WATERGATE SPECIAL PROSECUTION FORCE
1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

MARCH 1, 1974

THE FOLLOWING INDICTMENT WAS HANDED DOWN BY A FEDERAL GRAND JURY IN WASHINGTON TODAY:

NAMES:

Charles Colson, 42, McLean, Virginia
John Ehrlichman, 48, Seattle, Washington
Harry R. Haldeman, 47, Los Angeles, California
Robert C. Mardian, 50, Phoenix, Arizona
John Mitchell, 60, New York, New York
Kenneth W. Parkinson, 46, Washington, D.C.
Gordon Strachan, 30, Salt Lake City, Utah

CHARGES:

All defendants were charged with one count of conspiracy (Title 18, USC, §371).

The following defendants were indicted on additional charges:

MITCHELL: One count of violation of 18, USC, §1503 (Obstruction of Justice), two counts of violation of 18, USC, §1621 (Making false declaration to Grand Jury or Court), one count of violation of 18, USC, §1621 (Perjury) and one count of violation of 18, USC, §1001 (Making false statement to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation).

EHRLICHMAN: One count of violation of 18, USC, §1503 (Obstruction of Justice), one count of violation of 18, USC, §1001 (Making false statement to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation) and two counts of violation of 18, USC, §1623 (Making false declaration to Grand Jury or Court).

HALDEMAN: One count of violation of 18, USC, §1503 (Obstruction of Justice), three counts of violation of 18, USC, §1621 (Perjury).

STRACHAN: One count of violation of 18, USC, §1503 (Obstruction of Justice), one count of violation of 18, USC, §1623 (Making false declaration to Grand Jury or Court).

- MORE -

PENALTIES:

§371. Conspiracy. Carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment or fine of $5,000, or both.

§1503. Obstruction of Justice. Carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment or a fine of $5,000, or both.

§1001. Making false statement to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment or a fine of $10,000, or both.

§1621. Perjury. Carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment or a fine of $2,000, or both.

§1623. Making false declaration to Grand Jury or Court. Carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment or a fine of $10,000, or both.

A COPY OF THE INDICTMENT AND COPIES OF THE APPROPRIATE STATUTES ARE ATTACHED TO THIS FACT SHEET.

THE INDICTMENT WAS HANDED DOWN BY THE GRAND JURY IMPANELLED JUNE 5, 1972.

****

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JOHN N. MITCHELL, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, CHARLES W. COLSON, ROBERT C. MARDIAN, KENNETH W. PARKINSON, and GORDON STRACHAN, Defendants.	Criminal No. Violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1001, 1503, 1621, and 1623 (conspiracy, false statements to a government agency, obstruction of justice, perjury and false declarations.)

INDICTMENT

The Grand Jury charges:

Introduction

1. On or about June 17, 1972, Bernard L. Barker, Virgilio R. Gonzalez, Eugenio R. Martinez, James W. McCord, Jr. and Frank L. Sturgis were arrested in the offices of the Democratic National Committee, located in the Watergate office building, Washington, D. C., while attempting to photograph documents and repair a surreptitious electronic listening device which had previously been placed in those offices unlawfully.

2. At all times material herein, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Investigation were parts of the Department of Justice, a department and agency of the United States, and the Central Intelligence Agency was an agency of the United States.

3. Beginning on or about June 17, 1972, and continuing up to and including the date of the filing of this

indictment, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia were conducting an investigation, in conjunction with a Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia which had been duly empanelled and sworn on or about June 5, 1972, to determine whether violations of 18 U.S.C. 371, 2511 and 22 D.C. Code 1801(b), and of other statutes of the United States and of the District of Columbia, had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations.

4. On or about September 15, 1972, in connection with the said investigation, the Grand Jury returned an indictment in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia charging Bernard L. Barker, Virgilio R. Gonzalez, E. Howard Hunt, Jr., G. Gordon Liddy, Eugenio R. Martinez, James W. McCord, Jr., and Frank L. Sturgis with conspiracy, burglary and unlawful endeavor to intercept wire communications.

5. From in or about January 1969, to on or about March 1, 1972, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, was Attorney General of the United States. From on or about April 9, 1972, to on or about June 30, 1972, he was Campaign Director of the Committee to Re-Elect the President.

6. At all times material herein up to on or about April 30, 1973, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, was Assistant to the President of the United States.

7. At all times material herein up to on or about April 30, 1973, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, the DEFENDANT, was Assistant for Domestic Affairs to the President of the United States.

8. At all times material herein up to on or about March 10, 1973, CHARLES W. COLSON, the DEFENDANT, was Special Counsel to the President of the United States.

9. At all times material herein, ROBERT C. MARDIAN, the DEFENDANT, was an official of the Committee to Re-Elect the President.

10. From on or about June 21, 1972, and at all times material herein, KENNETH W. PARKINSON, the DEFENDANT, was an attorney representing the Committee to Re-Elect the President.

11. At all times material herein up to in or about November 1972, GORDON STRACHAN, the DEFENDANT, was a Staff Assistant to HARRY R. HALDEMAN at the White House. Thereafter he became General Counsel to the United States Information Agency.

COUNT ONE

12. From on or about June 17, 1972, up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, JOHN N. MITCHELL, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, CHARLES W. COLSON, ROBERT C. MARDIAN, KENNETH W. PARKINSON and GORDON STRACHAN, the DEFENDANTS, and other persons to the Grand Jury known and unknown, unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate and agree together and with each other, to

commit offenses against the United States, to wit, to obstruct justice in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1503, to make false statements to a government agency in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001, to make false declarations in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1623, and to defraud the United States and Agencies and Departments thereof, to wit, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and the Department of Justice, of the Government's right to have the officials of these Departments and Agencies transact their official business honestly and impartially, free from corruption, fraud, improper and undue influence, dishonesty, unlawful impairment and obstruction, all in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

13. It was a part of the conspiracy that the conspirators would corruptly influence, obstruct and impede, and corruptly endeavor to influence, obstruct and impede, the due administration of justice in connection with the investigation referred to in paragraph three (3) above and in connection with the trial of Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for the purpose of concealing and causing to be concealed the identities of the persons who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of (a) the activities which were the subject of the investigation and trial, and (b) other illegal [illegible] activities.

14. It was further a part of the conspiracy that the conspirators would knowingly make and cause to be made false statements to the FBI and false material statements and declarations under oath in proceedings before and ancillary to the Grand Jury and a Court of the United States, for the purposes stated in paragraph thirteen (13) above.

15. It was further a part of the conspiracy that the conspirators would, by deceit, craft, trickery and dishonest means, defraud the United States by interfering with and obstructing the lawful governmental functions of the CIA, in that the conspirators would induce the CIA to provide financial assistance to persons who were subjects of the investigation referred to in paragraph three (3) above, for the purposes stated in paragraph thirteen (13) above.

16. It was further a part of the conspiracy that the conspirators would, by deceit, craft, trickery and dishonest means, defraud the United States by interfering with and obstructing the lawful governmental functions of the FBI and the Department of Justice, in that the conspirators would obtain and attempt to obtain from the FBI and the Department of Justice information concerning the investigation referred to in paragraph three (3) above, for the purposes stated in paragraph thirteen (13) above.

