

Excerpts From St. Clair News Parley

NYTimes — MAY 8 1974

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 7 — Following are excerpts from a transcript of a news conference today by James D. St. Clair, White House special counsel, disclosing a hardened stand against turning over more Watergate tapes:

Mr. St. Clair: I think in fairness I should make an announcement to you. I just returned from Mr. Doar's office, and I advised him that the President has directed me to inform the committee through him that the President respectfully declines to produce any more Watergate tapes for the committee's use.

And, at the direction of the President, I have also advised Mr. Jaworski that the President has instructed me to press forward on our motion to quash Mr. Jaworski's subpoena.

That is the new for the day.

Q. Have you advised the court, that is to say, Judge Sirica, that you are going to have no further negotiations with Mr. Jaworski on this subject matter? A. No, but I will do so first thing in the morning.

Q. That is the import, is it not, that you will have no negotiations with Mr. Jaworski on the matter? A. No further negotiations.

Q. Does further mean you have had a session with him?

Met on Sunday

A. We met on Sunday afternoon at his request. He suggested that perhaps the matter could be adjusted. We said we would be glad to review it with the President. We have reviewed it with the President and the President is unwilling to make any further adjustments.

Q. Is this the course of action you, sir, as the President's lawyer would recommend? A. Yes.

Q. Do I understand then that the first time the President's judgment was sought on the question as to whether you should negotiate with Mr. Jaworski was then today? A. No. The matter has been under review by the President. I think ystrday was what, Monday?

Q. Yes, sir. I want to get the scenario down. Jaworski came over on Sunday afternoon to see whether it might be possible to negotiate? A. We said we would be glad to consider it and we would discuss it with the President. The matter was discussed with the President.

Q. When? A. Yesterday.

Throughout This Day

Q. Before or after your court appearance in the afternoon?

A. It was considered by him throughout the day at various times. I don't know. But the matter was considered by him without decision before I went to court. The matter was decided this morning, and we promptly advised the interested parties.

Q. And you approve of this? A. I recommend it, yes.

Q. Aren't you concerned that the House is going to consider this an impeachable offense if he continues to ignore subpoenas? A. I don't believe it will be an impeachable offense.

Q. You don't think the committee could find it an



United Press International

James D. St. Clair, President Nixon's lawyer, talking to reporters in the office of Kenneth W. Clawson, White House communications director, yesterday in the Executive Office Building in Washington.

impeachable offense? A. I don't direct what the committee will or won't do.

Q. You said you have been instructed to tell the committee they won't get the Watergate tapes. There are outstanding requests for milk and I.T.T. Did your instructions cover that as well?

A. We have said to them that we think we have provided them everything that is pertinent and that we will continue to examine the matters that they have requested that we examine and we will consider producing those from time to time. But as far as Watergate is concerned, the President has concluded, I think rightly so, that that full story is now out and it is time for the committee to start its deliberations.

Two Matters

Q. Mr. St. Clair, you are saying today with respect to the milk issue and the I.T.T. issue that you are still willing to consider that, but at a previous session you had said something to the effect that the name of the game here is Watergate, and the committee might as well just forget about the milk case and the I.T.T. case.

A. I don't think those are equivalent statements, but I don't think anyone would seriously contest, that the name of the game was not Watergate.

Q. I am asking, Mr. Wiggins of California, among others, has pointed out that the milk case and to some extent the I.T.T. case involved charges of bribery or allegations of bribery. The Constitution is very clear on bribery as an impeachable offense. How do you justify, in view of the Constitution, any opposition at all or any reluctance at all to furnish the requested material on the I.T.T. and milk?

A. I haven't indicated any reluctance at all. We think

we have given them everything. We have given them thousands of documents.

Q. You have a request now from the committee for conversations that include tapes that include milk and I.T.T. You said the committee might as well forget about them in a previous session.

A. I said in the previous session the principal concern of the American people is Watergate. I don't know that that necessarily means that the committee ought to forget about milk and I.T.T., and I have indicated here today that we are not in any way indicating an unwillingness to produce more information.

We have produced a great deal of information on both of these subjects. But if there is more that has not been produced that relates to the subject matters they have suggested—and they have been quite specific this time in their request—we are going to get it prepared, present it to the President for his release, and I have every confidence he will release it.

Q. He is going to comply with a request for the 141 as it applies to milk and I.T.T.?

Major Part Watergate

A. Yes, but believe me, the minor part of the 141 relates to non-Watergate matters. The major part is Watergate.

Q. You seem to indicate the President wants a Supreme Court confrontation. A. I have not so indicated.

Q. It is leading to that, is it not? A. I don't think so.

Q. Where do you think it will stop. A. I think it will stop on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Q. You mean the committee will vote out impeachment? A. I don't know what they will do, but I think it will stop on the floor of the House.

Q. Would you be more specific about what you mean on pressing forward on the Jaworski matter?

A. We have moved to quash their subpoena. We are going to press that motion. Sunday afternoon it was suggested if we didn't press that motion maybe we could come to some agreement. We were happy to consider that prospect. We reviewed it. The President decided that he would not be willing to come to an accommodation on that matter, and it will be pressed.