## Evidence Shows Shield Strateg

and Bob Kuttner Washington Post Staff Writers

After John Dean confronted him with the Watergate coverup on March 21, 1973, President Nixon and his chief aides sought as much to construct a protective shield for themselves as to make public disclosures, the House Ju-diciary Committee's evidence indi-

The committee's book of evidence covering the period March 22 to April 30, 1973, documents intensive efforts to keep the scandal clear of the President at the time he was vowing that an investigation of his own would stop at nothing to bring all the facts out.

The effort, which culminated in the dismissal of Dean and the resignations of two of those aides, H. R. (Bob Haldeman and John D. Ehrlichman, on April 30, included these key elements, according to the committee presenta-

• Mounting the appearance, more than the substance, of a thorough, inhouse investigation, first by Dean and,

when he failed to produce a satisfactory report, then by Ehrlichman.

• Planning how to deal with the Senate Watergate Committee, including which Nixon aides should testify, whether executive privilege should be invoked, and the "babysitting" of Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.), the

ranking minority member.

• Seeking to determine what witnesses before the Watergate prosecunesses before the watergate prosecutors and the federal grand jury were saying, by having then Atty. Gen. Richard G. Kleindienst get that information from Assistant Atty. Gen. Henry E. Petersen and report daily to the White House.

• Urging such witnesses to make sure they did not implicate the Presi-

dent or his ranking aides.

• Developing a record, in the course of the in-house investigation, that would demonstrate that the President had urged key figures in the case, including former Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell and convicted Watergate conspirator G. Gordon Liddy, to tell all they knew.

The committee's book of evidence covering this period contains little material not previously published. There is, however, a key memorandum by former White House counsel Charles W. Colson that suggests Haldeman favored action to prevent convicted Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt

from telling all.

One of the charges in the federal indictment against Haldeman and others is that on March 21, 1973, after a meeting with the President in the Oval Office, hush money to Hunt was authorized and paid. A critical point in the impeachment inquiry is whether Mr. Nixon knew of, authorized or failed to

stop the payment.

In his memo for the files dated March 23, 1973, Colson wrote:

"Bob Haldeman just called and asked what representations I hadmade to Howard Hunt with respect to the commutation of his sentence. I told him that I had made no representation." tion.

Hunt's lawyer, William O. Bittman, had called him, Colson wrote, and told him Hunt "did not want to go to jail, that he was going to jail, but didn't

want to stay in jail beyond the end of this year." In reply, Colson said, he told Bittman "essentially that I considered myself Howard Hunt's friend, that I would do anything anytime that I possibly could for Howard."

Colson wrote that Hunt "could get any impression he wanted" from that, "but that I was explicit in my recollec-

"but that I was explicit in my recollection that I had not said anything that would give anyone cause to have any specific understandings. In fact, there was no understanding .

"Bob then asked me what would happen if Hunt 'blew.' I said I thought it would be very bad, that from what I knew he would say things that would be very damaging.

"Bob said, 'Then we can't let that happen.'"

happen.

The Colson memo did not elaborate on what Haldeman intended to do.

The book of evide nce for this period also included previously unpublished recommendations (Colson said he and his law partner, Lawid Shapiro, made to Mr. Nixon thro ugh Ehrlichman on to Mr. Nixon thrd ugh Enrichman on April 13, 1973, on how to handle the Watergate matter. They included ordering anyone "in volved in authorizing, planning or ap proving" the Watergate either to come forward or be exposed; waiving of executive privilege for them and others who could testify on campling matters like testify on camp aign matters, like Haldeman and him iself; appointment of a special independ ent counsel and firing of Dean; sumi noning Liddy to the Oval Office to be told by the President himself "to tell the whole truth" as the only way to be considered for clem-

Ehrlichman, for his part, however, was following a d ifferent strategy, the Judiciary docume ntation indicates.

The evidence paints Ehrlichman spending most of his efforts to contain the damage rathe r than investigate the extent of the sc andal, as both President Nixon and Ehrlichman have insisted.

According to the official White House version, Mr. Nixon instructed Ehrlichman to pick up John Dean's investigation after Dean appeared to be implicating himse if.

