

NYTimes JUN 22 1973
Data on Dean-Nixon Conflict Incomplete

By WALTER RUGABER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 21—The expected conflicts on the Watergate affair between the White House and its former counsel, John W. Dean 3d, have failed to emerge fully in the limited statements made public so far.

Mr. Dean, who is scheduled to go before the Senate Watergate committee next week, was interviewed privately by the panel's staff, and excerpts from a report on this session were published in The New York Times today.

The White House version of Mr. Dean's contacts with President Nixon, also published in today's Times, is distinctly different in tone and in thrust. But these and other documents are often incomplete and frequently fail to join the issues.

For example, the Senate report quotes Mr. Dean as having said he met with the President after the first indictments in the Watergate case, naming seven men, were handed up last Sept. 15.

"Nixon said that Haldeman had reported what a good job Dean had done," the report said referring to H. R. Haldeman, the former White House chief of staff. There was no elaboration in the report.

Clash Hinted At

Newspaper accounts have indicated previously that Mr. Dean took this Sept. 15 remark as evidence that President Nixon was aware, at least by that time, of the efforts to cover up responsibility for the conspiracy.

The White House account noted merely that on Sept. 15 Mr. Dean "reported Watergate indictments." It also said that as late as March 20 Mr. Dean

told the President there had been no "White House" involvement.

Administration loyalists have insisted that the "good job" remark carried no sinister overtones, and several officials have testified that Mr. Dean held to the position of no "White House" involvement until March.

Thus, the documents hint at but do not fully pose a clash over the implications of the Presidential praise and over the significance of "White House" involvement as opposed to involvement by major figures elsewhere in the Administration.

Similarly, the Senate report quotes Mr. Dean as alleging that Gordon C. Strachan, an aid to Mr. Haldeman, "had received instructions from Haldeman to destroy documents—these related to wiretap information."

Mr. Haldeman dealt with this point at length in his pretrial deposition taken last month in connection with the Democratic National Committee's civil suit against Mr. Nixon's political organization.

Immediately after the Watergate arrests, Mr. Haldeman testified, he asked Mr. Strachan "if there had been any evidence received by your office, by him on my behalf, that would have given us any knowledge" of the bugging.

"... He said that there had not," Mr. Haldeman swore. But "in retrospect" Mr. Strachan had recalled a possible "exception" in the receipt of three documents "that had some nature of being reports of confidential information."

"Did you ask him to show you those three memorandums?" the former White House chief of staff was asked.

"No," he said.

"Did you ever see those three memorandums?"

"... To my knowledge I did not, except that he [Mr. Strachan] indicated that one of them may have been sent to me in a stack of material."

The attorneys examining Mr. Haldeman for the Democrats did not ask him whether he had ordered the documents destroyed. Mr. Haldeman's lawyers have objected to questions about events after the Watergate arrests.

Another Issue

On an issue related to events before the cover-up, Mr. Dean told Senate investigators that after a second meeting at which espionage plans had been discussed he had "told Haldeman what had been going on, and Haldeman agreed that Dean should stay out of it."

The proposals were advanced by G. Gordon Liddy in the office of former Attorney General John N. Mitchell, and several of the participants have said they dismissed them as preposterous and considered them abandoned.

Mr. Haldeman was asked during his testimony in the civil suit whether he recalled Mr. Dean's statement on the meeting and replied:

"I don't have a recollection of his giving me that report to my clear and present recollection, but I have no reason to question his statement that he did. I think I am willing to accept that as a possibility."

The possibility Mr. Haldeman was willing to accept is that Mr. Dean had informed him that Liddy's proposals were rejected out of hand. Mr. Haldeman said he did not remember that wiretapping had been proposed, and denied any prior knowledge that it was actually carried out.