung, with Sadat, needless to say the European and Latin American leaders, ad infinitum, all those materials are in the files of the National Security Council.

As far as my particular files are concerned, where the matters were specifically dealt with by me or where there was a meeting that I had, of course I have my own copy. A prett good example of that is the controversies over the famous Thieu letters. As soon as that controversy arose, the first I heard about it was when I read in the paper a statement by Mr. Nessen, Press Secretary, that a review of the Thieu letters indicated that, "they were on all fours" or at least consistent with the statements that I had made publicly about any communications with Mr. Thieu.

The point I am making is that I gave authority to Dr. Kissinger to go into my files and he didn't go in my files. He didn't have to, he had them.

Well, to the extent that Dr. Kissinger may not have Q had access in his files in the National Security Council, do you

Mnow whether he has had access to presidential materials for t conduct of his current functions? 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

19

20

21

22

: 23

24

25

25

27

28

135

an appropriate the full states

The second second second second

MR. MORTENSON: I object to the question. I think that Counsel for the government is aware of the procedures that have been set up for access by the NSC members for the presidential materials and records and in what instances they have not acces. and that is adequate basis and is the best evidence of such

MR. GOLDBLOOM: I don't know that that is the best evidence nor do I know that it is necessarily precluded from being the subject of this deposition.

One of the contentions of the plaintiff is the right of dominion and control over presidential materials and I think 13 it is important to explore the amount of access or the nature 14 of access on certain types of documents. 15

MR. MORTENSON: Well, excuse me, Counsel. To the extent that you are focusing on what access has occurred since 17 President Nixon resigned from office and particularly since 18 the imposition of the Court Order which prevents his access, except under specified conditions but which permits with notification to counsel if the review of materials for ongoing government purposes, that that information is best obtained from members of the NSC who have had the direct access not by plaintiff some three thousand miles away who has not had access.

MR. GOLDBLOOM: You are willing to stipulate that there has been access to presidential materials.

MR. MORTENSON: I can't stipulate if members of the NSC have had access then I assume they have.

THE WITNESS: Do they?

MR. MORTENSON: I don't have NSC records.

THE WITNESS: Let me say this. Knowing Dr. Kissinger, 3 everything that is in the presidential files he has a copy of 4 and I can't say the contrary however. 5

BY MR. GOLDBLOOM:

1

2

6

7

14

23

24

25

26

27

28

Mr. Nixon, if there is a reason to maintain an 8 Q accurate record of presidential activity in the area of foreign 9 affairs and national security, isn't it true that that reason 10 for an accurate record is to enable a President exercising 11 Constitutional powers to know precisely the matters relating to 12 national security in foreign affairs for his exercise of his 13 powers?

Well, wouldn't it be better if I answered that 15 A question by example and then I can be very precise. 16

When I became President I succeeded President 17 Johnson who was, of course, a member of the other party. 18 However, despite the fact that we had been opponents in the 19 campaign, we developed on a parallel basis at all levels 20 consultation and briefings. Rusk briefed Rogers; Rostow 21 briefed Kissinger; Johnson briefed me in great detail. Also 22 following, after coming into office, due to the fact that the Vietnam War negotiations, you know, they had the bombing halt just before the elections, and negotiations were still in process, Dr. Kissinger on several occasions Mr. Helms on several occasions at my direction, and General Haig talked to the President, went down to see President Johnson and Mr. Rostow

134

to see what the status of the negotiations had been and where 1 2 they should go. And they had absolutely no problem at all. And Secretary Rogers, in his relationships with Secretary of State Rusk, had the same problem.

5 I may say, too, looking back over the history of 6 this country, that even when one party succeeds another that 7 we have become mature enough that this kind of communication between Presidents particularly is now standard and should be. 8 As far as I am concerned there, of course, as you would assume 9 no problem as far as cooperating with President Ford and there 10 will be no problem as far as cooperating with a future President 11 in the event Mr. Ford is not the President, as long as I am 12 13 alive.

In other words, our foreign policy involves 14 Q 15 continuity?

A

Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3

4

And the President in this regard is more than a Q. person, he is an institution in a sense. Is that fair to say?

No, I think you can't say that the President is just A an institution or for that matter because each President is different. Each President develops his own policies. Some want to start with an absolutely clean slate and they sweep out all of their predecessors. They don't want anything to do with any of the previous policies.

There are instances when it is necessary for a President to have communication with a former President. For example, President Kennedy had several communications with President Eisenhower, when he thought it was necessary, and

135

there was cooperation.

1

2

5

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

That is our experience in modern times. Q

3 It is and it will continue to be now, particularly A will be in my case, because of my knowledge of the necessity 4 for continuity.

But I wish to point out, if I could, to Counsel, 6 that that continuity need not be obtained and should not be 7 obtained at the cost of destroying the principle of cofidentiali 8 You have to weigh -- we have problems to weigh and I have 9 already talked about my strong feelings with regards to 10 necessity to maintain the principle of confidentiality and 11 separation of powers. 12

I should point out that we can have both. We can 13 have or retain the principle of confidentiality and that means 14 the President should retain control over his papers and so forth 15 But at the same time that is not inconsistent with maintaining 15 continuity. That has not been the case in the past and we have-17 not had a serious problem in recent years and to my knowledge 18 we have not now and I don't see any coming up in the future. Certainly in view of the fact that this legislation deals only with my presidency, there is no chance whatever that that will happen.

Could the principle of continuity be destroyed or Q undermined by concepts of private property of a former President?

That would assume that a former President was A irresponsible and put his own views about the materials that were presidential materials, his own views with regard to his right thereto above the interest of the country. And despite

differences we may have as to who should occupy that office, I can think of no man in either party that would do that at the present time. And incidentally, that would include about forty people that are running for President or Vice President.

I believe you made some reference this morning, Mr. 5 0 Nixon, to classified documents and the interests of a former 6 President in abiding the rules and regulations and the out-7 standing executive orders concerning the use of dissemination of 8 classified materials. 9

10

13

14

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

A Correct.

Do you agree that a former President, with respect Q 11 to his presidential materials, must so abide by executive 12 regulation authorities concerning the use of and dissemination of classified materials?

I not only agree with it but I have -- again we can A 15 get to a precise example. 16

Shortly after President Johnson left office, when 17 he had started writing his memoirs, he called me not once but 18 almost every couple of months asking for more archivists who 19 had the experience and the qualifications to declassify materials, so that he could use it in his memoirs. In other words, he knew that he could not use and should not use classified materials in his memoirs. That was his practice, that was President Eisenhower's practice and I am sure it would have been President Kennedy's had he lived. It certainly was President Truman's practice and naturally would be mine.

As I said, President Johnson assumed that he could not use a classified document unless he got permission. Here,

when we talk about documents or presidential materials, I shoul 1 say, and in the national security area, there imbued with the 2 public trust, they are different from that you have described 3 earlier as being sensitive in the domestic area. And where thos 4 materials are concerned, where they are imbued with the public trust, then no former President, even though he has control thereof as to their disposition, no former President should disclose them or for that matter retain them unless or except with the consent of or an understanding with the incumbent President.