17. Among the means by which the conspirators would carry out the aforesaid conspiracy were the following:

(a) The conspirators would direct G. Gordon Liddy to seek the assistance of Richard G. Kleindienst, then Attorney General of the United States, in obtaining the release from the District of Columbia jail of one or more of the persons who had been arrested on June 17, 1972, in the offices of the Democratic National Committee in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C., and G. Gordon Liddy would seek such assistance from Richard G. Kleindienst.

(b) The conspirators would at various times remove, conceal, alter and destroy, attempt to remove, conceal, alter and destroy, and cause to be removed, concealed, altered and destroyed, documents, papers, records and objects.

(c) The conspirators would plan, solicit, assist and facilitate the giving of false, deceptive, evasive and misleading statements and testimony.

(d) The conspirators would give false, misleading, evasive and deceptive statements and testimony.

(e) The conspirators would covertly raise, acquire, transmit, distribute and pay cash funds to and for the benefit of the defendants in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the

of Columbia, both prior to and subsequent to the return of the indictment on September 15, 1972.

(f) The conspirators would make and cause to be made offers of leniency, executive clemency and other benefits to E. Howard Hunt, Jr., G. Gordon Liddy, James W. McCord, Jr., and Jeb S. Magruder.

(g) The conspirators would attempt to obtain CIA financial assistance for persons who were subjects of the investigation referred to in paragraph three (3) above.

(h) The conspirators would obtain information from the FBI and the Department of Justice concerning the progress of the investigation referred to in paragraph three (3) above.

18. In furtherance of the conspiracy, and to effect the objects thereof, the following overt acts, among others, were committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere:

OVERT ACTS

1. On or about June 17, 1972, JOHN N. MITCHELL met with ROBERT C. MARDIAN in or about Beverly Hills, California, and requested MARDIAN to tell G. Gordon Liddy to seek the assistance of Richard G. Kleindienst, then Attorney General of the United States, in obtaining the release of one or more of the persons in custody in connection with the Watergate break-in.

2. On or about June 18, 1972, in the District of Columbia, GORDON STRACHAN destroyed documents on the instructions of HARRY R. HALDEMAN.

3. On or about June 19, 1972, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN met with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time EHRLICHMAN directed Dean to tell G. Gordon Liddy that E. Howard Hunt, Jr., should leave the United States.

4. On or about June 19, 1972, CHARLES W. COLSON and JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN met with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time EHRLICHMAN directed Dean to take possession of the contents of E. Howard Hunt, Jr.'s safe in the Executive Office Building.

5. On or about June 19, 1972, ROBERT C. MARDIAN and JOHN N. MITCHELL met with Jeb S. Magruder at MITCHELL's apartment in the District of Columbia, at which time MITCHELL suggested that Magruder destroy documents from Magruder's files.

6. On or about June 20, 1972, G. Gordon Liddy met with Fred C. LaRue and ROBERT C. MARDIAN at LaRue's apartment in the District of Columbia, at which time Liddy told LaRue and MARDIAN that certain "commitments" had been made to and for the benefit of Liddy and other persons involved in the Watergate break-in.

7. On or about June 24, 1972, JOHN N. MITCHELL and ROBERT C. MARDIAN met with John W. Dean, III, at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue in the District of Columbia, at which time MITCHELL and MARDIAN [illegible] be requested to provide covert funds for the assistance of the persons involved in the Watergate break-in.

8. On or about June 26, 1972, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN met with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time EHRLICHMAN approved a suggestion that Dean ask General Vernon A. Walters, Deputy Director of the CIA, whether the CIA could use covert funds to pay the bail and salaries of the persons involved in the Watergate break-in.

9. On or about June 28, 1972, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN had a conversation with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, during which EHRLICHMAN approved the use of Herbert W. Kalmbach to raise cash funds with which to make covert payments to and for the benefit of the persons involved in the Watergate break-in.

10. On or about July 6, 1972, KENNETH W. PARKINSON had a conversation with William O. Bittman in or about the District of Columbia, during which PARKINSON told Bittman that "Rivers is OK to talk to."

11. On or about July 7, 1972, Anthony Ulasewicz delivered approximately $25,000 in cash to William O. Bittman at 815 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., in the District of Columbia.

12. In or about mid-July, 1972, JOHN N. MITCHELL and KENNETH W. PARKINSON met with John W. Dean, III, at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. in the District of Columbia, at which time MITCHELL advised Dean to obtain FBI reports of the investigation into the Watergate break-in for PARKINSON and others.

13. On or about July 17, 1972, Anthony Ulasewicz delivered approximately $40,000 in cash to Dorothy Dunn at Washington National Airport.

14. On or about July 17, 1972, Anthony Ulasewicz delivered approximately $8,000 in cash to G. Gordon Liddy at Washington National Airport.

15. On or about July 21, 1972, ROBERT C. MARDIAN met with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time MARDIAN examined FBI reports of the investigation concerning the Watergate break-in.

16. On or about July 26, 1972, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN met with Herbert W. Kalmbach at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time EHRLICHMAN told Kalmbach that Kalmbach had to raise funds with which to make payments to and for the benefit of the persons involved in the Watergate break-in, and that it was necessary to keep such fund raising and payments secret.

17. In or about late July or early August, 1972, Anthony Ulasewicz made a delivery of approximately $43,000 in cash at Washington National Airport.

18. In or about late July or early August, 1972, Anthony Ulasewicz made a delivery of approximately $18,000 in cash at Washington National Airport.

19. On or about August 29, 1972, CHARLES W. COLSON had a conversation with John W. Dean, III, during which Dean advised COLSON not to send a memorandum to the authorities investigating the Watergate break-in.

20. On or about September 19, 1972, Anthony Ulasewicz delivered approximately $53,500 in cash to Dorothy Hunt at Washington National Airport.

of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $20,000 in cash to William O. Bittman.

22. On or about November 13, 1972, in the District of Columbia, E. Howard Hunt, Jr., had a telephone conversation with CHARLES W. COLSON, during which Hunt discussed with COLSON the need to make additional payments to and for the benefit of the defendants in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

23. In or about mid-November, 1972, CHARLES W. COLSON met with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time COLSON gave Dean a tape recording of a telephone conversation between COLSON and E. Howard Hunt, Jr.

24. On or about November 15, 1972, John W. Dean, III, met with JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN and HARRY R. HALDEMAN at Camp David, Maryland, at which time Dean played for EHRLICHMAN and HALDEMAN a tape recording of a telephone conversation between CHARLES W. COLSON and E. Howard Hunt, Jr.

Dean?

25. On or about November 15, 1972, John W. Dean, III, met with JOHN N. MITCHELL in New York City, at which time Dean played for MITCHELL a tape recording of a telephone conversation between CHARLES W. COLSON and E. Howard Hunt, Jr.

Dean?

26. On or about December 1, 1972, KENNETH W. PARKINSON met with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time PARKINSON gave Dean a list of anticipated expenses of the defendants during the trial of Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Dean?