Ehrlichman has s testified in a civil Enrichman has a testined in a civil suit that "The Pi resident called me in on the 30th and said, 'My suspicions (about Dean) arel crystalized and I want you to get into this.'.. "He said it was evident to him at that point that Dean was into the e thing up to his eye-

Pinpointing the President's order as coming during it noon meeting on March 30, Ehrlich man testified to the Senate Watergate Committee that the President told hin 2 to "step into what Dean has been do ing here . . . I need to know where the truth lies in this thing.'

But the Judicias y Committee evidence indicates Nixton never gave Ehrlichman such an or der. The noon meeting, according to t he White House edited tape, was a strategy session between Ehrlichman, President Nixon and press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler. A new investigation of the White House staff is mentioned only as House staff is menti oned only as a possible new public melations device to tell the press.

At one point in the conversation, Mr. Nixon suggests that Ziegler might say that the President has "called for an investigation of the White House staff," and that every member of the staff under any suspiction "has submitted a sworn affidavit to me denying any knowledge."

Too defensive, replie's Ehrlichman, and worse, it alludes ton "a piece of paper that becomes the 1 ocal point for a subpoena." The conver sation continues in a like vein, focusing a seclusively on public relations. There is nothing resembling an order that Ehrlichman conduct an investigation conduct an investigation a.

A similar conversatio m en March 27 also includes the discu ssion of tactics to limit damage.

At one point, Ehrlic hman tells the President that Egil Krongh has admitted to having authorize d the Ellsberg break-in and is prepa red to resign. "Should he?" the Presid ent asks. Ehrlichman replies:

"I don't think he will have to. Number one, I don't think H ant will strike him. If he did, I would p at the national security tent over this whole opera-

"I sure would," says the President.

At the March 27 mereting, Ehrlichman, Haldeman and Mr. Nixon also discuss an approach to F Heindienst for grand jury information. "Ask Kleindienst, John," the Presid ent tells Ehrlichman. "Put it on the basis that you're not asking nor in effect is the White House asking; that John "Mitchell says you've got to have this information from the grand jury at this time and from the grand jury at this time and you owe it to him."

The next day, Ehrl ichman tells Kleindienst in a conversation taped by the former that the Pre sident's "best information" is that "neit her Dean nor

Haldeman nor Colson nor I nor anybody in the White House had any prior knowledge of his burglary," and that "He's counting on you to provide him with any information to the contrary if it ever turns up."

Like others, the conversation serves a dual, contradictory purpose: it builds a dual, contradictory purpose: it builds a record that the President wants his Attorney General to leave no stone unturned in pursuing the truth; it also widens a channel for the President's defenders to get at the grand jury information formation.

Throughout the period of Ehrlichman's supposed investigation, he reported back to the President. The discussions focus on who is likely to implicate whom.

"Liddy has pulled the plug on Magruder," Ehrlichman tells the President on April 8. However nothing that Dean could say will harm John Mitchell, he adds.

"But it would harm Magruder," the President concludes.

"Right," says Ehrlichman.

Mitchell's own vulnerability and likely posture are increasing concerns. They discuss Magruder "pulling the plug" on Mitchell. "We don't want Mitchell, you know, popping off," says the President the President.

A week later, on April 14, the President, Haldeman and Ehrlichman have an intensive, 2½-hour conversation about how to approach Mitchell. The subject is not who is culpable, but whether Mitchell will take the fall. The President asks Ehrlichman to summon Mitchell.

Later the same afternoon, Ehrlichman raises the question of meeting Kleindienst to "get this thing wrapped up." The purpose would be to show that the White House had begun its investigation before indictments own investigation before indictments

"I had ordered an independent investigation at the time McCord had something to say," the President agrees. "Right."

The findings were sufficiently serious to be turned over to the Justice Department, Ehrlichman suggests.

Still later, Ehrlichman phones Kleindienst to report on his investigation, which comes as a surprise to the Attorney General. "The conversation and what ensured the night in my home was the most shocking day of my life," Kleindienst later told the Watergate grand jury in secret testimony made public by the Judiciary Committee.