

6/18/73 mjt

Excerpts From Haldeman's May 22 and 24

Replies to Attorneys for Democrats

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 7—Following are excerpts from a deposition made by H. R. Haldeman on May 22 and May 24 under examination by two attorneys, Maurice R. Dunie, representing the Democratic National Committee, and Charles A. McNelis, representing Lawrence F. O'Brien, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee:

Q. Prior to June 17th of 1972, Mr. Haldeman, did you have any knowledge, personal or hearsay, of any plans to engage in a bugging attempt at the Democratic National Committee headquarters? A. I did not.

Q. Have you ever in your contacts with Mr. Magruder, particularly prior to June 17th, been led to believe that there may be such political espionage plans under way? I am speaking specifically now of bugging operations and that type of thing. A. No.

Would it be fair to describe you as the liaison person between the White House and the committee interested in working for the re-election of the President?

A. No, I don't believe so. I think that it would be more accurate to say that the President looked to me as his basic contact with the campaign in general, that I maintained a continuing communication with John Mitchell when he was campaign director and prior to the time he became campaign director, and with Clark McGregor after he replaced John Mitchell as campaign director, but I would not say that I functioned as a continuing liaison with the committee.

Q. Mr. Haldeman, prior to June 17, 1972, had you received any funds from the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President? A. I am not sure whether they were funds from the Finance Committee for the Re-election of the President. I did receive \$350,000—I didn't but it was received by Gordon Strachan for me—prior to the start of the campaign reporting period in cash.

Quotes Strachan

Q. Was that on or about April 6, 1972? A. That is what I am told by Mr. Strachan, yes. I don't have any first-hand knowledge of the speci-

fic of this, but I am telling you what Mr. Strachan has told me.

Q. Do you know from whom he obtained those funds from the Finance Committee? A. I understand he obtained them from Hugh Sloan.

Q. Did he obtain those funds on your instructions? A. Yes.

Q. Did he deliver these funds to you? A. No.

Q. To whom did he [Gordon Strachan] deliver the funds? A. He had the money held in a safe deposit box or a safekeeping box or safe—I am not sure what—but by another individual whose name I don't know.

Q. Were they kept in the White House? A. No, sir. It is my understanding they were kept, I believe, in Alex-

andria, in Virginia some place.

Q. Did you make any arrangements yourself with the Finance Committee for Mr. Strachan to pick up this money?

A. I am not sure exactly. I don't recall clearly exactly how the arrangements were made, but there was an agreement that I believe was concurred in, and it may have been discussed in a meeting or a telephone conversation with certainly Mr. Mitchell and I believe Mr. Stans and quite possibly Mr. Kalmbach prior to the April 7th time, that \$350,000 would be held out from the cash funds that were to become a part of the cam-



Associated Press

H. R. Haldeman, right, former White House chief of staff, with Representatives Lucien N. Nedzi, left, of Michigan and F. Edward Hebert of Louisiana. Mr. Haldeman appeared before the House Armed Services subcommittee looking into C.I.A. matters.

paigned fund on April 7th and would be held for me for possible polling use by the White House during the campaign period. That would be private polling as contrasted to campaign polling.

Q. Did there ever come a time when you personally saw the money? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever authorize the expenditure of any of that \$350,000 prior to June 17th?

A. I am not sure, but I am told by Mr. Strachan that sometime in April or May he had told me that there was a request for \$22,000, an immediate request for \$22,000, to pay for some advertising that was not directly related to the campaign and that I authorized the use of \$22,000 out of this fund for that purpose and that he then had the man who was holding this cash for him deliver \$22,000, I believe, to the advertising people who were to place this ad.

Q. Prior to June 17, 1972 did you have any conversations with Jeb Magruder relative to facts involving the Watergate operation? A. No.

Mitchell Present

Q. Did you have any further conversations with him up to the present time in which he made any statements to you indicating that he did have knowledge of the Watergate matter prior to June 17, 1972? A. Yes, he did. I think that would have been the conversation that I had with him with John Mitchell present in late March of 1973. I had a meeting at Mitchell's request, as I recall, first with Mitchell alone and then joined by Magruder with Mitchell remaining.

Q. Will you tell us, please, what was said by the various parties to that meeting?

A. To the best of my recollection there was a discussion of the question which Mr. Mitchell had raised and which Mr. Magruder also wanted to discuss and which the two of them wanted subsequently to discuss with John Dean. That was the question of the number and content of meetings that had been held in the early part of 1972, possibly the end of '71, but either the end of '71 or early '72, regarding so-called intelligence operations.