27. In or about early December, 1972, HARRY R. HALDEMAN had a telephone conversation with John W. Dean, III, during which HALDEMAN approved the use of a portion of a cash fund of approximately $350,000, then being held under HALDEMAN's control, to make additional payments to and for the benefit of the defendants in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

28. In or about early December, 1972, GORDON STRACHAN met with Fred C. LaRue at LaRue's apartment in the District of Columbia, at which time STRACHAN delivered approximately $50,000 in cash to LaRue.

29. In or about early December, 1972, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $40,000 in cash to William O. Bittman.

30. On or about January 3, 1973, CHARLES W. COLSON met with JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN and John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time COLSON, EHRLICHMAN and Dean discussed the need to make assurances to E. Howard Hunt, Jr. concerning the length of time E. Howard Hunt, Jr. would have to spend in jail if he were convicted in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

31. In or about early January, 1973, HARRY R. HALDEMAN had a conversation with John W. Dean, III, during which HALDEMAN approved the use of the balance of the cash fund referred to in Overt Act No. 27 to make additional payments to and for the benefit of the defendants in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

32. In or about early January, 1973, GORDON STRACHAN met with Fred C. LaRue at LaRue's apartment in the District of Columbia, at which time STRACHAN delivered approximately $300,000 in cash to LaRue.

33. In or about early January, 1973, JOHN N. MITCHELL had a telephone conversation with John W. Dean, III, during which MITCHELL asked Dean to have John C. Caulfield give an assurance of executive clemency to James W. McCord, Jr.

34. In or about mid-January, 1973, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $20,000 in cash to a representative of G. Gordon Liddy.

35. On or about February 11, 1973, in Rancho La Costa, California, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN and HARRY R. HALDEMAN met with John W. Dean, III, and discussed the need to raise money with which to make additional payments to and for the benefit of the defendants in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

36. In or about late February, 1973, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $25,000 in cash to William O. Bittman.

37. In or about late February, 1973, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $35,000 in cash to William O. Bittman.

38. On or about March 16, 1973, E. Howard Hunt, Jr., met with Paul O'Brien at 815 Connecticut Avenue, N. W. in the District of Columbia, at which time Hunt told O'Brien that Hunt wanted approximately $120,000.

32. In or about early January, 1973, GORDON STRACHAN met with Fred C. LaRue at LaRue's apartment in the District of Columbia, at which time STRACHAN delivered approximately $300,000 in cash to LaRue.

33. In or about early January, 1973, JOHN N. MITCHELL had a telephone conversation with John W. Dean, III, during which MITCHELL asked Dean to have John C. Caulfield give an assurance of executive clemency to James W. McCord, Jr.

34. In or about mid-January, 1973, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $20,000 in cash to a representative of G. Gordon Liddy.

35. On or about February 11, 1973, in Rancho La Costa, California, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN and HARRY R. HALDEMAN met with John W. Dean, III, and discussed the need to raise money with which to make additional payments to and for the benefit of the defendants in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

36. In or about late February, 1973, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $25,000 in cash to William O. Bittman.

37. In or about late February, 1973, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $35,000 in cash to William O. Bittman.

38. On or about March 16, 1973, E. Howard Hunt, Jr., met with Paul O'Brien at 815 Connecticut Avenue, N. W. in the District of Columbia, at which time told O'Brien that Hunt wanted approximately $120,000.

39. On or about March 19, 1973, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN had a conversation with John W. Dean, III, at the White House in the District of Columbia, during which EHRLICHMAN told Dean to inform JOHN N. MITCHELL about the fact that E. Howard Hunt, Jr. had asked for approximately $120,000.

40. On or about March 21, 1973, from approximately 11:15 a.m. to approximately noon, HARRY R. HALDEMAN and John W. Dean, III, attended a meeting at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time there was a discussion about the fact that E. Howard Hunt, Jr. had asked for approximately $120,000.

41. On or about March 21, 1973, at approximately 12:30 p.m., HARRY R. HALDEMAN had a telephone conversation with JOHN N. MITCHELL.

42. On or about the early afternoon of March 21, 1973, JOHN N. MITCHELL had a telephone conversation with Fred C. LaRue during which MITCHELL authorized LaRue to make a payment of approximately $75,000 to and for the benefit of E. Howard Hunt, Jr.

43. On or about the evening of March 21, 1973, in the District of Columbia, Fred C. LaRue arranged for the delivery of approximately $75,000 in cash to William O. Bittman.

44. On or about March 22, 1973, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, and John W. Dean, III, met with JOHN N. MITCHELL at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time MITCHELL assured EHRLICHMAN that E. Howard Hunt, Jr. was not a "problem" any longer.

45. On or about March 22, 1973, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN had a conversation with Egil Krogh at the White House in the District of Columbia, at which time EHRLICHMAN assured Krogh that EHRLICHMAN did not believe that E. Howard Hunt, Jr. would reveal certain matters.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.)

COUNT TWO

The Grand Jury further charges:

2. From on or about June 17, 1972, up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, JOHN N. MITCHELL, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, CHARLES W. COLSON, KENNETH W. PARKINSON and GORDON STRACHAN, the DEFENDANTS, unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did corruptly influence, obstruct and impede, and did corruptly endeavor to influence, obstruct and impede the due administration of justice in connection with an investigation being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, in conjunction with a Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and in connection with the trial of Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, by making cash payments and offers of other benefits to and for the benefit of the defendants in Criminal Case No. 1827-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and to others, both prior to and subsequent to the return of the indictment on September 15, 1972, for the purpose of concealing and causing to be concealed the identities of the persons who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of the activities which were the subject of the investigation and trial, and by other means.

(Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1503 and 2.)

COUNT [illegible]

The Grand Jury further charges:

On or about July 5, 1972, in the District of Columbia, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, did knowingly and willfully make false, fictitious and fraudulent statements and representations to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, which Department was then conducting an investigation into a matter within its jurisdiction, namely, whether violations of 18 U.S.C. 371, 2511, and 22 D.C. Code 1001(b), and of other statutes of the United States and the District of Columbia, had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in connection with the break-in at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters at the Watergate office building on June 17, 1972, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations, in that he stated that he had no knowledge of the break-in at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters other than what he had read in newspaper accounts of that incident.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001.)

COUNT FOUR

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about September 14, 1972, in the District of Columbia, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath that he would testify truthfully, and while testifying in a proceeding before the June, 1972 Grand Jury, a Grand Jury of the United States, duly empanelled and sworn in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, did knowingly make false material declarations as hereinafter set forth.

2. At the time and place alleged, the June, 1972 Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was conducting an investigation in conjunction with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 371, 2511, and 22 D.C. Code 1801(b), and of other statutes of the United States and of the District of Columbia had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations.

3. It was material to the said investigation that the said Grand Jury ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of the Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C., and related activities.

4. At the time and place alleged, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath at a proceeding before the said Grand Jury, did knowingly declare with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

> Q. Was there any program, to your knowledge, at the Committee, or any effort made to organize a covert or clandestine operation, basically, you know, illegal in nature, to get information or to gather intelligence about the activities of any of the Democratic candidates for public office or any activities of the Democratic Party?
>
> A. Certainly not, because, if there had been, I would have shut it off as being entirely non-productive at that particular time of the campaign.
>
> * * *
>
> Q. Did you have any knowledge, direct or indirect, of Mr. Liddy's activities with respect to any intelligence gathering effort with respect to the activities of the Democratic candidates or its Party?
>
> A. None whatsoever, because I didn't know there was anything going on of that nature, if there was. So I wouldn't anticipate having heard anything about his activities in connection with it.

