

NY Times FEB 23 1974
**White House Faces Clash
With Impeachment Panel**

By JAMES M. NAUGHTON
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22—The White House and the House Judiciary Committee moved today toward two potential collisions over the panel's inquiry into possible impeachment of President Nixon.

The White House press secretary, Ronald L. Ziegler, declared that the President's Watergate lawyers and the Department of Justice would both issue "another point of view" challenging the conclusion of the committee staff that the scope of impeachment covered a broad array of offenses not limited to indictable crimes.

The Judiciary Committee's special counsel, John M. Doar, posing a second possible conflict, told the panel at a meeting this morning that it should take the White House no more

than "a day or two" to comply with a committee request for some 700 pages of documents and 17 tape recordings. Mr. Ziegler declined to say whether the White House would voluntarily turn over the material.

Mr. Ziegler said the Administration views on the proper grounds for impeachment would be made public early next week. Mr. Doar told the House committee that his request for White House evidence, based on a list of material already assembled by the special Watergate prosecutor, Leon Jaworski, would be delivered "promptly."

Thus it appeared likely that both sides in the impeachment inquiry would know in a few

Continued on Page 7, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

days whether they would confront or cooperate with one another.

Mr. Doar, and other members of the committee's bipartisan impeachment inquiry staff, issued a 49-page advisory report yesterday, categorically rejecting the argument that a President may be impeached only for violations of Criminal laws. The study did not define precisely the scope of impeachment, but made clear that it included a broad assortment of actions that might represent "grave misconduct."

At a White House briefing this morning, Mr. Ziegler declined to characterize the Administration view on the basic issue of what constitutes impeachable misconduct. But he said that the President's advisers would have "another point of view on this question."

James D. St. Clair, the President's special Watergate counsel, has described impeachment as an "adversary" proceeding much like that between lawyers representing conflicting interests. He is expected by Republicans on the Judiciary Committee to challenge the committee staff's assertion that "impeachable conduct need not be criminal."

2 Justice Agency Studies

The Justice Department issued late today two "working papers" on the historical background of impeachment, but withheld publication of a legal memorandum drawing conclusions from the two appendices.

The two background studies were accompanied by a disclaimer in which Robert G. Dixon Jr., an Assistant Attorney General, stated that the documents "should not be regarded as an official position of the Department of Justice."

Nonetheless, the documents may have suggested the outline of the Administration's viewpoint.

The House Judiciary Committee staff said that the impeachment standard in the Constitution — "high crimes and misdemeanors" — was a legal "term of art" drawn from British impeachment proceedings. The committee lawyers said the phrase would include "constitutional wrongs that subvert the structure of government, or undermine the integrity of office and even the Constitution itself."

One of the two Justice Department "working papers," a 57-page report, "The Concept of Impeachment Offense," took account of interpretations of constitutional scholars similar to the committee staff's judgment. But the department paper also said that "much of what the framers" of the Constitution had done "was a reaction

against rather than a copy of the British model."

Text of Constitution

The Justice study also said that "one can make a strong argument, based on the text of the Constitution alone, that impeachment can only be predicated on a 'high' criminal offense" like treason or bribery, the only impeachable offenses specifically mentioned in the Constitution.

The scope of impeachment is likely to be debated for some time, but the question of White House willingness to supply evidence to the committee will apparently be tested swiftly.

In a progress report to the 38-member Judiciary Committee, Mr. Doar said that he was ready to make the first specific request for White House evidence, that the staff would begin interviewing witnesses "on a fairly major scale" next week, and that he was preparing to make a number of requests for documents from several Administration departments.

Several of the committee's Democrats pressed Mr. Doar to tell the panel how quickly he thought the White House should volunteer evidence.

Although he said he was not going to set any deadline, Mr. Doar told Representative Wayne Owens, Democrat of Utah, that he believed it would be "no burden" for the White House to respond to the initial request in "just a day or two."

Jenner's Opinion

The committee's chief Republican counsel, Albert E. Jenner Jr., told newsmen later he thought it would be "asinine" for the White House to refuse to give the committee any evidence already supplied to Watergate prosecutors.

The White House has not made clear, and Mr. Ziegler declined again today to do so, whether evidence will be voluntarily supplied to the committee.

Representative Robert McClory, Republican of Illinois, said he was "very confident we're going to have full consideration" from both the White House and the special Watergate prosecutor.

But Democrats suggested strongly that they would not tolerate White House delays and would, if necessary, resort to issuing formal subpoenas for the evidence.

"The public is looking for expeditious action," the panel's chairman, Representative Peter W. Rodino Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, said at one point. "Congress has asked us to act promptly. Any delay will not be forthcoming from our side."