

NYTimes JUN 26 1974
**Rodino Panel Embroiled
In Debate Before Public**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 25—Members of the House Judiciary Committee demonstrated today that, even in a process as lofty as impeachment, partisan pressures and human disorder can sometimes prevail.

The confusion centered, first, on a plan to issue a subpoena to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and, later, on uncertainty whether the panel could discuss in public the confidential information that a majority of the committee wanted to make public.

The disorder preceded a vote by the committee to release to the public virtually all of the evidence compiled for the impeachment inquiry.

Eventually, after more than one hour of public debate, the committee went behind closed doors to sort out what it had wrought in public view, to the evident embarrassment of some on the panel.

The committee's decision on the evidence came after the panel met publicly for more than an hour of disorderly debate—some of it personal in tone—that appeared to degenerate into open partisanship.

Democrats tried, and initially failed, to block consideration of a Republican proposal to subpoena from the House Clerk the records of contributions to members of Congress from dairy producer groups whose donations to Mr. Nixon's 1972 re-election campaign are one of the impeachment issues. Mayne of Iowa, the sponsor of the Republican subpoena motion, charged that Democrats were trying to impose "a gag rule and a cover-up" in moving to table the motion without debate.

"This committee cannot properly adopt the double standard," Mr. Mayne said, "of vigorously pursuing evidence of milk fund contributions to the President while ignoring contributions made at about the same time to members of Congress who were pressing the President" to raise Government milk price supports in 1971.

Response by Democrats

Democrats countered that there was a major difference between the action by the President and the members of Congress. The issue, said Representative William L. Hungate, Democrat of Missouri, is whether Mr. Nixon had accepted a bribe from dairy farmer groups and not whether Congressmen had pure motives in urging higher milk price supports.

"No one," Mr. Hungate added, "would confuse horse chestnuts with chestnut horses."

Representative Jack Brooks, Democrat of Texas, described Mr. Mayne's motion as "a rather foolish proposal" and urged that it be tabled or killed.

But some Democrats voted with a solid Republican bloc to defeat the tabling motion, 21 to 15, and at least enable Mr. Mayne to raise the issue.

Eventually, however, after acrimonious debate, the sub-

poena proposal was defeated by the Democrats on a straight party-line vote, 21 to 17.

No sooner had that issue been dealt with than the committee became entwined in a rambling, disorganized argument over whether to eject the public from the meeting in order to decide how much impeachment evidence could be made public.

Representative Jerome R. Waldie, Democrat of California, wondered about the problem of trying to discuss publicly evidence labeled confidential.

At first, Mr. Waldie moved to close the meeting from public view to discuss the evidence in private.

His staunchest supporter, however, was Representative David W. Dennis of Indiana, a Republican as conservative as Mr. Waldie is liberal and a frequent opponent in committee debates.

"I'm overwhelmed by Mr. Dennis," said Mr. Waldie. "I withdraw the motion."

But Representative Hungate then offered to make the motion, and Mr. Dennis again seconded it—but the chairman, Representative Peter W. Rodino Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, apparently did not hear Mr. Hungate make the motion.

When Mr. Hungate brought the matter to Mr. Rodino's attention a second time, the chairman, a surprised look on his face, asked, "Is the gentleman serious about offering the motion?"

"Mr. Chairman," said Mr. Hungate, "I am serious, but I have trouble convincing anyone."

Then the committee debated, at some length, whether it would be possible to decide the principle involved—publication of the evidence—without discussing the content of the evidence.

Mr. Rodino said it did not seem possible. But Representative Robert W. Kastenmeier, Democrat of Wisconsin, said that all Mr. Rodino would have to do would be to admonish committee members that they were not free to discuss confidential material openly.

The matter was sealed finally when Representative Charles E. Wiggins, Republican of California, announced that he intended to discuss specific items of confidential evidence during the debate.

"In that case, we have no choice" but to close the meeting, said Representative John F. Seiberling, Democrat of Ohio.

Speaking with apparent sarcasm, Representative Walter Flowers, Democrat of Alabama, called for a vote and said he did so "with great fear I'm cutting off this stimulating discussion."

The committee voted, 24 to 14, to expel outsiders from the hearing room. The majority was composed of 14 Republicans and 10 Democrats.

And Mr. Waldie, who originally offered the closed-meeting motion, voted against it.