5. The underscored portions of the declarations quoted in paragraph 4, made by JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, were material to the said investigation and, as he then and there well knew, were false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1623.)

COUNT FIVE

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about April 20, 1973, in the District of Columbia, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath that he would testify truthfully, and while testifying in a proceeding before the June, 1972 Grand Jury, a Grand Jury of the United States, duly empanelled and sworn in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, did knowingly make false material declarations as hereinafter set forth.

2. At the time and place alleged, the June, 1972 Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was conducting an investigation in conjunction with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 371, 2511, and 22 D.C. Code 1801(b), and of other statutes of the United States and of the District of Columbia had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations.

3. It was material to the said investigation that the said Grand Jury ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed information relating to unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the office of the Democratic National Committee [illegible] in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C., and related activities.

4. At the time and place alleged, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath at a proceeding before the said Grand Jury, did knowingly declare with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

Q. Did Mr. LaRue tell you that Mr. Liddy had confessed to him?

A. No, I don't recall that, no.

Q. Did Mr. Mardian tell you that he'd confessed to him?

A. No.

Q. Do you deny that?

A. Pardon me?

Q. Do you deny that?

A. I have no recollection of that.

* * *

Q. So Mr. Mardian did not report to you that Mr. Liddy had confessed to him?

A. Not to my recollection, Mr. Glanzer.

Q. That would be something that you would remember, if it happened, wouldn't you?

A. Yes, I would.

* * *

Q. I didn't ask you that. I asked you were you told by either Mr. Mardian or Mr. LaRue or anybody else, at the Committee, prior to June 28th, 1972, that Mr. Liddy had told them that he was involved in the Watergate break-in?

A. I have no such recollection.

5. The underscored portions of the declarations quoted in paragraph 4, made by JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, were material to the said investigation and, as he then and there well knew, were false.

COUNT III

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about July 10 and July 11, 1973, in the District of Columbia, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath before a competent tribunal, to wit, the Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, a duly created and authorized Committee of the United States Senate conducting official hearings and inquiring into a matter in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he would testify truly, did willfully, knowingly and contrary to such oath state material matters hereinafter set forth which he did not believe to be true.

2. At the time and place alleged, the said Committee was conducting an investigation and study, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 60 adopted by the United States Senate on February 7, 1973, of the extent, if any, to which illegal, improper or unethical activities were engaged in by any persons, acting either individually or in combination with others, in the presidential election of 1972, or in any related campaign or canvass conducted by or in behalf of any person seeking nomination or election as the candidate of any political party for the office of President of the United States in such election, for the purpose of determining whether in its judgment any occurrences which might be revealed by the investigation and study indicated the necessity or desirability of the enactment of new legislation to safeguard the electoral process by which the [illegible] of the United States is chosen.

3. It was material to the said investigation and study that the said Committee ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed, information relating to (a) unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of the Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C., and (b) related activities, through such means as the destruction of documents and other evidence of said facts.

4. At the times and place alleged, JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath before the said Committee, did willfully and knowingly state with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

July 10, 1973:

> Mr. Dash. Was there a meeting in your apartment on the evening that you arrived in Washington on June 19, attended by Mr. LaRue, Mr. Mardian, Mr. Dean, Mr. Magruder --
>
> Mr. Mitchell. Magruder and myself, that is correct.
>
> Mr. Dash. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting, the discussion that took place there?
>
> Mr. Mitchell. I recall that we had been traveling all day and, of course, we had very little information about what the current status was of the entry of the Democratic National Committee, and we met at the apartment to discuss it. They were, of course, clamoring for a response from the Committee because of Mr. McCord's involvement, etc., etc., and we had quite a general discussion of the subject matter.
>
> [illegible] the so-called Gemstone files or the [illegible] tapping files that you had in your possession?

Mr. Mitchell. No, I had not heard of the Gemstone [illegible] at that particular meeting [illegible] or any conversation with it.

July 11, 1973:

Senator Weicker. Now, on June 19, Mr. Magruder has testified and Mr. LaRue has stated that Mr. Mitchell, that you instructed Magruder to destroy the Gemstone files, to in fact, have a bonfire with them.

* * *

Senator Weicker. Did you suggest that any documents be destroyed, not necessarily Gemstone.

Mr. Mitchell. To the best of my recollection.

Senator Weicker. At the June 19 meeting at your apartment?

Did you suggest that any documents be destroyed, not necessarily Gemstone or not necessarily documents that relate to electronic surveillance?

Mr. Mitchell. To the best of my recollection when I was there there was no such discussion of the destruction of any documents. This was not the type of a meeting we were having.

5. The underscored portions of the declarations quoted in paragraph 4, made by JOHN N. MITCHELL, the DEFENDANT, were material to the said investigation and study and, as he then and there well knew, were false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1621.)

(Count Four)

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about July 30, 1973, in the District of Columbia, HENRY R. HALDEMAN, the defendant, having duly taken an oath before a competent tribunal, to wit, the Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, a duly created and authorized Committee of the United States Senate conducting official hearings and inquiring into a matter in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he would testify truly, did willfully, knowingly and contrary to such oath state material matters hereinafter set forth which he did not believe to be true.

2. At the time and place alleged, the said Committee was conducting an investigation and study, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 60 adopted by the United States Senate on February 7, 1973, of the extent, if any, to which illegal, improper or unethical activities were engaged in by any persons, acting either individually or in combination with others, in the presidential election of 1972, or in any related campaign or canvass conducted by or in behalf of any person seeking nomination or election as the candidate of any political party for the office of President of the United States in such election, for the purpose of determining whether in its judgment any occurrences which might be revealed by the investigation and study indicated the necessity or desirability of the enactment of new legislation to safeguard the electoral process by which the President

3. It was material to the said investigation and study that the said Committee ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed, information relating to (a) unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of the Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C. and (b) related activities, through such means as the payment and promise of payment of money and other things of value to participants in these activities and to their families.

4. At the time and place alleged, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath before the said Committee, did willfully and knowingly state with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

> I was told several times, starting in the summer of 1972, by John Dean and possibly also by John Mitchell that there was a need by the committee for funds to help take care of the legal fees and family support of the Watergate defendants. The committee apparently felt obliged to do this.
>
> * * *
>
> Since all information regarding the defense funds was given to me by John Dean, the counsel to the President, and possibly by John Mitchell, and since the arrangements for Kalmbach's collecting funds and for transferring the $350,000 cash fund were made by John Dean, and since John Dean never stated at the time that the funds would be used for any other than legal legal [sic] and proper purposes, I had no reason to question the propriety or legality of the process of delivering the $350,000 to the committee via LaRue or of having Kalmbach raise funds.

> I have no personal knowledge of what was done with the funds raised by Kalmbach or with the $350,000 that was delivered by Strachan to LaRue.
>
> It would appear that, at the White House at least, John Dean was the only one who knew that the funds were for "hush money", if, in fact, that is what they were for. The rest of us relied on Dean and all thought that what was being done was legal and proper. No one, to my knowledge, was aware that these funds involved either blackmail or "hush money" until this suggestion was raised in March of 1973.

