

Nixon Allows Haig to Testify

By Lawrence Meyer
Washington Post Staff Writer

White House chief of staff Alexander M. Haig Jr. answered questions for about three hours before the Senate select Watergate committee yesterday only 13 days after President Nixon ordered Haig to remain silent when interrogated by the committee.

In a reversal of the hard-line position taken by Haig on May 2 under orders from Mr. Nixon, Haig answered every question put to him except two yesterday. Sen. Lowell P. Weicker Jr. (R-Conn.) who was presiding over the closed session, ruled that

Haig did not have to respond to the questions, which related to a Secret Service wiretap President Nixon ordered on his brother, F. Donald Nixon.

According to two sources, Haig was permitted to answer questions after the White House realized that his continued silence would result in his being cited for contempt of Congress by the committee.

The committee voted 7 to 0 last week to resubpoena Haig after supporting the ruling of its chairman, Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.), that executive privilege did not apply to the line of in-

quiry that the committee staff was pursuing.

The committee staff has been investigating a \$100,000 payment made by billionaire Howard Hughes to President Nixon's friend, Charles G. (Bebe) Rebozo.

Earlier, the committee voted to ask the Senate to extend the committee's life for one month with full subpoena power until June 30, to give the committee additional time to write its report and to complete its investigations.

While Haig avoided a contempt citation by his testimony that the committee staff was pursuing.



ALEXANDER M. HAIG JR.
... avoids citation

WATERGATE, From A1

mony yesterday, the committee took steps during a morning session to cite Rebozo for contempt. Rebozo, who appeared before the committee for a day-long session last Thursday, was to have produced numerous documents and records subpoenaed by the committee by last Monday under an agreement negotiated by Rebozo's lawyer and the committee staff.

Rebozo, however, failed to produce the records on Monday. Chief committee counsel Samuel Dash reportedly directed assistant chief counsel Terry F. Lenzner to draft a legal statement detailing the reasons why Rebozo should be cited for contempt.

The subpoena served on Rebozo are part of a broad investigation into Rebozo's personal finances. Among other things, the committee is investigating a report that Rebozo received a \$50,000 secret contribution to President Nixon's re-election campaign but that the money never reached the campaign committee.

The committee also is trying to determine whether the \$100,000 from Hughes, purportedly given in 1969 or 1970 as a contribution to the 1972 Nixon campaign, remained in a safe deposit for three years before being returned to Hughes last June

as Rebozo has testified, or whether Rebozo gave or lent a portion of the money to President Nixon's secretary, Rose Mary Woods, and to F. Donald Nixon.

Mr. Nixon's former law-

yer, Herbert Kalmbach, has reportedly told the committee that Rebozo told him that he had given or lent portions of the money to Donald Nixon and Miss Woods.

Haig was called before the committee on May 2 to answer questions concerning Rebozo and the Hughes payment. At that time, he produced a letter from President Nixon stating that "it would be wholly inappropriate for the committee to question Haig about his activities as White House chief of staff or his earlier activities as a member of the National Security Council. Despite a ruling to testify by Weicker, who was presiding over the May 2 closed session, Haig declined to answer any questions.

Last week, however, White House counsel J. Fred Buzhardt appeared before the committee in executive session and answered questions on the Hughes-Rebozo matter.

Speaking to reporters during a break, Ervin said that the committee's final report would make "recommendations for legislation and stop at that." He said the report would not draw conclusions concerning the involvement of persons in the Watergate affair in order to avoid interfering with the House impeachment proceedings or pending criminal prosecutions. A draft of the report prepared by the committee staff attempts to evaluate the testimony of key witnesses, questioning the credibility of their testimony in several instances.

See WATERGATE, A10, Col. 1