

NYTimes
JUL 12 1974
**St. Clair Tries to Discredit
Dean Before House Panel**

By DAVID E. ROSENBAUM
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 11—President Nixon's chief defense lawyer tried today to discredit John W. Dean 3d before the House Judiciary Committee in what one committee member called "a real bloodletting."

It was the first chance ever for James D. St. Clair or any of the President's other lawyers to cross-examine Mr. Dean, once Mr. Nixon's legal counsel and, for more than a year, the chief witness against the President.

Meanwhile, the committee released today heretofore secret grand jury testimony bearing on \$75,000 paid to E. Howard Hunt Jr. last year.

A central point in Mr. St. Clair's defense in the impeachment inquiry is that the money paid to Mr. Hunt, one of the seven convicted in the original Watergate burglary case, was for legitimate expenses and not to meet a blackmail threat.

Hunt Testimony Noted

However, according to the grand jury records, Mr. Hunt testified that he was clearly threatening the White House when he made his demand for money. And John D. Ehrlichman, one of the President's principal assistants, told the grand jury that "blackmail" was involved.

The Judiciary Committee members differed, depending on their viewpoint about impeachment, on whether Mr. St. Clair had successfully challenged Mr. Dean's credibility.

But the members agreed on two points: that Mr. Dean had stood by the now familiar story he told to the Senate Watergate committee last summer, and that Mr. St. Clair had attacked his testimony with ferocity and dexterity.

"He's doing what any good

Continued on Page 23, Column 6

Continued From Page 1, Col. 6
his credibility, in my mind, is in serious doubt."
But, when he made the same statement to a Republican colleague, Representative Henry P. Smith 3d, of upstate New York, during a break in the hearing, Mr. Smith reportedly replied:

"I wouldn't say that St. Clair has scored any big fat points. I keep looking for the bolt of lightning, and I don't see it."
As he had with previous witnesses, Mr. St. Clair tried today to rebut what he believes to be the central allegation against the President: that Mr. Nixon ordered or at least sanctioned the payment of hush money to Mr. Hunt.

Question About Memory

Time and again, the members reported, Mr. St. Clair tried to show that Mr. Dean had been inconsistent.

How, he asked, could Mr. Dean, given his remarkable memory, not remember whether a critical telephone call occurred on March 20 or March 21? Why, he wanted to know, did Mr. Dean in his Senate testimony last year make some statements that differed from what he had told the grand jury?

But Mr. Dean, described as polished and self-assured in his testimony, reportedly could not be seriously shaken from his story. He testified once again that he believed the President was aware of the Watergate cover-up as early as September, 1972; that he and the President discussed the matter throughout March, 1973; that on March 21, 1973, he laid out the full cover-up scheme for the President, and that thereafter he was disappointed when the President took no action to end the scheme.

Harm to Nixon Cited

Representative Edward Mezvinsky, an Iowa Democrat, said that he thought Mr. Dean's testimony had been harmful to the President's case because it had left "the impression that the President knew of the cover-up before March 21."

Mr. Dean reportedly said that he believed that the question of payments had come up in a discussion between him and the President before March 21, although he could not pinpoint the occasion. The transcript of their March 13 conversation contains a hint that Mr. Nixon knew that money was paid to the Watergate defendants.

Representative Lawrence R. Hogan, a Maryland Republican, told reporters that there were "substantial discrepancies" in Mr. Dean's testimony and that

there any other interpretation other than the clear meaning of the words that you would review your options for alternatives other than that you would tell about these so-called seamy things unless they met your demands?

A. No.

Mr. Hunt went on to say that he was threatening, unless he was paid, to tell about the burglary of the office of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg's former psychiatrist, the forging of State Department cables and the political dirty tricks of Donald Segretti.

Ehrlichman's Quoted

Mr. Ehrlichman's grand jury testimony was also damaging to Mr. St. Clair's argument. Mr. Ehrlichman told the grand jury last September, the record shows, that, when Mr. Dean told him about Mr. Hunt's demand, "I said it looked to me like blackmail."

There seems to be no doubt, from the transcript of Mr. Nixon's conversation with Mr. Dean on March 21, 1973, that they were talking in terms of hush money. Mr. St. Clair, however, has argued that the President considered paying silence money as an option but never ordered that it be paid.

As to the question of whether the scheme was set in motion before the Nixon-Dean discussion, Mr. Dean testified that he and Mr. LaRue had talked about the payment earlier.

To some Republicans, that buttressed the President's case. But other committee members failed to see why the sequence of events mattered in the impeachment inquiry. To them, it was enough that the President did not order the scheme abandoned.

'Not Critical Factor'

Mr. Mezvinsky said that the "time sequence is not the critical factor in whether the President directed or acquiesced in the payment to hunt."

He went on to say that "the tapes are conclusive on that point" and that the undisputed events and discussions before and after the payment left no other conclusion but that the President was culpable.

Mr. Fish is thought to be a key Republican who has not yet made up his mind about impeachment.

*Excerpts from testimony, Newsweek 22 Jul 74, p. 25, filed 15 Jul 74