5. The underscored portion of the statements quoted in paragraph 4, made by HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, was material to the said investigation and study and, as he then and there well knew, was false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1621.)

COUNT EIGHT

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about July 30 and July 31, 1973, in the District of Columbia, HENRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath before a competent tribunal, to wit, the Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, a duly created and authorized Committee of the United States Senate conducting official hearings and inquiring into a matter in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he would testify truly, did willfully, knowingly and contrary to such oath state material matters hereinafter set forth which he did not believe to be true.

2. At the times and place alleged, the said Committee was conducting an investigation and study, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 60 adopted by the United States Senate on February 7, 1973, of the extent, if any, to which illegal, improper or unethical activities were engaged in by any persons, acting either individually or in combination with others, in the presidential election of 1972, or in any related campaign or canvass conducted by or in behalf of any person seeking nomination or election as the candidate of any political party for the office of President of the United States in such election, for the purpose of determining whether in its judgment any occurrences which might be revealed by the investigation and study indicated the necessity or desirability of the enactment of new legislation to safeguard the electoral process by which the President of the United States is chosen.

3. It was material to the said investigation and study that the said Committee ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed, information relating to (a) unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of the Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C., and (b) related activities, through such means as the payment and promise of payment of money and other things of value to participants in these activities and to their families.

4. At the times and place alleged, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath before the said Committee, did willfully and knowingly state with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

July 30, 1973:

> I was present for the final 40 minutes of the President's meeting with John Dean on the morning of March 21. While [sic] I was not present for the first hour of the meeting, I did listen to the tape of the entire meeting.
>
> Following is the substance of that meeting to the best of my recollection.
>
> * * *
>
> He[Dean] also reported on a current Hunt blackmail threat. He said Hunt was demanding $120,000 or else he would tell about the nasty things he had done for Ehrlichman. The President pursued this in considerable detail, obviously trying to smoke out what was really going on. He led Dean on regarding the process and what he would recommend doing. He asked such things as [illegible]

right?" and he asked where the money would come from? how it would be delivered? and so on. He asked how much money would be involved over the years and Dean said "probably a million dollars -- but the problem is that it is hard to raise." The President said "there is no problem in raising a million dollars, we can do that, but it would be wrong."

July 31, 1973:

Senator Baker. . . . What I want to point out to you is that one statement in your addendum seems to me to be of extraordinary importance and I want to test the accuracy of your recollection and the quality of your note-taking from those tapes, and I am referring to the last, next to the last, no, the third from the last sentence on page 2, "The President said there is no problem in raising a million dollars. We can do that but it would be wrong."

Now, if the period were to follow after "We can do that", it would be a most damning statement. If, in fact, the tapes clearly show he said "but it would be wrong," it is an entirely different content. Now, how sure are you, Mr. Haldeman, that those tapes, in fact say that?

Mr. Haldeman. I am absolutely positive that the tapes --

Senator Baker. Did you hear it with your own voice?

Mr. Haldeman. With my own ears, yes.

Senator Baker. I mean with your own ears. Was there any distortion in the quality of the tape in that respect?

Mr. Haldeman. No, I do not believe so.

* * *

Senator Ervin. Then the tape said that the President said that there was no problem raising a million dollars.

Mr. Haldeman. Well, I should put that the way it really came, Mr. Chairman, which was that Dean said when the President said how much money are you talking about here and Dean said over a period of years probably a million dollars, but it would be very hard -- it is very hard to raise that money. And the President said

it is not hard to raise it. You can raise a million dollars. And then got into the question of, in the one cash request, [illegible] into the President making a statement that it would be wrong and in other explanation of this getting into the -- trying to find out what Dean was talking about in terms of a million dollars.

Senator Ervin. Can you point -- are you familiar with the testimony Dean gave about his conversations on the 13th and the 21st of March with the President?

Mr. Haldeman. I am generally familiar with it, yes, sir.

Senator Ervin. Well, this tape corroborates virtually everything he said except that he said that the President could be -- that the President said there would be no difficulty about raising the money and you say the only difference in the tape is that the President also added that but that would be wrong.

Mr. Haldeman. And there was considerable other discussion about what you do, what Dean would recommend, what should be done, how -- what this process is and this sort of thing. It was a very -- there was considerable exploration in the area.

5. The underscored portions of the statements quoted in paragraph 4, made by HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, were material to the said investigation and study and, as he then and there well knew, were false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1621.)

COUNT EIGHT

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about August 1, 1973, in the District of Columbia, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath before a competent tribunal, to wit, the Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, a duly created and authorized Committee of the United States Senate conducting official hearings and inquiring into a matter in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he would testify truly, did willfully, knowingly and contrary to such oath state material matters hereinafter set forth which he did not believe to be true.

2. At the time and place alleged, the said Committee was conducting an investigation and study, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 60 adopted by the United States Senate on February 7, 1973, of the extent, if any, to which illegal, improper or unethical activities were engaged in by any persons, acting either individually or in combination with others, in the presidential election of 1972, or in any related campaign or canvass conducted by or in behalf of any person seeking nomination or election as the candidate of any political party for the office of President of the United States in such election, for the purpose of determining whether in its judgment any occurrences which might be revealed by the investigation and study indicated the necessity or desirability of the enactment of new legislation to safeguard [illegible] process by which the President of the United States is chosen.

3. It was material to the said investigation and study that the said Committee ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed, information relating to (a) unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of the Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C., and (b) related activities, through such means as the commission of perjury and subornation of perjury.

4. At the time and place alleged, HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath before the said Committee, did willfully and knowingly state with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

> Senator Gurney. Let's turn to the March 21 meeting.
>
> * * *
>
> Senator Gurney. Do you recall any discussion by Dean about Magruder's false testimony before the Grand Jury?
>
> Mr. Haldeman. There was a reference to his feeling that Magruder had known about the Watergate planning and break-in ahead of it, in other words, that he was aware of what had gone on at Watergate. I don't believe there was any reference to Magruder committing perjury.

5. The underscored portion of the statements quoted in paragraph 4, made by HARRY R. HALDEMAN, the DEFENDANT, was material to the said investigation and study and, as he then and there well knew, was false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1621.)

COUNT FOUR:

The Grand Jury further charges:

On or about July 21, 1973, in the District of Columbia, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, the DEFENDANT, did knowingly and willfully make false, fictitious and fraudulent statements and representations to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, which Department was then conducting an investigation into a matter within its jurisdiction, namely, whether violations of 18 U.S.C. 371, 2511, and 22 D.C. Code 1001(b), and of other statutes of the United States and the District of Columbia, had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in connection with the break-in at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters at the Watergate office building on June 17, 1972, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations, in that he stated that he had neither received nor was he in possession of any information relative to the break-in at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters on June 17, 1972, other than what he had read in the way of newspaper accounts of that incident.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001.)

COUNT [illegible]

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about May 3, and May 9, 1973, in the District of Columbia, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath that he would testify truthfully, and while testifying in a proceeding before the June, 1972 Grand Jury, a Grand Jury of the United States, duly empanelled and sworn in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, did knowingly make false material declarations as hereinafter set forth.