(At this time the plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel 11 confer out of the hearing of the reporter.) 12

BY MR. GOLDBLOOM:

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

With Article

and some for a special standard to a special

Moving on to a slightly different subject. Q

In Paragraph 5 of your Affidavit, on Page 3, you 16 indicate various different roles that the President serves as 17 "Chief Executive but is a major force in foreign affairs, a 18 formulator of domestic policy, a leader of his political party, 19 a politician in his own behalf, a private citizen with personal 20 friends and associates, and a husband and father to his family." 21

I believe this morning you indicated with respect 22 to documents that may relate to -- well, that are included among 23 presidential documents --24

25

Presidential material. A

-- presidential material there is an intermixture 26 Q of these roles and that in some instances where the President 27 is acting as Chief Executive he is also acting in a political 28

sense, particularly where he is faced with a Congress of a 1 2 different political party.

3 Even when he has a party of his own. Mr. Roosevelt A learned after 1938, as you recall.

5 In a sense, isn't it fair to say that in many Q. respects the various roles of the President are contained 6 throughout most of his activities, the roles that you have 7 indicated in Paragraph 5, and that no one role is sharply 8 defined in terms of his activities? 9

10 Are you suggesting, if I get the question, that the A roles are intermingled in conversations? 11

12 Well, I am asking you whether or not they are not Q in fact intermingled in fact. 13

14 For example, the President taking action in an official capacity under his constitutional or perhaps statutory 15 powers might properly take into account political considerations 16 concerning Congress in taking action. Is that correct? 17

18

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4

1.19.20

Yes, he must. A

The President is a leader of the people and in a 19 Q sense his personal health is a matter of public concern. So to 20 the extent that matters that one might consider to be quite personal to the average citizen might also be matters that would be effected with public interest. Would that be fair to say?

MR. MORTENSON: Let me ask, Counsel. Are you saying members of the public would be interested in learning the President's health? Are you saying they have an interest in knowing what the President says to his doctor?

MR. GOLDBLOOM: No. I am saying they are, or I am asking

whether it is fair to assume that the members of the public are interested in knowing what the President's health is.

THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. Yes. And I mean this is growing 3 out, as we know, of rather tragic experience of President Wilson 4 who for fourteen months was unable to really serve in the office. And a tragic experience of Franklin D. Roosevelt, perhaps that is questionable, but some believe that he had health problems in the end.

But it has been customary in recent years, 9 particularly after President Eisenhower's serious illnesses, 10 for reports to be made publicly with regard to the annual physical examinations. I have had those reports made. On the other hand, I distinguish those from reports, from conversations that I have with my doctor and I have both with regard to how I feel and what I ought to do about my health to make it better or want to preserve it or what have you.

18 BY MR. GOLDBLOOM:

Q

1

2

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19 Now, in connection with the development of the Q taping system, the installation of it by the Secret Service. 20 Do you know whether there were any instances when references 21 were made, and I say this prior to any public controversy 22 concerning the existence of the tapes, whether they were ever used for any governmental purpose?

No. To my knowledge no tape was ever transcribed. 25 Α And as far as I knew, none was ever listened to until this 26 controversy began. 27

28

23

24

Do you know whether the Secret Service agents who

operated the system had the capability of listening to the tapes

2 Yes. It is my understanding that the Secret Service A agents who operated the system did have the capability of 3 listening to the tapes. I have no knowledge that they ever 4 5 did.

The installation of the taping system, was that Q 6 financed by the government? 7

I understand it was. Both the Johnson and Nixon A 8 Administrations it was a government project and I understand 9 the Kennedy Administration as well was financed by the govern-10 ment. 11

12

1

13

14

26

27

28

MR. GOLDBLOOM: I have no further questions.

MR. MORTENSON: Off the record.

(A brief recess is taken at this time.)

MR. GELLER: Mr. Nixon, my name is Kenneth Geller and I 15 am the attorney with the Watergate Special Prosecution Force. 16

As you may know, the Special Prosecutor intervened -17 in the civil action last January in order to protect our 18 interests in certain of the presidential materials of your 19 Administration, which were relevant to our ongoing investigations 20 and prosecutions and from the outset our interests in this 21 lawsuit has been so limited. 22

As you may also know or as you are certainly aware, 23 several months ago procedures were instituted between our 24 office and counsel representing you by which the Special 25 Prosecutor has been given access to certain of the materials which we requested in order to carry out our responsibilities.

The Special Prosecutor believes that we have

received good faith compliance with substantially all of our 1 2 requests up to this time and we expect to have full compliance in the near future, at which point we intend to withdraw from the lawsuit.

My understanding, by the way, is that there still is relatively outstanding requests at this time for materials.

Finally it is our understanding that the accommodatic which we worked out with your counsel is an ongoing one and that if we have any future requests for material the procedures which we have instituted in the past will again be followed to carry out those requests.

12 Having explained the posture of the Special Prosecutor in this lawsuit, I believe that the few questions 13 I intended to ask were covered by counsel for the Justice 14 Department and therefore I have no questions. 15

16

17

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

5 815

1

Ξ.

1

のでのないが

14.10

MR. MORTENSON: Off the record.

(Discussion, off the record.)

MR. MORTENSON: It has been agreed among counsel for 18 the plaintiff and the government defendants and the joint 19 Intervenor Defendants that plaintiff's Affidavit, which has 20 21 formed the basis for some of the questioning during this deposition and which has been submitted in this litigation 22 shall constitute the direct testimony of the plaintiff and 23 shall be admitted as such subject to appropriate objections 24 by parties seeking to interpose them and that the questioning 25 by the joint Intervenor Defendants and the government defendants 26 taken today shall constitute the cross-examination, again 27 subject to any appropriate objections on the admissibility of 28

1 the evidence or the testimony elicited. 2 MR. DOBROVIR: With one further proviso. Of course, 3 subject to the fact that we do not waive any rights we may have 4 with respect to those questions that the witness was instructed 5 not to answer and did not answer. 6 MR. MORTENSON: All right. I don't ask you to waive 7 any. 8 MR. DOBROVIR: Thank you. 9 MR. MORTENSON: Now, Mr. President, let me backtrack over 10 a couple of the areas of questioning. 11 12 EXAMINATION BY MR. MORTENSON: 13 Did you prepare speeches which you intended to Q deliver during the time you occupied the Office of the President 14 15 A Yes. 16

Did any of those speeches, which you prepared, 0 relate to political matters as opposed to matters official in 17 18 character?

Oh, yes.

A

Q

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

19

• 1,5 × 6, 5

and a first of a state of a state of the sta

Did you personally prepare these?

I spent more personal time on them, as I have A indicated earlier, than most recent Presidents. But I had excellent assistance from members of my staff. When it came down, however, to the major thrust, the theme, the final editing, I have very strong feelings about that and take responsibility for any grammatical errors.

Were portions of any of these speeches prepared 0 by you personally without the assistance of any members of the

143

staff?

1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2 I would say that more than half was prepared by me A 3 personally.

