

Richardson Back For Surprise Quiz

N.Y. Times Service

Washington

In a sudden and unexpected move, the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday reopened its confirmation hearings on Elliot L. Richardson as Attorney General and questioned him closely about his contacts with the White House and figures close to the Watergate scandals.

Richardson's nomination had been headed for swift confirmation by senators eager to get on with the criminal investigation of the Watergate case.

However, Daniel Ellsberg, a central figure in the Pentagon papers case that was dismissed May 11 because of government tampering, contacted a number of key senators yesterday morning, saying he felt Richardson was not telling all he knew of a luncheon meeting on May 1 at the Pentagon with Egil Krogh Jr., a White House staff man who headed the so-called "plumbers"

See Back Page

From Page 1

group that was trying to plug information leaks at the White House.

DETAILS

Yesterday, Richardson repeatedly went over his discussions with Krogh at the meeting set up April 30, by John D. Ehrlichman, the assistant to the President for domestic affairs who was Krogh's superior.

Each time, it seemed, a few more of the details came out.

"I cannot add to what I've already said," Richardson protested at one point. "I have given you answers to the same questions four, five and six times."

"Each time you answer them, we gain a little more information," Senator John V. Tunney (Dem.-Calif.)

said.

TELL

Richardson produced a memorandum on the meeting yesterday that indicated that Krogh wanted to tell all of his part in the burglary of Ellsberg's former psychiatrist in Los Angeles but was unsure of how to do it.

Such a burglary, Richardson said Krogh told him, could only be understood if one realized it was done for national security and was not just a common burglary.

"Krogh felt he had been part of an undertaking that had a legitimate national security purpose and as part of over-zealousness in carrying out that purpose, a burglary was carried out," Richardson said.

QUESTION

A question pursued throughout the day by Senator Tunney, and other Democrats was whether Richardson was aware that the crew that conducted the break-in under Krogh's direction had used equipment provided by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Richardson said he had "the impression" that Krogh also told him about the CIA's assistance in providing disguises for the burglary but would have to check his notes on the meeting.

The senators then wanted to know why Richardson had not informed United States District Judge Matt Byrne, who later threw out the case against Ellsberg, that Krogh had referred to CIA documents and disguises during his meeting with Richardson. Krogh did not mention this material support for the operation in a memorandum he submitted to Judge Byrne on May 4.

Senator Philip A. Hart (Dem.-Mich.), said that as newly designated attorney general, or as a lawyer subject to the ethics of the bar, it was reasonable to ask Richardson why he did not take some action after read-

ing Krogh's statement knowing that the CIA involvement was omitted.

PROTEST

Senator James O. Eastland (Dem.-Miss.), the committee chairman, protested that Richardson "wasn't attorney general — he wasn't responsible for the prosecution." Hart replied that he was "a general member of the bar."

Richardson commented that "it did not occur to me to regard that as a significant omission."

In his notes, Richardson said that Krogh said to him about the burglary: "Something needs to be brought to the att'n of Pres. Was made aware of the fact itself in late March — but not who and what."

Richardson said it meant, as previously disclosed in the New York Times, that President Nixon knew of the burglary in late March. However, it was not made known to the judge in the Ellsberg trial until late April.