2. At the times and place alleged, the June, 1972 Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was conducting an investigation in conjunction with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 371, 2511, and 22 D.C. Code 1801(b), and of other statutes of the United States and of the District of Columbia had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations.

3. It was material to the said investigation that the said Grand Jury ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed, information relating to unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of the Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D.C., and related activities.

4. At the times and place alleged, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath at a proceeding before the said Grand Jury, did knowingly declare with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

May 3, 1973:

Q. Mr. Ehrlichman, going back to that first week following the Watergate arrest, did you have any conversations besides those on Monday with Mr. Dean?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Will you relate those to the ladies and gentlemen of the Grand Jury?

A. Well, I don't recall the content specifically of most of them. I know that I saw Mr. Dean because my log shows that he was in my office. I think it was four times that week, once in a large meeting -- excuse me, more than four times.

He was in alone twice on Monday, and in the large meeting that I have described. He was in twice alone on other occasions, and then he was in a meeting that I had with Pat Gray -- well, that was the following week. It was a span of seven days, within the span of seven days.

* * *

Q. All right. Now at any of those meetings with Mr. Dean, was the subject matter brought up of a person by the name of Gordon Liddy?

A. I can't say specifically one way or the other.

Q. So you can neither confirm nor deny that anything with respect to Mr. Liddy was brought up at any of those meetings, is that correct, sir?

A. I don't recall whether Mr. Liddy was being mentioned in the press and would have been the subject of an inquiry by somebody from the outside. If he would have, then it is entirely [illegible]

Q. All right. Let's assume for a moment that Mr. Liddy's name did not in that first week arise in the press. Can you think of any other context in which his name came up, including any possible press problem with respect to the name of Liddy?

A. I have no present recollection of that having happened.

Q. So you can neither confirm nor deny whether or not the name of Gordon Liddy came up in the course of any conversation you had with Mr. Dean during that week, or for that matter with anyone else?

A. That's right, unless I had some specific event to focus on. Just to take those meetings in the abstract, I can't say that I have any recollection of that having happened in any of those.

Q. All right. Let's take the example of did anyone advise you, directly or indirectly, that Mr. Liddy was implicated or involved in the Watergate affair?

A. Well, they did at some time, and I don't know whether it was during that week or not.

Q. To the best of your recollection, when was that done, sir?

A. I'm sorry but I just don't remember.

Q. Well, who was it that advised you of that?

A. I think it was Mr. Dean, but I don't remember when he did it.

Q. Would it have been within a month of the investigation? Within three months of the investigation?

A. I'm sorry but I just don't know.

Q. You can't even say then whether it was within a week, a month, or three months? Is that correct, sir?

A. Well, I think it was fairly early on, but to say it was within a week or two weeks or something, I just don't know.

Q. How Mr. Dean advised you that Mr. Liddy was implicated. Did you advise the United States Attorney or the Attorney General, or any other law enforcement agency, immediately or at any time after?

A. No. I don't think it was private information as far as I had it.

Q. Well, did you inquire to find out whether or not it was private information?

A. To the best of my recollection, when I first heard it it was not in the nature of exclusively known to them, or anything of that kind.

Q. Well, was it in the newspapers that he was involved?

A. I'm sorry. I just don't remember. It probably was, but I just can't recall.

Q. You mean the first time you found out from Mr. Dean that Liddy was involved, Mr. Ehrlichman, it was in the same newspaper or the newspapers that you yourself could have read?

A. No, no. I am telling you that I cannot remember the relationship of time, but my impression is that he was not giving me special information that was not available to other people.

A lot of Mr. Dean's information came out of the Justice Department apparently, and so I think the impression I had was whatever he was giving us by way of information was known to a number of other people. That's what I meant by special information.

May 9, 1973:

Q. When did you first become aware that Mr. Liddy was involved?

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't know?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever become aware of it?

A. Well, obviously I did, but I don't know when else it was.

Q. Was it in June?

A. I say I don't know.

Q. Who told you?

A. I don't know.

Q. How did you learn it?

A. I don't recall.

5. The underscored portions of the declarations quoted in paragraph 4, made by JOHN D. LUDWIGSEN, the DEFENDANT, were material to the said investigation and, as he then and there well knew, were false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1623.)

COUNT TWO

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about May 3 and May 9, 1973, in the District of Columbia, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath that he would testify truthfully, and while testifying in a proceeding before the June, 1972 Grand Jury, a Grand Jury of the United States, duly empanelled and sworn in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, did knowingly make false material declarations as hereinafter set forth.

2. At the time and place alleged, the June, 1972 Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was conducting an investigation in conjunction with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 371, 2511, and 22 D.C. Code 1801(b), and other statutes of the United States and of the District of Columbia had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations.

3. It was material to the said investigation that the said Grand Jury ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed, information relating to unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of

The Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D. C., and related activities.

4. At the times and place alleged, JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, the defendant, appearing as a witness under oath in a proceeding before the said Grand Jury, did knowingly declare with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

May 3, 1973:

> Q. Now with respect to that, what further information did you receive that really related to this fundraising for the defendants and the defense counsel and their families?
>
> A. I had a call from Mr. Kalmbach within four or five days to verify whether or not I had in fact talked to John Dean. I said that I had.
>
> Q. This was a telephone call, sir?
>
> A. I think it was. It may have been during a visit. I'm not sure. I used to see Mr. Kalmbach periodically about all kinds of things.
>
> It may have been during a visit, but I think it was just a phone call.
>
> He said substantially that John Dean had called me and said that I had no objection, and I said, "Herb, if you don't have any objection to doing it, I don't have any objection to your doing it, obviously."
>
> He said, "No, I don't mind," and he went ahead.
>
> * * *
>
> Q. So far as you recall the only conversation that you recall is Mr. Kalmbach saying to you, "John Dean has asked me to do this," and you stated that you had no objection. He said that he was checking with you to determine whether you had any objection or not?
>
> A. He was checking on Dean.
>
> Q. On Dean?

Q. And you said to him, "If you don't have an objection then I don't have any objection"?

A. Right.

Q. Was there any discussion between the two of you as to the purpose for which that money was to be raised?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Did you in any way approve the purpose for which this money was being given?

A. No, I don't think so. I don't recall doing so.

Q. Based on your testimony for the background of this, there would have been no basis for your approval or for you to affirm that?

A. That's right. That's why I say that I don't believe that I did.

Q. And your best recollection is that you did not?

A. That's right.

Q. Do you have any recollection of Mr. Kalmbach inquiring of you whether or not this was appropriate, sir?

A. Questioning me with respect to that?

Q. Yes.

A. No, I don't.

Q. He did not, to the best of your recollection?

A. I don't have any recollection of his doing so.

May 9, 1973:

Q. You had never expressed, say back six or seven months ago, to Mr. Kalmbach that the raising of the money should be kept as a secret matter, and it would be either political dynamite, or comparable words, if it ever got out, when Mr. Kalmbach came to see you?

A. No, I don't recall ever saying that.

5. The underscored portions of the declarations quoted in paragraph 4, made by JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN, the

[redacted], were material to the said investigation and, as he then and there well knew, were false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1623.)