4 Let me, if I could, explain how I went about preparing a speech. We are all a little different, you know. 5 All of you are lawyers, I guess. I take the yellow pad and I 6 sit down before seeing anything from any of my associates on 7 any major speech, like an inaugural or State of the Union or 8 report to the nation on what is going on in Vietnam or China 9 or something like that and make very extensive notes maybe on 10 eight or ten pages. After I have made those notes I then call 11 in the individual, normally it would be Mr. Price, sometimes Mr. 12 McKinnon, who was going to work on the speech, and run over 13 the notes with him and ask him, with the help of others on the 14 speech writing -- in the speech writing group, to prepare a 15 draft. The draft would come back and, of course, would always 16 be much too long. I then would cut it back. And because the 17 speech writers obviously would have some ideas to stimulate my 18 own thinking, I would prepare other sections to go into the 19 speech. At the same time, in following this process one goes 20 through and it is an agony of trying to create a speech, to 21 get the ideas down on paper and to get the written word so that it can flow into the spoken word. Many extraneous ideas come to mind and what I would do in this instance would be either to write out again on yellow pad or to dictate on the Dictabelt extraneous ideas not to be included in the speech but to be used later. I would say over a period of five and a half years and perhaps some of the better speeches were never

I have, oh, perhaps several hundred pages, fifty thousand made. 1 to one hundred thousand words of speech ideas, writing ideas that 2 I intended to use at a later time. Whether it is precedent there-3 after, for example, and I won't belabor this any longer, but I 4 thought it might be interesting to our group of visitors here, 5 when I wrote the article for Foreign Affairs in 1967 on the 6 opening to China, it didn't create much stir except among 7 sophisticates who read Foreign Affairs. 8

After the opening occurred, I did a great deal of 9 thinking about what the future of the world would be fifteen to 10 twenty years from now when the Chinese, already the most 11 populous nation in the world, would then have a very significant 12 nuclear capability and in addition be a very significant economic 13 power in the world, how this would affect not only the United 14 States but our relations, the relations of the United States with 15 Japan and Southeast Asia and the Soviet Union in particular and, 16 of course, with Western Europe and the so-called Third World. 17

I recall this, for example, as one of the very 18 expensive monographs that I have written. It is in my presidential 19 papers. It is in what you call the China Folder.

The announcement of going to China, as you recall, 21 was two minutes. What I wrote before boiling it down to two 22 minutes was one hundred pages. 23

In that regard, do you intend in the future to write Q 24 on matters of foreign affairs and domestic policy? 25

A

Yes.

20

26

27

28

Do you intend or did you intend, at the time the Q materials that you have just described were generated, to

エマノ

utilize these materials either as they presently exist or in 1 some revised form to formulate the basis for your writings on 2 matters of foreign affairs and domestic policy? 3 4 Yes. As a matter of fact, I would label them A "Speech Material," or "Book Material." 5 6 Has any of this material been published? Q 7 A No. Or delivered in a public form, to your knowledge? 8 Q No. And as a matter of fact, this material I would 9 A put in the file and would not give to my speech writers, not 10 that I was trying to keep anything from them. I didn't want to 11 divert them from what I eventually determined would be the 12 theme. 13 Now, in your proposed writings on matters of foreign 14 Q affairs and domestic policy, how would that be affected if all 15 of the materials within your files, which you had previously 16 generated, were made public? 17 It would be worthless. Α. 18 Would it influence your abilty to write on these Q. 19 issues? 20 Oh, I could still write on them but it would 21 A perhaps -- oh, I am not an expert on what would be newsworthy 22 and what would not be materially newsworthy. What is particular 23 ly important in my view is that these are thoughts that I had. 24 I am not sure in all cases that I will come down exactly the 25 same way, because the world is changing so much today. But 26 these are thoughts that I have had in the field of foreign 27 policy and some in domestic policy as well, which I hope to 28

enunciate. Frankly I hoped to in my second term. And once I 1 complete my first volume of my memoirs I would hope to write in 2 this area. These are areas and these I should point out are 3 primarily in foreign affairs, very little in the political area. 4

Q

A

. \*\*

5

Do they include political matters?

Oh, yes. Yes, I had some ideas with regard to, for 6 A example, the two party structure in this country; with regard to 7 the retirement or, shall we say, the age limits for members of 8 the House, Senate, Court and et cetera, et cetera. Some that 9 were even more novel, that I have not yet determined will be 10 included in an article or speech but that might well be. 11

Were these materials that you have just described 12 Q left in the White House at the time you resigned on August 9th? 13

14

They were.

15

26

During your term in office, --Q

Let me point out. They were left because I had Α 16 mentioned earlier that I, of course, had some materials in my 17 office, but these would be in my speech files because the 18 thought which brought this forth was generated there. 19

You, during your term in office, were you aware of Q 20 any prior Presidents' practice with regard to the use of their 21 presidential materials in the preparation of their memoirs? 22

Oh, yes, I was quite aware of that. I read most of 23 A them. 24

Q Did you ever discuss with President Johnson the 25 concept of private ownership of the presidential materials?

I think it would be more proper to say he discussed 27 A with me vehemently. 28

147

Q Would you describe that conversation.

1

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

216.9

2 Well, as a matter of fact I had two conversations A 3 with him. He suggested, when I called on him at the White House between the election and the inauguration, that I should 4 give my vice presidential papers to the government. I hadn't 5 thought of it before and I don't know why I wasn't aware of the Act. And I followed his advice and did make a gift of the vice presidential papers for the government as I think it has been reported to a certain extent.

A year later, and I believe it was late, very late 10 in the year, as a matter of fact just before Christmas of 1969, 11 President Johnson came in to see me and we had breakfast. And 12 as you know, he was a man of many moods, but he could sometimes 13 have a towering rage and in this instance rage was directed 14 against what he called the Williams Amendment, which I recollect 15 was an amendment which was removed or revoked, that portion of the law which allowed gifts of public papers to be deducted for tax purposes. And President Johnson said to me, he said, "Now, in view of that fact," he said, "Just remember your papers are yours." And he said, "Don't you ever give them to the government, because they are not going to let you deduct them. That is going to have a bad effect on all people in the future. Libraries are going to dry up. Those papers are yours. You should leave them to your children."

I didn't follow his advice. Nevertheless he did indicate his view.

Despite his advice, do you intend to place your Q presidential papers in a presidential library?

148

A I only intend to place my presidential papers and my vice presidential and my congressional and my senatorial papers as well as a considerable amount of papers that were accumulated during the years I was out of office.

9 You have stated in your Affidavit and in testimony given today at the deposition that you engaged in private or personal conversation with members of your family. Did any of these conversations occur in the White House Oval Office or on telephones which were connected to the taping system?

A Well, I must say that most of them occurred on telephones from either the White House, either from the Oval Office or the EOB or the Aspen Lodge, as the case might be. Several occurred in the Oval Office and some in the EOB and, of course, some in the residence where there was no taping system whatever.

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

If the --

Oh, yes.

A The number of telephone calls was astronomical, I just say.

Q If the contents of the recordings made in the White House during your term in office were disclosed, would it have any impact upon your ability to associate with individuals who you had previously associated with?

A

Q

Q

Would you explain what impact that would have.

