

WASHINGTON, Oct. 31— Following is the text of a statement issued by former Attorney General Richard D. Kleindienst in defense of his role in an antitrust case against the International International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation:

Three weeks ago I had a conversation at the Special Prosecutor's office with Mr. Cox and two of his assistants concerning the handling of the I.T.T. antitrust case dur-ing my tenure as Deputy At-torney General. A story in The New York Times yesterthe networks and in news-papers around the country, contained a very specific re-port of one part of that con-versation versation.

As a result of the leak to The Times, I have been ac-cused on national television of having given false infor-mation to the Senate Judi-ciary Committee at the time of my nomination as Attor-ney General. That accusation is false.

My conversation with Pro-fessor Cox was held under strict assurances of confiden-tiality, and as Professor Cox has stated, was a serious breach of faith on the part of the Special Prosecutor. I continue to regard my con-versation with Professor continue to regard my con-versation with Professor Cox as confidential, but be-cause of the distorted and misleading accounts of my conduct that have appeared in the press, I feel com-pelled at this time to relate an important aspect of the event which was not leaked. On Monday afternoon

On Monday afternoon, April 19th, 1971, Mr. Ehrlich-man abruptly called and stated that the President distated that the President di-rected me not to file the ap-peal in the Grinnel case. That was the last day in which that appeal could be taken. I informed him that we had determined to take that ap-peal, and that he should so inform the President. Min-

utes later the President called me and, without any discussion ordered me to to drop the appeal Immediately thereafter, I sent word to the thereafter, I sent word to the President that if he persisted in this direction I would be compelled to submit my res-ignation. Because that was the last day in which the ap-peal could be perfected. I ob-tained an extension of time from the Supreme Court to enable the President to con-sider my position. The President changed his mind and the appeal was filed 30 days later in the exact form it would have been filed one month earlier. Thus, but,

form it would have been filed one month earlier. Thus, but, but for my threat to resign, the Grinnell case would nev-er have been appealed and we would never have been able to obtain what even Pro-fessor Cox has characterized as a settlement bighty advan as a settlement highly advantageious to the United States.

tageious to the United States. At the time of my testi-mony before the Senate Ju-diciary Committee, I was not asked whether I had had any contacts with the White House at the time of this decision, and I did not deny any such contacts.

## Focus of the Hearings

The focus of the hearings dealing with the I.T.T. affair was the negotiations in May, June and July of 1971 leading Was the negotiations in May, June and July of 1971 leading to settlement of the pending cases on July 31. I was ques-tioned at length concerning these negotiations and par-ticularly with reference to any conversations or meet-ings I might have had with Mr. Peter Flanigan of the White House staff. It was in the context of those ques-tions that I made the state-ment quoted on C.B.S. news last evening; as follows: "In the discharge of my responsibilities as the Acting Attorney General in these cases, I was not interferred with by anybody at the White House. I was not im-portuned: Iwas not pressured I was not diracted."

portuned: Iwas not pressured I was not directed."

It was also in response to

a question by Senator Fong concerning Mr. Flanigan that I made the other statement quoted by C.B.S., as follows: ". I would have had a vivid recollection if someone at theWhite House had called me up and said, 'Look, Klein-dienst, this is the way we are going to handlethat case.' People who know me, I don't think would talk to me that People who know me, I don't think would talk to me that way, but if anybody did it would be a very sharp im-pact on my mind because I believe I know how I would have responded.No such con-versation occurred." Both of these statements, taken in the context in which they were made, were com-pletely accurate. In short, I did not perjure myself or give false informa-

myself or give false informa-tion to the Senate Judiciary Committee. A fair and objec-tive reading of the transcript of my testimony will so indicate.

I deeply regret the cir-cumstances which have comcumstances which have com-pelled me to make this state-ment. However, in view of the serious breach of faith by the Special prosecutor and the distorted treatment of my testimony in the press, I have no other choice. I have done no wrong have done no wrong.