

Dean Charges Efforts to Prevent Testimony About White House

MAY 11, 1973

NYTimes

By WALTER RUGABER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 10 — John W. Dean 3d, the deposed White House counsel, charged today that there "is an ongoing effort to limit or prevent my testifying fully and freely" in the Watergate investigation.

The 34-year-old lawyer asserted that there had been at-

tempts to influence the handling of his statements by the Government prosecutors and that "restrictions have been placed on the scope of my testimony as it relates to the White House."

Mr. Dean also said in a statement issued through his attorneys that there was an "unwillingness to accept the truth" in the White House that

still prevails among some who are affected by the truth." The former White House official, who was forced to resign on April 30, gave no elaboration of what he knows about the conspiracy to spy on Democrats last year and the alleged Nixon Administration cover-up attempt.

It was disclosed yesterday that the Justice Department intends to delay for 30 days a court order under which Mr. Dean could be granted immunity from prosecution and forced to testify before the select Senate committee investigating the Watergate break-in.

Other developments today include the following:

¶The select Senate committee chairman, Sam J. Ervin Jr. of

Continued on Page 20, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

North Carolina, said that aside from the 30-day delay there was nothing the Justice Department could do to prevent Mr. Dean's testimony.

¶Hugh W. Sloan Jr., former treasurer of President Nixon's campaign organization, said in sworn testimony that two other aides had tried to persuade him to perjure himself and that he had informed other officials of this.

¶James W. McCord Jr., in his first public testimony, gave multiple details of the inception and execution of the conspiracy to wiretap telephones at the offices of the Democratic National Committee.

Lawyers for the Democratic National Committee said they would attempt to take pretrial testimony from Mr. Dean in their civil suit against the Republicans. The deposition was set for May 17.

There have been conflicting reports this week on the evidence Mr. Dean, who is known to be seeking immunity from prosecution, could supply to the Senate and the grand jury.

Newsweek and Time magazines said that Mr. Dean was ready to testify that he believed President Nixon was informed of efforts to cover up the anti-Democratic plot.

But The New York Times said in today's editions that both the Government prosecutors and Senate sources believed that Mr. Dean had no evidence that would implicate the President.

'Unidentified Sources'

"The news stories quoting unidentified sources and speculating on the nature of my testimony did not come from me, have not been authorized by me, nor have they come from my attorneys," Mr. Dean said today.

"The information contained in these stories is neither complete nor accurate," said in his two-page statement. "I have not, and will not, leak my testimony to the media."

Despite Mr. Dean's assertion, it is known that some of the articles, attributed to "friends" of Mr. Dean and relating his threat to implicate superiors in the Watergate cover-ups, were provided to newsmen by one of his attorneys and described as authoritative reports.

Mr. Dean said that in the last four or five months, there had been discussions in the White House on how to "end the Watergate story," but that there was always "an unwillingness to accept the truth for what it meant."

"I have always been—as I am now—prepared to have the truth emerge," Mr. Dean asserted, "but I am not willing to see the truth distorted further nor am I willing to shoulder the blame for those unwilling to accept the truth."

Intimidation Charged

Mr. Dean charged that there had been attempts to "publicly intimidate me" and to "discredit me personally in the hope of discrediting my testimony." He did not elaborate.

Even before Mr. Dean uttered a word of sworn, public testimony on the affair, a growing controversy had developed over his credibility.

Mr. Dean's supporters and others suspect an effort to protect Mr. Nixon and other high officials from possible embarrassment while Mr. Dean's critics believe he is merely trying to avoid prison by implicating others.

The prosecution has refused to grant him immunity from prosecution or to call him before the Federal grand jury now investigating the case. It contends that Senate immunity for Mr. Dean would damage any prosecution of him.

But Senate authorities and others contend that committee testimony by Mr. Dean under a grant of immunity would not prevent the Government from using evidence it has already gathered against him.

"I point out that those who are charged with responsibility for conducting an investigation have had jurisdiction of this case" since last June, Senator Ervin said today.

The added: "The F.B.I., the Department of Justice, the attorneys assigned to the prosecution have supposedly been studying this case since last summer. If they can't show enough evidence to convict people by this time, they maybe ought to go out of business."

Suggestions of Perjury

Mr. Sloan charged in a deposition in the Watergate civil litigation, a transcript of which was made public today, that suggestions of perjury had come last June from two Nixon committee officials.

He named Jeb Stuart Magruder, then deputy director of the Committee for the Re-election of the President, and Frederick C. Larue, then an assistant to former Attorney General John N. Mitchell.