A Well, the discussions that occurred in a President's Office, particularly when the individual who was talking to the President feels that he can talk in confidence, as our Affidavit indicates, not only free-wheeling but sometimes blunt and

sometimes clearly apart from what we would use, we would describe in the narrow way of being personally embarrassing, they would be quite honest in giving their views.

1

2

3

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- N

4 For example, this would be particularly the case where an appointment was being made for the Judiciary or to the 5 Cabinet or to other top government positions. Here are all the 6 files, the raw files of the FBI and letters would come in from 7 various individuals. Members of Congress would either come in 8 or write indicating their pros and cons and so forth and so on. 9 And the individuals who wrote or talked to me, as Mr. Morris 10 Ernst already indicated, would write and talk to me in a very 11 direct way and say things. And if they became public, it would 12 not only be personally embarrassing to them but more likely would 13 make it impossible for me to have a continuing association with 14 them in the future on the basis as I have had in the past. 15 I don't mean by that that the Presidency in the White House 16 listens to and expresses rather derogatory opinions about 17 every individual whose name is up, but in order to make the right kind of appointment, for example, you have got to consider where a lawyer is concerned not only his legal qualifications but his relationships with his family, his personal habits, his reputation in every respect, and all of that of course would be considered before a decision was made.

The same would be true with regard to some of the very controversial political issues, and I mean personal issues that came in. I am sorry, domestic issues as distinguished from foreign policy issues. Needless to say, foreign policy, the enormous division in the country with regard to the war, all of

that, it was bluntly discussed and is well known. But the 1 country also has had very, very strong disagreements with regard 2 to such volatile subjects as busing, desegregation, Welfare 3 reform, et cetera. And I have had discussions, for example, 4 with members of Congress, both the House and the Senate, of both 5 parties, some of whom have been my friends going back over 6 twenty-five years, where they thought they were talking in 7 confidence and where if what they said got out it might not only 8 affect what they would feel is their right to express themselves 9 freely in the future, because every man must live with his 10 public statements. He has great enough difficulty doing that. 11 But having to live here with private statements that he thought 12 was off the record would be more difficult. But insofar as I 13 am concerned, of course, it would have a most devastating effect 14 in terms of many of the individuals who talked to me or wrote 15 to me in confidence and then found their confidence has been 16 destroyed. 17

Q During your term as President, did you ever find it necessary, either for the effective conduct of foreign affairs or the promotion of domestic policies, to depend or request of President Johnson or of members of his family access to any of his presidential materials?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

A I have no recollection of that. When I say that I should point out that as I did in answering your earlier questions here, my relationship with President Johnson, while we were political opponents, my relationship was one that I valued very greatly and was one where at his insistence, not only his insistence but only with his agreement had various

contact not only with him by phone but also at times in person 1 and also by my sending Dr. Kissinger down and Mr. Helms, 2 General Haig, and he was their friend.

3

And after the time that President Johnson died, in 4 Q. your experience in the office is it your opinion that had 5 President Johnson destroyed his presidential materials, that 6 that fact would have precluded you from conducting an effective 7 foreign policy? 8

We could have conducted an effective foreign policy, A 9 10 yes.

Did you have access to presidential materials as 11 0 part of the conduct of your foreign policy? 12

We had access. First we had access to enough A 13 material, as a result of our consultation during the transition 14 to go forward, to conduct an effective foreign policy. Also you 15 must realize when President Johnson died, Mr. Rostow is still 16 living and Secretary of State Rusk is living and Mr. McNamara 17 is living and all of them, incidentally, have been extremely 18 cooperative, being of assistance whenever we thought there was 19 a need to go back into the past history in order to be sure we 20 made good history for the future. 21

Early during this deposition counsel for the Joint 0 22 Intervenor Defendants read to you a list of government 23 organizations and asked you whether the files of those 24 organizations or the materials generated by them were claimed 25 by you as presidential materials in connection with this 26 litigation. Do you know whether the organizations which were 27 recounted by the Joint Intervenor Defendants' counsel were 28

federal agencies or commissions or what status they were?

2 I regret to say I really don't know and I doubt if A President Ford knows or President Johnson knew, there are so 3 many. Most of them, incidentally, are useless. 4

> Q. That too.

1

5

1

23

26

27

23

I stand with that. Not that people are useless but 6 A the product. So I would be unable to say, Mr. Mortenson, in 7 answer to that question, be helpful in answering the question 8 by Mr. Dobrovir, that as far as these agencies are concerned, 9 whether they were set up by statute or whether they had been 10 set up as a result of an Executive Order or whether they were 11 agencies that might have even been set up on an ad hoc basis 12 without even an Executive Order, you just ask a group of people 13 to report, I would be unable to say. 14

When a staff member left his position in the Office Q. 15 of the President, are you aware of any instructions to them or 16 any policies which were adopted by your office which would 17 preclude them from taking from their files matters which they 18 deemed to be purely personal? 19

No, on the contrary. However, instructions were A 20 given to all staff members. Incidentally, this is another 21 recommendation that President Johnson made to me very strongly 22 during the period between the election and the inauguration.

The instructions were given to all staff members 24 as well as Cabinet members that any papers that had to do 25 with relationships with the President, conversations, for example with the Vice President or President or presidential business, should be left in the White House. And, as a matter of fact, President Johnson recommended that his practice after every Cabinet meeting was to have somebody go around the table and pick up every scrap of paper.

1

2

3

9

×.\_\_\_\_\_

......

÷. 

1.1.1

The best in the second second

4 Would you describe for us in a bit more detail how Q conversations with, for example, congressmen, the conversation 5 would relate not solely to matters which you describe as 6 relate to official actions, such as veto of legislation but 7 also to branch into conversation with politics and personal 8 matters.

10 To begin with, the fact that the conversations that A I had generally with men and some women who were in Congress and 11 the Senate, Margaret Chase Smith, that I had known them for 12 many, many years, so we met on a person-to-person basis. 13

Second, I found that in dealing not only with 14 members of Congress but also with members outside of government, 15 a business leader, labor leader, educator or religious leader, 16 and the rest, that in order to really plumb his thinking or 17 hers, that it was even more necessary than it is when you are 18 an ordinary citizen, to gain his or her confidence to make him 19 or her feel comfortable. And so it is what we call warming 20 up the individual so that eventually when he comes to talk about 21 the business that he is there to talk about, that he talks very 22 frankly with the feeling of confidence. That is why when a 23 congressman or senator or other individual came in or would come 24 in, the conversations were replete with references to family 25 matters or their relations with their colleagues or their own 26 health, their own problems and matters that are basically 27 private in the light of it. 28

ムノ下

There also, of course, would be innumerable times when political matters would be discussed with both Democrats and Republicans. They would talk about their opponents they might have in the primary or expect to have in the final campaigns and usually in not too complimentary terms.

Q Are you aware of any official government document, such as a vote or message to Congress or an enrolled bill which you signed being maintained among your presidential materials?

9 A Oh, absolutely not. That goes in the out box and 10 goes to wherever they keep such things.

11 MR. SPOONER: Mr. Mortenson, when you use the term "such 12 as," what are you including in this term?

MR. MORTENSON: I am including vote or message to Congress
including the appointment of officers of the Army and Navy and
Air Force.

16

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE WITNESS: The Judiciary.

