



that that the President relieved him."

### President's Suspicions

Mr. Ehrlichman added:

"The President called me in on the 30th and said, 'My suspicions [of Mr. Dean] are crystallized and I want you to get into this.'

"He said it was evident to him at that point that Dean was in the thing up to his eyebrows. The President, incidentally, had a number of conversations with Dean starting, I think, the last week in February and running through the time that he was sent to Camp David."

He said that while the President's suspicions about a cover-up were growing, he and Mr. Haldeman "generally tried to avoid learning too much" about the situation.

He said he could picture himself in the office of a lawyer for the Democrats "and being asked for something that somebody had inadvertently told me, and so I didn't run around with a butterfly net trying to collect facts" during the early stages of the President's growing suspicion about Mr. Dean.

For the most part, however, Mr. Ehrlichman's deposition dealt with matters that occurred before the 1972 break-in at Watergate.

### Early "Prospectus"

He said his former assistant, John J. Caulfield, came to him 18 months before Watergate with "a prospectus for the creation of a private detective agency, [which] is about the best way I can describe it, which he proposed to have the Government go out and form."

He said the idea was to "contract with the Presidential campaign" and that he was shopping around for a sponsor.

Mr. Ehrlichman said, "I gave him this prospectus back and sent him on his way."

He said proposals for intelligence gathering went back to 1971 and a project he identified as "Sandwedge" but did not explain.

He said that when Mr. Magruder became worried about the widening Watergate investigation in early April, he outlined in detail a number of proposals that went to high officers of the Committee for the Re-election of the President.

A number of earlier proposals "would surface and die" tracing back to 1970, he said.

He said Mr. Magruder outlined a series of at least three meetings attended at various times by Mr. Mitchell, Liddy, Mr. Dean, Mr. Magruder and Frederick C. LaRue, an aide at the re-election committee.

### Plan in January, 1972

The first presentation made by Liddy for "establishment of an information and intelligence gathering facility" was presented at a meeting of all but Mr. LaRue in January, 1972, he said.

"This was so grandiose and so extreme in its concept that it was rejected by the other three gentlemen out of hand," he said.

Mr. Ehrlichman said it was called the \$1-million plan. A second, modified proposal, called the \$500,000 plan, was also rejected by the same three.

The money figure related to the cost of the plans, he said.

The group was asked to work out another proposal, Mr. Ehrlichman said.

Mr. Magruder and Liddy, who were working on the plans, were not getting along and, according to Mr. Ehrlichman, Mr. Magruder said at one point that Liddy had threatened to kill him.

He was also undecided on whether to go ahead with the bugging proposals, Mr. Ehrlichman said.

At that time Mr. Magruder said to Mr. Ehrlichman that he had received a telephone from

Charles W. Colson, then special counsel to the President, urging him to go forward with the intelligence gathering operations. However, Mr. Ehrlichman said, it was his understanding that at no point did Mr. Colson recommend illegal activities.

The final plan was presented to Mr. Mitchell in Florida in March, 1972, and was for \$200,000 to \$250,000, Mr. Ehrlichman testified.

At that meeting he said, Mr. Mitchell was said to have indicated the bugging sites. He described it this way:

"This is based either on a conversation which Mr. Dean had with Mr. Mitchell—or Mr. Magruder had with Mr. Mitchell and reported to Mr. Dean—one or the other and I can't recall which."

He said it was "that the proposal for the electronic surveillance of the three locations was a written proposal and that Mr. Mitchell had actually in writing selected those premises

which were to be bugged from a number of choices."

He said he recollected that Mr. Dean told him later he had confronted Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Mitchell agreed it had happened that way.

"Do you mean that Dean told you that Mitchell had actually signed a piece of paper in which the subjects or objects of electronic surveillance were proposed, thereby indicating his approval of the project?" the Democratic lawyer, Mr. Dunie, asked.

"Not necessarily signed. But in writing indicated his choices by circling or checking or some other way selecting his choices," Mr. Ehrlichman replied.

He said that when the bugging went into effect, the reports appeared in summary form under such code names as Gemstone, Sedan Chair, Ruby and Crystal. He said that some reports went to Gordon C. Strachan, an assistant to Mr. Haldeman.