Mr. Sloan testified before the grand jury and at the Watergate trial last January that he had paid \$199,000 in campaign cash to G. Gordon Liddy, a defendant who was later convicted in the conspiracy.

About a week after the break-in at the Watergate on June 17, Mr. Sloan testified, Mr. Larue said he had mentioned to Mr. Larue "the magnitude of the amount of money

involved, whether I had a precise figure or not."

"He said something to the effect that it can't be that high; we can't use a figure that high," Mr. Sloan said. The witness said he replied that it was a problem no matter what the amount.

In July, Mr. Sloan said, Mr. Magruder came to him and that at this point he "definitely knew" Liddy had received \$199,000. Mr. Magruder was quoted as suggesting "a figure of \$70,000 or \$80,000."

Mr. Sloan testified: "I responded that I would not perjure myself. As I recall it, he said, 'You may have to.' And I left his office at that point."

New Amount Cited

At still another meeting in early July, Mr. Sloan said, Mr. Magruder "brought up the subject again . . . that we would have to agree to a figure, and he at this time suggested, I believe, a figure of \$40,000."

Later, Mr. Sloan said, he agreed "that if I were asked whether I had given Mr. Liddy \$40,000 I would say yes, but I would not agree to not saying it was more if I was asked about it or the precise amount if that question were asked."

Of a July 13 meeting with Mr. Larue, Mr. Sloan said:

"It seemed apparent to me that the committee, with political decision-making going into this, was heading in the direction of—I am not sure of my choice of words—but it was obvious to me, anyway, by what had been addressed to me in terms of suggestions that I tell an untrue story, a general atmosphere of suggesting a Fifth Amendment, that this was something I did not want to be a party to."

Mr. Sloan resigned as treasurer of the financial arm of the re-election committee on July 14.

Neither Mr. Magruder nor Mr. Larue, said to be among those under grand jury investigation, have been available for comment.

Mr. Sloan also said in his deposition that he had informed the three Government prosecutors in the case—Earl J. Silbert, Seymour Glazer and Donald E. Campbell—of the approaches from Mr. Larue and Mr. Magruder and that the information was given to the grand jury last year.

Mr. Sloan then described approaches to a number of high Administration figures, including Mr. Dean, John D. Ehrlichman and Dwight L. Chapin.

He said he did not recall Mr. Dean's reaction on being informed "about the efforts being made to perjure yourself."

'Developing Problem'

On meeting with Mr. Ehrlichman, who resigned last week as the President's domestic adviser, Mr. Sloan said:

"I expressed the thought that I thought there was a developing problem with the committee. I think I got as far as saying there were funds that I did not know where they went, that there might be a connection with [the break-in]."

"He told me to go no further, that he didn't want any of the details. He said his position was that he would have to take executive privilege until after the election in any case."

Mr. Sloan said that he had suggested to Mr. Chapin, who resigned earlier this year as Mr. Nixon's appointments secretary that "somebody ought to look into" what was going on in the campaign.

"His reaction essentially was (1) you are overwrought and (2) the important thing is to protect the President and (3) you ought to take a vacation."

"I don't know how to describe the atmosphere in talking to all of these people," Mr. Sloan said. "It was sort of everything is going to work out."

At one point before the break-in, Mr. Sloan said, he became concerned with the large sums that were going to Liddy, then counsel to the fund-raising unit, and that he went to Maurice H. Stans, chairman of the organization.

'Totals Mounting'

Mr. Sloan said:

"The totals were mounting up without any knowledge on our part of what, in fact, had happened to the money. He [Mr. Stans] indicated to me at that point in response to an inquiry along those lines that, 'I don't want to know and you don't want to know.'"

On another occasion, Mr. Sloan testified, Mr. Stans had asked how to get a \$100,000 contribution out of Mexico. This was just prior to April 7, when strict reporting requirements were to take effect, and Mr. Sloan said:

"At this point, we were in a situation where the contributions were coming in so rapidly we really had to cut off and we couldn't even send people out to pick up contributions that were under \$100,000."

McCord's deposition, taken on April 30 and May 1 and resulting in a transcript of 383 pages, produced no major new revelations. The convicted plotter detailed the bugging conspiracy from its inception in early 1972.

McCord said that he, Liddy and E. Howard Hunt Jr., a third conspirator, held a number of planning sessions and that he and Hunt "cased" the Democratic National Committee offices on several occasions before the break-in.