MR. MORTENSON: I am including the signing of enrolled
 bills and issuance of presidential pardons and any other document
 reflecting the final action taken pursuant to a constitution
 obligation of the President or those required under statutes.

THE WITNESS: He is limiting it, in other words, to what is required by constitution or statute and distinguishing therefrom those matters that might be, say, a speech you are going to make to the American Legion or something of that sort.

BY MR. MORTENSON:

Q You have characterized a portion of the presidential materials, which I think at the time you were talking about

National Security related materials, as being imbued with the public trust, or at least that was your opinion. Does that opinion encompass other forms of presidential materials?

4 Well, when we say imbued with the public trust, that A is a phrase that I may have used too loosely or I should, on the 5 contrary, too precisely, because what I meant in the case of 6 National Security material, that I would consider that a former 7 President is inhibited from the disclosure thereof in making a 8 decision in regard to disclosure thereof before getting permission 9 or permission from whoever is the encumbent President which, of 10 course, was the practice President Johnson involved with me. 11

Now, with regard to materials that have to do with revenue sharing or the energy programs or matters of that sort in the domestic area, I would not consider that that was material that could not be disclosed without consultation.

Now, as a practical matter, it would be, however, 16 my practice if the issue involved was a hot one, for instance 17 a domestic issue, and was before a present administration and 18 if I had material that I thought might affect it one way or 19 another I would, of course, try to be responsible enough to use 20 that material or not to use it, depending upon what affect it might have on action under present consideration. But I can think of no examples there.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

12

13

14

15

MR. MORTENSON: I have no further questions.

FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Mr. Nixon, Mr. Mortenson asked you about, if I am Q not mistaken, whether there were ever any instructions to your

staff about how to handle their personal records. Am I 1 recollecting correctly? 2 3 A Yes. MR. MORTENSON: Material that they considered to be 4 5 personal. 6 BY MR. DOBROVIR: 7 All right. In that connection then I would like to 8 Q. ask you if you are familiar with a document that was introduced 9 in the other lawsuit in which you were plaintiff, Nixon v. 10 Sampson, as Nixon Exhibit 8. It is titled "Donation of Personal 11 Papers to the Richard Nixon Library," and at the bottom of it 12 it says "National Archives and Records Service, General 13 Services Administration, November 1972." 14 A Yes. 15 MR. DOBROVIR: Would you please mark this. 16 THE NOTARY: The three-page document handed to me by 17 counsel, titled "Donation of Personal Papers to the Richard 18 Nixon Library," dated November 1972, will be marked Intervenor 19 Defendants' Exhibit G, to the deposition, for identification. 20 21 BY MR. DOBROVIR: 22 My question is: Are you at all familiar with the 23 Q contents of that document? 24 I didn't know we were suing them. Go ahead. 25 A What is your specific question? 26 First of all, are you familiar with it? 27 ତ୍ 28 A Oh, yes. Yes.

	1	(At this time plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel confer
	2	out of the hearing of the reporter.)
	3	THE WITNESS: My counsel informs me that he has prepared
	4	it so I must be familiar.
	5	MR. MILLER: I have not informed you.
	6	THE WITNESS: I had thought. I am sorry. I just assumed
	7	my counsel tells me everything but apparently he doesn't.
	8 .	MR. MORTENSON: I think it is important for the record to
	9	reflect we may have to go back and pick up the question. I think
	10	my question was is he aware of any instructions to members of the
	11	office of the staff which preclude them from taking with them
	12	their personal materials.
	13	THE WITNESS: Personal materials.
	14	MR. DOBROVIR: Fine.
. 1	15	MR. MORTENSON: You are not aware of this?
1	16	THE WITNESS: I am not. This one I am afraid I am not
1	17	aware of.
1	8	
1	9	BY MR. DOBROVIR:
2	0	Q Well, could you examine it and tell me whether this
. 21	1	was the policy of your administration, with respect to dis-
22	2	position of files by members of your staff.
23	12	A Which paragraph?
24		Q The whole thing, please.
25		(At this time the plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel
26	0	confer out of the hearing of the reporter.)
27		THE WITNESS: This reflects my understanding. All right.
28	F	As a matter of fact, it is personal correspondence of an
	and a second sec	

official that does not directly concern the work of the office 1 and does not intend to be part of the official records. For 2 example, part of a personal file maintained for his own personal 3 use, they must be distinguished from official records. 4

MR. MORTENSON: I think the record should reflect, though, 5 that while the witness has indicated this is his understanding 6 of the position of his office, that we do not, for purposes of 7 this litigation, adopt in total the verbiage used in the 8 documents, such as some official records. 9

MR. DOBROVIR: Now, this is not a question but I want to 10 make a record of the following statements of Mr. Miller's letter 11 to me of July 22, 1975, in which he says: "Plaintiff's 12 Affidavit and your response to plaintiff's motion for protective 13 order, which in light of the Court's Order of July 16, 1975, 14 should accept the parameters for the deposition." 15

Reflecting the understanding that Mr. Mortenson and 16 I had reached on the telephone the Friday before, I would like 17 to in that connection incorporate Paragraph 5 of the document 18 referred to in that letter, Defendants' opposition to motion 19 for protective order, which states "Finally, plaintiff asserts 20 that he alone, assisted by others of his selection, has the 21 right and thus should have the exclusive opportunity to cull 22 through the materials, to select those that will be made public 23 and those which will never see the light of day (9 21, "Certainly 24 not the tape recordings;" ¶ 22, 23). He asserts the exclusive right to determine what should be deleted from the tape recordings (923 at p. 17; see 924) and "To reserve for my own review" materials which "I consider" to be private ( 9 26;

25

26

27

28

- 11

emphasis added). Flaintiff's assertion of this right of exclusive control raises the issue whether he, as distinguished from other Presidents, should be granted this privilege by a Court of equity; whether on the record he has made he may be entrusted with the power to conceal evidence of his own activities that might reflect most adversely upon him. Only oral examination carries the possibility of eliciting testimony that would inform the trier of fact on this score." And that ends my quotation from that document.

This is in further response, Mr. Mortenson, to your question to me wherein the pleadings in the case is stated the defense which I asserted to you as to the grounds on the c relevancy as to questions which I posed to the witness with respect to the discrepancies between his public statements and the transcribed tests of certain tapes and with respect to material deleted from the transcripts of tapes which were made public. In the light of that, I renew my request that the witness be permitted by you to answer those questions.

MR. MORTENSON: Well, my response, Counsel, is that Paragraph 5 of your motion for your opposition and motion for protective order miscarries grossly in several respects the allegations for or contentions made by the plaintiff in the suit and they speak for themselves and to the extent that you rely upon this to naming the issues of this case you are obviously free to do so.

MR. DOBROVIR: I merely wish to point out, Mr. Miller in his letter to me reflected our conversation the Friday before and indicated what was stated in that pleading as well

as in the Affidavit sets the parameters for the deposition and 1 you now disagree. 2

MR. MORTENSON: It clearly reflected what we considered 3 to be the parameters of the deposition. It in no way implied 4 explicit or implicitly that any question that counsel put in 5 which he deemed to fall within the parameters of those which are 6 therefore proper and upon that basis do we object as well as 7 others. 8

MR. DOBROVIR: I have nothing further.

