

OCT 12 1973

Dear Jim,

Ervin committee suppressions? 10/9/73

Today I received Vols. 2-4 of the hearings, from my Senator, who assured me I am on the committee's mailing list. This, no doubt, accounts for my not having received the first copy from that mailing list. Also, they are still trying to get the exhibits I have been refused for me. With the hearings I did some checking. I find that where I think they are in the lists, they are undescribed. They could be used toilet paper from the description. In the text, not much better. And to make it worse, where Ervin quotes from one, which I noticed by accident, he uses a wrong exhibit number and that is faithfully footnoted to the wrong citation. I checked it. Any check would have disclosed this to whoever edited or prepared. Ervin cited Exhibit 36. He may have meant 6.

By way of explanation, if I have not carboned you, I'm seeking xeroxes of the originals of Nixon's spy plan of 1970, the so-called Huston papers. My recollection of what Ervin said about them is not identical with the words I find at the end of the session of 6/25/73, p. 1020: "...will ~~be~~ admitted into evidence all of the exhibits identified by the witness in the course of his testimony except exhibits Nos. 34-5, 34-6, 34-7, and 34-8 whose admissibility will be considered later by the committee."

I am confident I heard him say that some pages would be removed for "national security" and the others not withheld, whatever his phrasing.

If you still have this tape and if it would be no trouble to locate the very end of that day, 6/25 (all ~~that~~ that follows is formalizing recess, 11 words), I'd appreciate the exact language, for several reasons. Obvious use. Another is to give to the Senator. If he was not part of this and if he is really opposed to hanky-panky, if Ervin gets some proof, assuming I'm right, he may find out something about what I think is going on.

Aside from this, some or all the documents have been published. Not knowing and not being able to tell from their avoidance of any description what they put into evidence - I am sure the number four can't refer to four separate documents only - I can't be sure. My recollection is that by date 11 different ones have been cited in the papers. The Post and Times reprinted some allegedly verbatim. I don't see how they can withhold those or attribute any need to withhold. I suspect this is what the Senator's staff is working on.

2 goes through 6/14, Magruder.

3 is Dean only, 6/25, 26.

4 is the rest of Dean and Mitchell 7/10 only.

All exhibits seem to be in facsimile - even all the "enemies". In skimming I find some fascinating. Colson started laying a false trail based on what he knew others would say almost immediately, not later than 6/20/72.

The Ogarrio checks, which do not seem to bear any US bank stamps, have notations including a series of 415 phone numbers, if they interest you. The notes appear to have been added to xerox copies. 622-3456; 661-659 (likely Banco of America); 662-2548 Mrs. Jacklyn. The first, reverse, endorsement, even has his name typed "AMNUEL"

Have to drop this fascinating stuff and get back to reading a completed chapter for "il to read so she can type.

If checking the tape, if you still have, represents any appreciable amount of work, don't bother. I've finished with that too-long chapter. But I'm interested in this Senate hiding that serves no immediate purpose. And the reason(s).

Nothing new. Hope you are all ok.