There was a feeling on Mr. Mitchell's part that there was a disagreement as to how many such meetings had been held and as to what the content of those meetings was. I am not exactly sure the reason for this question being raised in a meeting with me except that as I understood it Mr. Mitchell wanted subsequently to meet with Mr. Dean on this subject. I was brought into the question in terms of whether Mr. Dean had said anything to me about any such meetings.

Because I tried to reconstruct a conversation from a long time ago and it is difficult for me to do in view of all the intervening events and things I have read. But I will try to put it in what I believe was the content of that conversation at that time. To do that, however, I have to refer to an earlier conversation with John Dean in which he reminded me or said he was reminding me that he told me that there had been two such meetings regarding intelligence planning attended by John Mitchell, Job Magruder, Gordon Liddy and himself; that those meetings were held in John Mitchell's office and were for the purpose of Gordon Liddy presenting to them plans and recommendations for intelligence activity.

'Word Was Incredible'

Dean told me that after the second of those two meetings he reported to me that he had attended these two meetings or at least had attended the second one; that at the second meeting there had been a plan discussed by Mr. Liddy which he found to be totally unacceptable and I believe his word was incredible; that it was a plan so out of the question that he says he told me at the time that he had said that it should not even be discussed in the Attorney General's office and he made very strongly at the meeting

the point that there should be no further such discussion of such kinds of things, and that the reason that he was reporting this to me was to tell me that he intended not to involve himself in any further meetings if here should be any regarding intelligence planning with Mr. Liddy; that he felt this was not a productive thing for him to do and he intended not to do so, and he says I agreed with him. I have strayed off this earlier conversation, but I need this point as a base for the purpose of the conversation with Magruder and Mitchell.

During that period of time, the July, August, and I would add September and October period, in other words, from the time of the Watergate break-in to the election, really, there were periodic new developments with regard to Watergate that would appear in the press or that would come forth as a part of the investigation or the various actions that were being taken by the prosecutors, court and so on. Whenever there was such a development there was a concern expressed on the President's part, usually to me, that we try to get the facts in this matter determined and made known.

There was a natural concern on his part being at that time up for re-election and conducting a campaign for re-election that the insinuations and appearances and allegations that were arising would be detrimental to that campaign effort and that there was a desire that the facts be known, cleared up and established in the public mind as well as legally so that those doubts would not persist. Those questions from the President or urgings from the President would give rise to my inquiry of Dean again,

"Can't we get the full story out?"

As I recall it, and I, again, can't give you specific time points, during the course of that time there were varying reasons why a full story wasn't available. They related to the lack of knowledge of what really did happen and of who really was involved at some points, at least, of conflicting statements of testimony of various individuals who would be presumed to have knowledge of what was involved; and then other factors were also brought in—the questions of rights of defendants, the questions of the ongoing legal process as contrasted to the ongoing political process.

Q. Then after the election and until the meeting you have told us about in March did you have any further conversations with Dean relative to the Watergate break-in?

A. I am sure there were some; I don't think there were very many. They would have been of the same nature. In the period from the election through the end of the year, once the election was over, there was a new concern on the President's part, having just been re-elected, that this matter, any questions pending on the Watergate and so on, be cleared up not for the reason of the effect on the election but for the effect on the start of the new term and the desire that before the Congress returned and before the President was inaugurated that the whole matter be cleared up and made known so that it wouldn't be hanging over into the second term.

As a result of that concern (and I think during that period there were probably some developments in the case—I am not sure what the chronology is there but we

are leading up to the time of the trial, I guess, at that point) he would have raised again questions as to why this couldn't now be cleared up. Basically, the answers continued to be the same. There was still a very real question as to what the facts were; the same negative answer that there was still in his, in Dean's, view no involvement of White House personnel was sustained very strongly. It basically continued in that same pattern.

Q. In other words, would it be fair to say, Mr. Halde- man, that from July until the early meeting which you had with Dean there was essentially no change in what he told you so far as pre- June 17th events were concerned and that the essence of what he kept telling you was that there was no involvement by White House personnel? Is that a fair statement?

A. Yes, I think it is with the modification that I wouldn't necessarily put the fix on early March as the time of an expansion of that. It could have been mid- until late-February.

Q. That leads me to this question: From June 17, until the time that you resigned as assistant to the President, were the President's sources of information to the best of your knowledge concerning the Watergate affair?