11 FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR. KRULWICH:

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

12 Mr. Nixon, you testified, in answer to a question Q from Mr. Mortenson, that all documents reflecting your actions, 13 reflecting your constitutional duties as President, were matters of public record. One of your duties under Article 2, Section 3, of the Constitution is to "Take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

Another duty under Article 2, Section 2, is that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

Will you then agree that all documents or materials reflecting your performance as President, of your duties to take care that the laws be faithfully executed are to be a matter of public record?

Well, that is a matter that has to be determined 25 A as has been the case with all previous presidents. It has to 26 be determined when I examine the materials and the documents. 27 As I said, I intend to be as forthcoming as I feel is proper and 28

I think that is repetition of a statement I have previously made
 on that score.

----

Q Just to clarify then. There are in a sense two types of presidential types of constitutional duties. There are those normally represented by official action, such as veto messages, appointments, pardons, material that Mr. Mortenson talked about and others that are under the more general categories of your constitutional duties. The other is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Do you agree?

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, I think it is a legal conclusion. You are asking the witness as to whether materials that are related to the faithful execution of the laws of the United States represent official documents. We have contended in this suit that those which are official are lodged in other branches of the government.

MR. KRULWICH: I am only asking a question directed to the questions you asked Mr. Nixon on constitutional duties and I am seeking an answer to the question you asked. He can answer the question I asked.

MR. MORTENSON: My question was to his knowledge --

MR. KRULWICH: I believe you asked him where the official records were and how they were kept of the official records and documents reflecting certain of his constitutional duties. My point, what I was trying to ask the witness, was whether there are other types of constitutional duties that are of a sort different from those that you asked him about.

MR. MORTENSON: I am sorry, Counsel, I don't understand the question. If the witness does, --

26 27

28

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. KRULWICH: If the witness understands he can answer; 1 2 if not, so be it. 3 THE WITNESS: What are you trying to drive at? Let me get at it that way. 4 5 MR. KRULWICH: Let me see if I can rephrase it. 6 7 BY MR. KRULWICH: 8 Would you agree that in addition to constitutional Q. duties under Article 2, such as veto messages, State of the 9 Union addresses, pardons, reprieves, which are expressed as a 10 final public document, there are also constitutional duties 11 under Article 2 that are not expressed in the form of a final 12 public document and in that sense are of a more general nature, 13 such as the duty to take care that the laws be faithfully 14 executed, which would be expressed only in terms of papers, 15 memoranda, letters, that are not part of the public official 16 record, in the same sense that a pardon or a reprieve or an 17 act of Congress that you have seen is. 18 augels You know, that sounds like how many angles on the 19 A head of a needle. I still don't get the drift of what you are 20 driving at. 21 I will agree there are many presidential duties --22 Well, -- I am sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. 23 Q. MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, I think if the question is are 24 there other duties, if the President has a duty to take care 25 that the laws be faithfully executed, I think that is clear --26 27 THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. MORTENSON: -- clear in the Constitution. 28 The

		question is: Are those reflected in documents? If you have a	
	4	document I mean, I don't know what you mean by that.	
		THE WITNESS: As Commander in Chief, do you mean are the	
	4	reflected? They will be defined. You probably will find those	
	5		ł
	6		
	7	BY MR. KRULWICH:	
	8		
	9		
	10		
	11	are presently public?	
	12	A I don't know. I don't I haven't had access to	
	13	those documents.	
	14	MR. KRULWICH: Fine. I have no further questions.	
	15		
	16	EXAMINATION BY MR. ANDERSON:	
а с на	17	Q Along the same lines, isn't it a fact that your -	
	18	official duties as President went beyond those specific duties	Contraction of the local division of the loc
	19	with which you were charged under the Constitution and statutes?	?
	20	A My official duties?	
	21	Q You mentioned several duties which you were charged	
	22	under the Constitution, such as vetos and State of the Union	
	23	messages. Don't the President's official duties go beyond those	
	24	specific responsibilities mentioned in the Constitution and	
	25	statutes?	
	26	MR. MORTENSON: I think that is a legal conclusion,	
	27	Counsel. I don't know we have established the basis for his	
	28	legal opinion on it.	
	12		1

Salaran ar

エレイ

BY MR. ANDERSON:

1

Q Let me put it this way. Would not gathering public support for a program such as conservation or Welfare reform be related to presidential action?

MR. MORTENSON: I have got to interrupt. I don't mean to be argumentative in your attempt to put the question, but the question is a legal conclusion as to whether or not a President has to engage in gathering support for a program.

MR. ANDERSON: I am trying to ascertain Mr. Nixon's review of his responsibilities as President so we can explore as to the relation of the presidential duties

MR. MORTENSON: He has used the basis of official action as those duties imposed by the Constitution and by the statutes.

MR. ANDERSON: All I am asking is, is that the only term that you consider related to your official duties as President. Are the rest all private, personal or political?

MR. MORTENSON: And he has testified that he has documents relating to the official actions.

MR. ANDERSON: I am not asking about documents right now, I am asking about Mr. Nixon's conception of his role as President and whether it goes beyond the specific duties of which he is charged under the Constitution and statutes.

MR. SPOONER: Mr. Mortenson, I don't understand what your objection is. Are you saying Mr. Nixon cannot state what the duties of the President of the United States are?

MR. MORTENSON: What I am saying is I believe that it is a matter of law what a President can be charged with under the Constitution and by statute and that if a President deems his

role as gathering public support for a program of inflation 1 control as something which he views presidential responsibility, 2 that is not necessarily an official obligation of the President 3 even though he may view it as an obligation that he has. But 4 his responsibilities or duties that are imposed on him as the 5 holder of that office derive from the Constitution and statutes. 6

BY MR. ANDERSON: 8

7

Do you believe that gathering support for a program Q. 9 of Welfare reform was related to your official duties as 10 President or would you put that in the category of political 11 and personal activities? 12

Well, is your purpose to determine whether or not A 13 I would consider that such materials, as such, be held in 14 private and not be made public? What are we talking about? 15

Is the paper work that would be generated on such Q 16 subjects related to official presidential actions? 17

(At this time the plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel 18 confer out of the hearing of the reporter.) 19

20

21

22

26

THE WITNESS: Of course.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Is this often intermingled with political consider-Q 23 ations? 24

Always. Virtually always, if you want to get A 25 success.

And this is related to official presidential action, Q. 27 whether there is a statute or not on the subject; is that 28

correct?

A

Q.

2

1

It can be; yes.

Q. When your staff works on these subjects which are 3 both political and official, they are acting within the 4 appropriate scope of their White House duties? 5

Yes, they are acting for the purpose of carrying out A the presidential programs, eliciting support therefore.

6

7

8

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

So these are not totally political in any sense?

The line between what is political and official, if A 9 that is what your question is, is a blurred line. I would agree 10 to that. But let us come right down to the nut cutting on the subject of what you want to know is what I believe a President. 12 any President, I mean after he leaves office or his family after he is deceased, what his policy should be with regard to making public his papers and other materials, what we call I have already indicated that I believe presidential materials. that the policy should be as forthcoming as possible. I have already indicated that I would take a very hard line in terms of national security and under no circumstances would I move from that area without giving the gravest consideration what might be a current national security problem. And that means, of course, getting the national security clearance.

