

JWS PH Finley, Chi. Daily News

Dear Larry, Watergate Update 3/22/72

This is an I-Told-You-So letter, but an I told Larry so nor even, if one were to be fair, an I told Bob, although I did. I could even give you the date because I met him when Lil and I had medical appointments, and where we did. The Post's story this a.m. on discrepancies of \$500,000 in the first Republican accounting may have come from a tip and suggestion I gave Woodward months ago or not, may have been fed recently by someone with inside or not. May have come from my conversation with Carl Bernstein last week of not. I don't know and don't expect they'll say. But I suggested this check to them all and one not yet made, for the 1968 returns of certain Repub. committees.

I used those files so extensively when I was a kid and the Clerk of the House of Representatives kept them that they changed the rule to frustrate me! Once I moved in three typists at one, unannounced time, having decided in advance and very quietly what I wanted and needed.

So, I feel badly that this important part of the story broke so late, when I believe indictments may be but minutes away. I read the official statements as keyed to the backgrounding on them already given by Justice which is, after all, part of the administration and the party in power. Had this kind of thing broken earlier, it would have been less easy for the prosecutor to follow his traditional role and dominate the grand jury. It is, I would now presume, fairly certain that the grand jury did not consider the party involvement, was limited to the crime of breaking and entering or something like it, with possibly but not certainly a bugging charge.

Well, after reading this a.m.'s story, which was rather late in the day when I was taking a break, I phoned Bernstein. He was busy so we may talk tomorrow. I asked him if he had made a personal check (as I'd suggested recently) and he said he had. I asked how come he didn't use the tally that summarizes at the beginning. He said you'd never believe it, but their ain't none. Almost direct quote! Ever heard of anything that bald and bold? There is supposed to be the not unusual recap to summarize, then breakdowns, then breakdowns of breakdowns, unless the law had been changed radically. They didn't even do this. And that, to me, says but one thing: desperation.

There are six-figure omissions in income and expenditures. Now, this suggestion, if you are still publishing and interested. One of the heavier sugar suppliers is your insurance magnate Stone. He seems not unwilling to talk about his contributions. I think it is a legitimate question to ask him if he has made any contributions since the new law went in. Inference: you BUM, did you give everything on the assumption that it could not be made public? He might get defensive and deny it and tell you, voluntarily or in answer to questions, when he also gave how much subsequent to the law, I believe the date was April 7. If you get something like this, from him or anyone else out there who is likely, Bob can trot over and check the public records to see if recorded. That part ought to be a snap, unless this part of the record keeping also has been deliberately fouled up. It used to be organized.

Frankly, although the Post hasn't used it, I think there is a good story in the state of the "records" themselves.

Hastily,

Clement

Exp we did follow under fore