

# Magazine Says Nixon Aide Admits Disruption Effort

10/30/72  
By Carl Bernstein  
and Bob Woodward

Washington Post Staff Writers

Time magazine reported yesterday that Dwight L. Chapin, President Nixon's appointments secretary, has "admitted to FBI agents that he had hired" California attorney Donald H. Segretti to disrupt Democratic political campaigns.

In its latest edition, Time says: "Chapin had also told the FBI that Segretti's payment was set by Nixon's personal attorney, California lawyer Herbert Kalmbach."

In addition, Time reported that Justice Department sources say that "Kalmbach, too, admitted to FBI agents that the money he paid Segretti came from cash kept by the Committee for the Re-election of the President in the office of its finance chairman, Maurice H. Stans."

On Oct. 15, The Washington Post reported that Lawrence Young, 32, another California attorney, had said in a sworn statement that Segretti told him that "Dwight Chapin was a person I reported to in Washington."

Chapin at that time said through the White House press office that the story "is based on hearsay and is fundamentally inaccurate."

Time and The Post have previously reported that Kalmbach paid Segretti for his work, and The New York Times has said Segretti made at least six telephone calls to the White House and one to Chapin's home since March.

Time's account also said "no hard evidence could be developed to support a charge by

The Washington Post that H. R. Haldeman, the White House chief of staff, was one of those with control over a fund that paid for spying and disruption."

The Post, citing accounts of grand jury testimony and information from federal investigators, reported Wednesday that Haldeman was one of five high-ranking presidential associates authorized to approve payments from the fund.

The Post article said Hugh W. Sloan Jr., the former treasurer of the Nixon committee,

See WATERGATE, A10, Col. 1

## WATERGATE, From A1

reportedly had named Haldeman in testimony before the grand jury investigating the Watergate bugging.

The next day Sloan's attorney denied "unequivocally" that Sloan had named Haldeman to the grand jury or any federal investigators.

Post reporters then asked Sloan if Haldeman was indeed among those authorized to approve payments from the fund even if he did not tell that to the grand jury. Sloan declined to answer, but said, "Our denial is strictly limited" to the question of whether he named Haldeman to the grand jury and investigators.

The Post reporters then went back to their federal sources and were told that The Post story was incorrect in identifying Sloan's grand jury testimony as a source of information on Haldeman's link to the fund.

However, these same sources, who have provided detailed information on the Watergate investigation, confirmed once more that Haldeman was au-

thorized to make payments from the fund.

One source went so far as to say, "This is a Haldeman operation," and that Haldeman had "insulated" himself, dealing with the fund through an intermediary.

Meanwhile, both Sen. George McGovern and Vice President Agnew spoke about the alleged Haldeman involvement yesterday in separate television interviews.

On NBC's Meet the Press, McGovern said: "Why haven't we had some explanation about all of this matter from the President himself? Why has he declined to appoint an impartial investigator to look into this matter and give the people all the facts before election day?"

Agnew said on ABC's Issues and Answers that The Post's coverage of the Watergate case was "journalistically re-

prehensible," and the story connecting Haldeman with the fund was "a contrived story constructed out of two untruths attempting to tie this to the President."

Agnew said the Haldeman story was in question because Sloan's attorney had denied that his client named Haldeman before the grand jury and because of the reference to a special fund that has often been called a "secret fund" by the news media.

"In fact, I deny that there is any secret fund," Agnew said.

In August, the General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, cited the existence of a \$350,000 cash fund in the Nixon committee as a possible violation of the law because it was not properly reported to the government as required by a new campaign finance disclosure law.