I also indicated that I would take a very hard line, firm line with regard to any conversations that I considered to be private and personal, ones that might be, apart from embarrassment in the Webster sense, but one that might inhibit another person's right to speak freely, to associate his political area or what have you, because he had relied upon --

	. 168					
1	when he talked to the President had relied on the fact that he					
2	thought it was going to be confidential. And as far as private					
3	matters are concerned, for example, I made a number of telephone					
4	calls and had a number of conversations with my daughter prior					
5	to her wedding. Incidentally, if I kept that all segregated,					
6	anyone working with reels of tape you know it is just (the					
7	witness snaps his fingers three times) and I wouldn't have					
8	anybody believe me, no government associate, not my lawyers,					
9	not because there is anything to me that would be embarrassing,					
10	but because it is private to listen to the conversation other					
11	than myself or her.					
12	MR. ANDERSON: I have nothing further.					
13	(The time is 4:25 p.m.)					
14						
15						
16						
17	RICHARD M. NIXON					
18						
19						
20	Ĩ					
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

168

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.

1

2

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SS.

- レフ

A BAR AND A MANAGE AND A MANAGEMENT

I, Joseph F. Weitzen, a notary public in and for the 3 County of San Diego, State of California, duly commissioned, 4 qualified and acting, hereby certify that the deposition of 5 Richard M. Nixon, plaintiff herein, was taken by Defendants 6 in Intervention pursuant to the applicable sections of the 7 Code of Civil Procedure, before me, beginning at the hour of 8 9:00 a.m. on Friday, July 25, 1975, at the Coast Guard Station, 9 in the City of San Clemente, County of Orange, State of 10 California; that before the taking of said deposition the 11 said witness was by me first duly sworn to testify to the 12 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the 13 testimony he was about to give in said action; that said 14 witness was thereupon examined upon oral interrogatories 15 propounded by counsel as aforesaid, and said witness made answer thereto, under oath, as hereinabove contained; that all of said questions and all of said answers thereto, as well as the proceedings had at the taking of said deposition were by me duly taken down in shorthand and later transcribed into typewriting, as hereinabove contained; that I do further certify that the above and foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to 168, inclusive, contain a full, true and correct statement of all of said interrogatories so propounded by counsel as aforesaid, and of all of the said answers made by said witness thereto, in the order in which said questions and answers were asked and answered, and of all of the proceedings had in said matter; that, pursuant to stipulation of counsel, as the same

appears herein, I delivered the original of this deposition to Richard M. Nixon, for the purpose of having the said witness read and sign his deposition, with the request that the said deposition then be returned to me for filing. 

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the documents attached hereto and marked as Defendants' in Intervention Exhibits A through G, both inclusive, are the same documents referred to by both counsel and the witness, and as identified during the taking of said deposition. 

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am a disinterested person and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of said action. 

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal at the City of San Diego, in the County of San Diego, State of California, this the 30<sup>Th</sup> day , 1975.

والمراجع والمحاج والمراجع والمحاجة

	171				
	1 STATE OF, )				
	2 COUNTY OF SS.				
	I,, a notary public in and				
2	for the County of, State of				
ļ	duly commissioned, qualified and acting, in accordance with the				
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11	initialed by me; that thereupon said witness in my presence				
12	subscribed his name to his said deposition at the end thereof,				
13	and before me took oath that his testimony, as contained in				
14	his deposition, as corrected, was the truth, the whole truth,				
15	and nothing but the truth.				
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and				
17	affixed my notarial seal at the City of, in				
18	the County of, State of,				
19	this the day of, 1975.				
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

## DEPOSITION OF RICHARD M. NIXON

## VOLUME I

-		;
3	20	175
		[

## ERRATA SHEET

Page	Line	*
		Correction
4	24	Change "Bureau of Management" to "Office of Management"
8	26	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
9	9	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
9	10	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
9	13	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
9	16	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
17	9	Change "others in the" to "others than the"
17	13	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
17	24	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
18	19	Delete "the" before "State"
20	9	Change "since" to "in"
22	24	Change "within individuals, an attorney" to "individuals or an attorney" deleting the word "within"
23	1.	Delete "a" after "somewhat"
25	9	Change "terms" to "items"
27	18	Change "not" to "just"
29	3	Change "Presidents" to "precedents"
29	4	Delete comma after Madison and add
29	24	Change "has" to "says"
34	5	Change "pleadings are set forth on other" to "pleadings set forth other" deleting the words "are" and "on"

	۲.	∠∪.	а. Т	Change "Complaint" to "Act" add "are" before "broader"
	35	17		Insert "by" after "not only"
	35	22		Delete "very"
	37	l		Delete "of"
	37	19		Change "Senator" to "Secretary"
	38	12		Delete "not"
	38	15		Change "made public, but I am suggesting that, and I" to "made public. But I am also suggesting that, I" adding "also" after "am" deleting "and" before "I"
	38	18		Change "unique" to "eunuch"
	40	4		Delete "or down"
	40	5		Delete "in the public's"
	40.	7	4 <b>_</b>	Insert "which" after "but"
	40	23		Change "before" to "Before"
	40	24		Change "fall" to "Fall"
	41	15		Delete "they know"
8	42	10	* *	Change "possession" to "a position"
	42	12		Insert "with" before "whom"
	43	. 4		Insert "when" before "what"
	43	7		Change "that" to "they"
	43	10	ġ	Insert "became known" after "system"
	43	15		Delete "and" before "in future" add comma before "and probably" add comma after "presidencies"
	<u>4</u> 4	16	-	Change "with Pierre Renfret." to "with the liberal economists, Pierre Rinfret."
	46	ŀ		Delete "is" before "later"

47	3	Delete "the", change "cause" to "course", change "would" to "I should"
47	4	Change "in a" to "as to"
48	25	Insert "me" after "want"
49	l	Insert "the" before "position"
49	4	Insert "If" before "it is", add comma after "definable" change "and" to "that"
51	12	Insert "secrecy of" after "provide for"
54	8	Change "considerations" to "conversations"
56	12	Add "against" after "were"
61	9	Add "your definition." after "don't know"
61	27	Change "the definition" to "your definition"
62	10	Change "DeGaspary" to "de Gasperi"
63	24	Add "Presidential" after "since the"
63	25	Change "Library's" to "Libraries"
65	13	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
65	23	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
66	4	Change "Erlichman" to "Ebrlichman"
67	6	Change "through" to "to"
67	7	Insert comma after "Judiciary"
68	6	Change "Runsfield" to "Rumsfeld" and "Asia" to "Europe"
68	8	Insert "unofficial" before "correspondence"
69	15	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman" twice

72	11	Change "he" to "I"
74	14	Change "Erlichman" to "Ehrlichman"
76	16	Change "Federal" to "Presidential"
76	18	Change "considering" to "considered"
. 76	20	Change "Federal" to "Presidential"

.

.