COUNT THIRTEEN

The Grand Jury further charges:

1. On or about April 11, 1973, in the District of Columbia, GORDON STRACHAN, the DEFENDANT, having duly taken an oath that he would testify truthfully, and while testifying in a proceeding before the June, 1972 Grand Jury, a Grand Jury of the United States, duly empanelled and sworn in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, did knowingly make false material declarations as hereinafter set forth.

2. At the time and place alleged, the June, 1972 Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was conducting an investigation in conjunction with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 371, 2511, and 22 D.C. Code 1801(b), and of other statutes of the United States and of the District of Columbia had been committed in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to identify the individual or individuals who had committed, caused the commission of, and conspired to commit such violations.

3. It was material to the said investigation that the said Grand Jury ascertain the identity and motives of the individual or individuals who were responsible for, participated in, and had knowledge of efforts to conceal, and to cause to be concealed, information relating to unlawful entries into, and electronic surveillance of, the offices of the Democratic National Committee located in the Watergate office building in Washington, D.C., and related activities.

4. At the time and place alleged, GORDON STRACHAN, the DEFENDANT, appearing as a witness under oath at a proceeding before the said Grand Jury, did knowingly declare with respect to the material matters alleged in paragraph 3 as follows:

Q. Did you, yourself, ever receive any money from the Committee for the Re-election of the President, or from the finance committee to re-elect the President?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the Grand Jury about that?

A. Yes, sir. On April 6, 1972, I received $350,000 in cash.

* * *

Q. From whom?

A. From Hugh Sloan.

* * *

Q. What was done with the money after you received it from Mr. Sloan on April 6th?

A. I put it in the safe.

Q. Was the money ever used?

A. Pardon?

Q. Was the money ever used?

A. No, the money was not used.

Q. To your knowledge, was it ever taken out of the safe?

A. No.

Q. To your knowledge, is it still there?

A. No, it is not.

Q. Where is it?

A. I returned it to the committee, at Mr. Haldeman's direction, at the end of last week.

Q. November of '72?

A. Yes, '72, or early December.

* * *

Q. To whom did you return it?

A. To Fred LaRue.

Q. Where did that transfer take place?

A. I gave it to Mr. LaRue in his apartment.

* * *

Q. That was either late November or early December?

A. That's correct.

Q. Well, let me ask you this: Why would it have been given to Mr. LaRue at his apartment as opposed to being given to the Committee?

A. Well, Mr. LaRue is a member of the Committee and he just asked me to bring it by on my way home from work.

Q. After Mr. Haldeman told you to return the money, what did you do? Did you contact someone to arrange for the delivery?

A. Yes, I contacted Mr. LaRue.

Q. That was at Mr. Haldeman's suggestion or direction?

A. No.

Q. Why is it that you would have called Mr. LaRue?

A. I don't think Stans was in the country at that time. He was not available.

Q. What position did Mr. LaRue occupy that would have made you call him?

A. He was the senior campaign official.

Q. That's the only reason you called him?

A. That's correct.

Q. No one suggested you call him?

* * *

Q. Was anyone present in Mr. LaRue's apartment at the hotel when you did, in fact, give the money to him?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever tell anyone to whom you had given the money? Did you report back to either Mr. Haldeman or anyone else that you had delivered the money and to whom you had delivered the money?

A. I don't think so. I could have mentioned that I had done it. When I received an order, I did it.

Q. Did you get a receipt for the money?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Did you ask for it?

A. No, I did not.

A JUROR: Why?

THE WITNESS: I did not give a receipt when I received the money, so I didn't ask for one when I gave it back.

* * *

A JUROR: Did someone count the money when it came in and when it went out, so they knew there were no deductions made from that $350,000?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I counted the money when I received it, and I counted it when I gave it back.

A JUROR: You solely counted it; no one else was with you?

THE WITNESS: I counted it when I received it alone, and I counted it in front of Mr. LaRue when I gave it back.

A JUROR: You had that money in the White House for seven months and did nothing with it?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

* * *

Q. So who told you to give it to Mr. LaRue?

A. I decided to give it to Mr. LaRue.

Q. On your own [illegible]?

A. That's correct.

Q. Who do you report to?

A. Mr. Haldeman.

Q. Did you report back to Mr. Liddy that you gave it to Mr. LaRue?

A. No, I did not.

Q. You just kept that cash to yourself?

A. He was a senior official at the organization. I gave it back to him. He said he could account for it, and that was it.

Q. Who told you to go to Mr. LaRue and give him the money?

A. I decided that myself.

Q. Do you have a memo in your file relating to this incident?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Did you discuss this incident with anybody afterwards?

A. Yes, I told Mr. Haldeman afterwards that I had given the money to Mr. LaRue.

Q. What did he say to you?

A. Fine. He was a senior campaign official.

Q. What time of day was it that you gave it to Mr. LaRue?

A. In the evening, after work.

Q. Does the finance committee of the Committee to Re-elect the President conduct its business in Mr. LaRue's apartment?

A. No. It was a matter of courtesy. He's a senior official. He asked me to drop it by after work.

* * *

THE FOREMAN: Do you have any idea why Mr. LaRue asked you to return this money to his apartment, where actually you could just walk across 17th Street?

THE WITNESS: No, I do not.

THE FOREMAN: And you could have had the protection of the Secret Service guards with all that money, if you were afraid someone might snatch it [illegible]

THE WITNESS: I wouldn't ask for the Secret Service guards -- protection.

A JUROR: Why not?

THE WITNESS: They protect only the President and his family.

THE FOREMAN: Or the White House guards, whoever. I mean, I find it somewhat dangerous for a person to be carrying this amount of money in Washington, in the evening, and you accompanied by your brother, then it would have been much easier and harder just to walk across 17th Street.

THE WITNESS: I agree, and I was nervous doing it, but I did it.

* * *

THE FOREMAN: I'm still puzzled. You get the money from the treasurer or whatever Mr. Sloan's position was in the Committee -- shall we say on an official basis, between the disbursers and you as the receiver, and the money sits in the safe for seven months; then Mr. Haldeman decides it has to go back to the Committee. You call Mr. LaRue -- you don't call Mr. Sloan and say "Hugh, seven months ago you gave me this $350,000 and we haven't used any of it; I'd like to give it back to you since I got it from you", but you call Mr. LaRue.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Sloan was no longer with the Committee at that time.

THE FOREMAN: Well, whoever took Mr. Sloan's place.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Barrett took Mr. Sloan's place.

THE FOREMAN: Why didn't you call him?

THE WITNESS: I honestly don't know.

* * *

Q. When you got to Mr. LaRue's apartment was he expecting you?

A. Yes. I said I would be by.

Q. And no one was present when you were there?

Q. Was the money counted?

A. Yes, sir, I counted it.

* * *

A JUROR: It must have taken a long time to count that money.

THE WITNESS: It did. It took about 45 minutes. It takes a long time to count it.

* * *

Q. How did you carry this money?

A. In a briefcase.

Q. Did you take the briefcase back, or did you leave it?

A. No, I left the briefcase.

Q. Whose briefcase was it?

A. Gee, I think it was mine. I'm honestly not sure.

Q. Did you ever get the briefcase back?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Have you spoken to Mr. LaRue since that day?