Directly With Dean

A. The principal source would be inquiries that he would make of me or John Ehrlichman as to the status of the case, which we were subsequently—I had better speak for myself—which I would subsequently direct to John Dean. In other words, I would relay the question to John and relay the answer back to the President. That would have been the case up to, let's say, the latter part of February, latter part of February, 1973. Starting at the latter part of February, I believe, the President met directly with John Dean and I was not in those meetings, so I can't report on the content of them except that I know they were related to Watergate and not solely to the events prior to June 17th but they were related to problems of executive privilege and the Ervin Committee and that sort of thing that

was developing at that time. But, there were a number of meetings that the President had with John Dean during the period from February, late February, through and up to March 21st.

On March 20th I believe the President had the feeling that he was—I should not assume what someone else felt. On March 20th, as I understand it, the President directed John Dean to meet with him the next morning, March 21 st, and give him a complete report on everything that he could regarding the facts of the Watergate

and regarding his opinions as to how those facts fit together and where they might lead and what the situation was and so on. Dean, as I recall, on the evening of the 20th told me that the President had so directed him and said that he was trying to put his thoughts together with the intention of doing that, and I urged that he do so. I said that I thought it was very important that he give the President a complete story to the best of his ability. The President met with John on the morning of the 21st. I sat in on the latter part of that meeting.

Q. Anyone else? A. I don't believe so. John did attempt at that time to give him the best most complete picture that he could, but the picture was, basically, pretty much the same as it had been all the way along: (A) that nobody in the White House had in any way been involved and (B) that he was not sure on the basis of anything that he could find out or even conjecture as to who exactly was responsible for what with relation to the planning and execution of the Watergate at the re-election committee. He by that time, however, had — no, I don't think so. I think by the 21st that is the point where he was. The President directed him to meet with Mitchell, Ehrlichman and me the following day and to review all of the things with us that he had reviewed with the President. We did have such a meeting on the 22d. As a result of that meeting and a subsequent meeting with the President — the President directed Dean (as I

recall, we all concurred that this should be done) to write up a complete written report of all the facts as best he could put them together with the intent that that report would be made public in some way at the earliest possible time. Dean, as I recall, indicated that it would take him probably a couple of days to sit down and do this.

Q. During this period of time from late March up until about the 13th of April or so, and perhaps beyond that, Mr. Ehrlichman was also conducting his inquiries at the request of the President, was he not? A. From approximately March 20th, I believe that is what he basically started, up to April 14th; 14th or 15th.

'Wasn't Getting Results'

Q. Do you know what information had been passed on to the President which caused the President to ask Mr. Ehrlichman to undertake this matter?

A. I don't believe that it was information passed on to the President so much as it was lack of information and lack of success or lack of delivery on the assignment

that he had given Dean. In other words, as of the 22d he was excepting in a few days this full development from Dean which never materialized, and things were moving on and he wasn't getting the results he had sought and I think he at this point made a shift in assignment and took Dean in his own mind, at least, off of the assignment and put Ehrlichman on it with the idea of busting through it because he wasn't getting through from Dean. As I said, some of these conversations that I had during this period with Dean and with other people and that Dean had with other people and reported to me, I did transmit in substance to the President so he was aware of the ongoing views that Dean was expressing.

Q. Other than from what you may have read in the press, do you have any knowledge as to what Mr. Gray did with the package of documents [found in Howard Hunt's safe]? A. I have no knowledge other than what I have read in the press. I have

hearsay knowledge that confirms what I have read in the press.

Q. From whom did you obtain that hearsay knowledge?

A. I was present in the President's office on the evening of April 15th when John Ehrlichman called Acting Director Gray and inquired as to the disposition of this. It was told by Acting Director Gray, according to Mr. Ehrlichman, that he had destroyed the material.

Q. Do you know whether he told Mr. Ehrlichman when that material had been destroyed? A. No, I don't believe he did. I don't believe he told him when he destroyed it. Mr. Ehrlichman's shocks at receiving that original information I think precluded his pursuing it further.

Q. Do you know whether Mr. Gray told Mr. Ehrlichman or anyone else, to the best of your knowledge or from information you may have gathered, whether he read or made synopses of the documents prior to destroying them? A. I don't know. I have no knowledge.

Q. Mr. Dean has been quoted in the press, widely, I believe, saying that you and the President were, to use the quotation I have, "all grins" because no one in the Administration had been charged with involvement in the Watergate affair. Do you recall seeing those rather widely spread statements in the press, Mr. Haldeman?

A. I recall seeing them. I think you have somewhat mis-characterized them, in that I don't believe Mr. Dean was quoted by the press. I believe an associate of Mr. Dean was quoted by the press as having said that Mr. Dean said this. In other words, I think it was a second generation hearsay, not first.