-----

VOLUME II

ERRATA SHEET

		anna air an ann an ann an ann an an ann an ann an a	-
Page	Line	Correction	<u>1</u>
80	16	Change "Strong" to "Sti	achan"
81	20	Delete "and"	
81	27	Change "challenge" to '	'challenged"
83	28	Change "project" to "ir	iterject"
85	4	I pert "it" after "avoi	.d "
85	5	Delete "to" after "ever	its"
85	7	Change "was" to "is"	
85	8	Insert "for" before "di	nners,"
85	14	Insert "as" after "clai	m "
85	19	Insert "the" before "su	bstance"
85	26	Insert "did" after "sta	
86	7	Change "Erlichman" to "	Ehrlichman"
88	4	Insert "to" before "whi	
88	9	Change "Erlichman" to " Insert "and" after "doc	
88	10	Insert "it" after "plac Insert comma after "fil	
88	14	Change "the" to "a"	
88	26	Insert comma after "doc Change "where" to "whet	
89	5	Insert "a" before "posi	tion"
91	11	Delete "and" after "sup	porters"
91	16	Insert "not" before "su	pporters"
91	24	Change "he" to "it"	

		<u>د ت</u>	unange "whoever" to "whomever"
	94	7	Insert "that" after "stipulated"
	95	18	Change "whoever" to "whomever"
	96	14	Change period after "Committee" to, comma, insert "but"
	96	15	Delete paragraph, change "If" to "if"
	96	21	Insert "to know" before "whether"
	96	25	Delete "as to"
	97	11	Change "he" to "Dean"
	97	15	Change "to" to "or"
	97	19	Change "read and" to "heard"
	99	1	Delete "which"
	99	23	Change "consented" to "contended" Change "the" to "a"
	100	1	Delete "for" after "requires"
	100	4	Change "statement" to "statute"
	101	9	Insert "to material" after "itself"
	104	3	Change "that" to "had"
	105	8	Change "the" to "for" and "of" to "the"
	105	10	Change "the case" to "this case"
	107	4	Insert "also" after "That has" Delete "also" before "the practice"
	107	8	Change "tapes" to "types"
	107	25	Change "can" to "cannot"
	108	10	Insert "if" after "And"
	108	11	Delete "and"
	108	13	Insert period after "responsibility" Change "and" to "And"
и		· · ·	
8 		•	2
		×	

108	22		Change "here" to "there" and "the" to "for"
108	24		Change "that" to "the" before "safeguard"
111	10		Delete "it" after "read"
111	14		Change "facts" to "fact"
111	22		Delete period after "was" Insert period after "I think" Change "it" to "It"
112	9		Change "as" to "is"
 113.	6		Change "counsellor and" to "counsel for"
113	7		Delete "to", change "split" to "splitting"
 113	9		Insert period after "parties" Change "in a normal proceeding" to "The normal procedure"
113	10		Change "as" to "is" and "party" to . "witness"
115	7		Change "probably an irrelevant" to "in particular the", insert "that" before "was"
115	15		Insert "are you" before "referring"
117	2		Insert "presidential" before "papers"
117	23		Insert "some of" before "these letters'
117	25		Delete "even" after "while"
118	· 2 · · ·		Change "letters" to "library to be set up"
118	9		Insert "say" after "would"
118	10		Change "President," to President's"
. 118	11	-	Change "is presidential" to "are presidential"
118	26		Insert comma after "conclusion" Change "or" to "so"

	118	27	Change "fairly proper" to "fair and proper"
	119	8	
	120	3	Insert "yet" after "had not"
	120	17	Change "whether" to "which of"
			Change "confidentially" to "confidently"
	121	19	Change "understood" to "understand"
	123	7	Insert "in" before "which"
	123	21	Insert "just" after "speak not"
	124-	6	Change "He" to "She"
	124	18	Change "discribed as" to "described in"
	124	19	Insert comma after "record" Change "The" to "the" Insert comma after "gifts"
	124	21	Delete "to be" after "which is"
•	125	3	Insert "State" before "gift"
	125	6	Delete "and" after "donated"
	129	10	Insert "was" after "recorded"
	131	22	Change "the" to "a"
	132	20	
	132 .	24	Insert "the" before "Press Secretary"
	132	25	Insert "no" before "authority"
		1	Insert period after "files" Change "and" to "And"
	133	5	Change "members for" to "members to"
	133	6	Insert "had" before "access"
	133	21	Delete "if" before "the review"
	133	28	Insert period after "access" Delete "then" before "I assume"
	134	2	Insert "the" before "NSC"

.

. <u>4</u>

	134	5	Delete "and" before "I can't"
	134	20	Insert "for" after "levels"
	134	26	Insert "met" before "Mr. Helms"
	135	4	Change "the same" to "no" .
	135	9	Insert "is" after "there"
	136	10	Insert "the" after "regards to"
	136	14	Change "retain" to "maintain"
	137	4	Insert "now" before "running"
	138-	2	Change "there" to "they are" Change "the" to "a" after "with"
	138	3	Change "that" to "what"
	138	5	Change "the public" to "a public"
	138	8	Change "retain" to "maintain"
	139	4	Insert "that" after "learned"
	140	4	Insert "the" before "rather"
	140	6	Change "a" to "the" before "tragic"
	140	13	Delete "from" before "reports" Delete comma after "reports"
	140	16	Change "want" to "how"
-	140	- 26	Change "knew" to "know"
	143	7	Change "any" to "anything"
	144	11	Change "have" to "had", insert "would" before "then"
	144	13	Change "McKinnon" to "Buchanan"
	145	l	Change "perhaps" to "at least"
	145	19	Change "expensive" to "extensive"
	146	8	Change "form" to "forum"
	148	8	Change "for" to "to"
·			5

/

	148	14	Insert "that" before "rage"
	148	16	
			Delete "was" before "removed" Delete comma after "revoked"
	149	1	Insert "not" after "I" Change "and" to "but"
	149	21	Change "who" to "whom"
	149	28	Insert "were" after "indicates"
	150	16	Change "Presidency" to "President"
	151	13	Change "was" to "were"
	153-	21	Change "this" to "that"
	154	7	
	155	7	Change "relate" to "relating"
	155	13	Change "vote or" to "veto"
			Change "vote or" to "veto" Change "message" to "messages"
	155	19	Change "constitution" to "con- stitutional"
	156	5	Insert "say" after "I should"
	156	11	Change "involved" to "followed"
•	157	25	Change "them" to "him"
	159	9	Change "documents" to "document" Delete "same", Insert duotes before "official" and after "records"
r	160	20	Delete "for your opposition and motion for" Insert "on your o
	160	21	Delete "protective and
	160	23	Insert "Protective Order miscarries" Insert period after "suit" Delete "and", Change "they" to "They"
	160	24	Change "naming" to "name"
	161	5	Change "explicit" to "explicitly" Delete "in" after "put"

P -----

161	6	Delete "which" after "those"
161	7	Insert period after "proper" Change "and" to "And"
163	19	Change "angles" to "angels"
165	12	Change "basis" to "phrase"
165	27	Insert "doing" before "under"
167	20	Insert "as to" before "what"
167	27	Insert "in" before "his"