A. No -- well, I ran into him at a party two weeks ago.

Q. Did you have a discussion?

A. No, just talked to him.

5. The underscored portions of the declarations quoted in paragraph 4, made by GORDON STRACHAN, the DEFENDANT, were material to the said investigation and, as he then and there well knew, were false.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1623.)

JEB. JAMOSKI
Special Prosecutor
Watergate Special Prosecution Force

FOREMAN

1 Heading of chapter amended by Pub.L. 87-849, Oct. 23, 1962, 76 Stat. 1119 without amending analysis.

2 Heading of chapter amended by Pub.L. 89-318, Sept. 6, 1965, 79 Stat. 636 without amending analysis.

CHAPTER 19—CONSPIRACY

Library references: Conspiracy ⇐1 et seq.; C.J.S. Conspiracy § 1 et seq.

§ 371. Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 701.

Historical and Revision Notes

Revised Note. Based on Title 18, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §§ 88, 294 (Mar. 4, 1909, c. 321, § 37, 35 Stat. 1096 [derived from R.S. § 5440]; Mar. 1, 1909, c. 321, § 278a, as added Sept. 27, 1944, c. 412, 58 Stat. 730).

This section consolidates said sections 88 and 294 of Title 18 U.S.C., 1940 ed.

To reflect the construction placed upon said section 88 by the courts the words "or any agency thereof" were inserted. (See Haas v. Henkel, 1909, 29 S.Ct. 649, 216 U.S. 462, 54 L.Ed. 569, 17 Ann.Cas. 1112 where court said: "The statute is broad enough in its terms to include any conspiracy for the purpose of impairing, obstructing, or defeating the lawful functions of any department of government." Also, see United States v. Walter, 1922, 41 S.Ct. 10, 263 U.S. 15, 68 L.Ed. 155, and definition of department and agency in section 6 of this title.)

The punishment provision is completely rewritten to alleviate the penalty (from 2 years to 5 years except where the object of the conspiracy is a misdemeanor. If the object is a misdemeanor, the maximum imprisonment for a conspiracy to commit that offense, under the revised section, cannot exceed 1 year.

The injustice of permitting a felony punishment on conviction for conspiracy to commit a misdemeanor is described by the late Hon. George M. Morrow, United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, in an address delivered March 14, 1944, before the section on Federal Practice of the New York Bar Association, reported in

§ 1503. Influencing or injuring officer, juror or witness generally

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness, in any court of the United States or before any United States commissioner or other committing magistrate, or any grand or petit juror, or officer in or of any court of the United States, or officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States commissioner or other committing magistrate, in the discharge of his duty, or injures any party or witness in his person or property on account of his attending or having attended such court or examination before such officer, commissioner, or other committing magistrate, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or injures any such grand or petit juror in his person or property on account of any verdict or indictment assented to by him, or on account of his being or having been such juror, or injures any such officer, commissioner, or other committing magistrate in his person or property on account of the performance of his official duties, or corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 769.

Historical Notes

1962 Amendment. Pub.L. 87-194, § 37 [illegible] (d), Mar. 10, 1962, 76 Stat. 42, inserted [illegible] item 1027.

1954 Amendment. Act Oct. 31, 1951, c. 655, § 25, 65 Stat. 720, substituted, in item 1013, "Public Housing Administration" for "United States Housing Authority".

1949 Amendment. Act [illegible] 1949, [illegible] 63 Stat. 92, [illegible] substituted "officers" for [illegible] 1019. Certificates by [illegible]

Cross References

Alien registration, fraud and false statements, see section [illegible] Nationality.

Carriers' reports to Interstate Commerce Commission, false entries [illegible] 20(7) of Title 49, Transportation.

China Trade, false or fraudulent statements prohibited, see section [illegible] Commerce and Trade.

§ 1001. Statements or entries generally

Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 749.

Historical and Revision Notes

Reviser's Note. Based on Title 18, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 80 (Mar. 4, 1909, c. 321, [illegible] 1934, c. 587, 48 Stat. 996; [illegible] Oct. 23, 1918, [illegible] Apr. 4, 1938, c. 69, 52 Stat. 197).

Section 80 of Title 18, U.S.C., 1940 ed., was divided into two parts.

The provision relating to false claims was incorporated in section 287 of this title.

Reference to persons causing or procuring was omitted as unnecessary in view of definition of "principal" in section 2 of this title.

Words "or any corporation in which the United States of America is a stockholder" in said section 80 were omitted [illegible] in view of [illegible] "agency" in section 6 of this title.

In addition to [illegible] the [illegible] was changed [illegible] consistent with [illegible] (See reviser's note [illegible] this title.) 80th Congress House Report No. 304.

Canal Zone. Applicability of [illegible] Canal Zone, see section 14 of this title.

Cross References

Conspiracy to defraud—

Government in regard to false claims, see section 286 of this title.

United States, see section 371 of this title.

Education, [illegible] as applicable to National Defense Education Program, see section [illegible] of Title 20, Education.

False claims for—

Pensions, [illegible]

Postal [illegible] officer, or agent, see section [illegible]

False entry [illegible]

CHAPTER 79—PERJURY

§ 1621. Perjury generally

Whoever, having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he will testify, declare, depose, or certify truly, or that any written testimony, declaration, deposition, or certificate by him subscribed, is true, willfully and contrary to such oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true, is guilty of perjury, and shall, except as otherwise expressly provided by law, be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. This section is applicable whether the statement or subscription is made within or without the United States. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 773; Oct. 3, 1964, Pub.L. 88-619, § 1, 78 Stat. 995.

Title 18, U.S.C., Section 1623

§ 1623. False declarations before grand jury or court

(a) Whoever under oath in any proceeding before or ancillary to any court or grand jury of the United States knowingly makes any false material declaration or makes or uses any other information, including any book, paper, document, record, recording, or other material, knowing the same to contain any false material declaration, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) This section is applicable whether the conduct occurred within or without the United States.

(c) An indictment or information for violation of this section alleging that, in any proceedings before or ancillary to any court or grand jury of the United States, the defendant under oath has knowingly made two or more declarations, which are inconsistent to the degree that one of them is necessarily false, need not specify which declaration is false if—

(1) each declaration was material to the point in question, and

(2) each declaration was made within the period of the statute of limitations for the offense charged under this section.

In any prosecution under this section, the falsity of a declaration set forth in the indictment or information shall be established sufficient for conviction by proof that the defendant while under oath made irreconcilably contradictory declarations material to the point in question in any proceeding before or ancillary to any court or grand jury. It shall be a defense to an indictment or information made pursuant to the first sentence of this subsection that the defendant at the time he made each declaration believed the declaration was true.

(d) Where, in the same continuous court or grand jury proceeding in which a declaration is made, the person making the declaration admits such declaration to be false, such admission shall bar prosecution under this section if, at the time the admission is made, the declaration has not substantially affected the proceeding, or it has not become manifest that such falsity has been or will be exposed.

(e) Proof beyond a reasonable doubt under this section is sufficient for conviction. It shall not be necessary that such proof be made by any particular number of witnesses or by documentary or other type of evidence.

Added Pub.L. 91-452, Title IV, § 401(a), Oct. 15, 1970, 84 Stat. 933.