

# RODINO AIDES FIND THEIR TRANSCRIPTS VARY FROM NIXON'S

Doar Calls on Impeachment  
Panel to Insist President  
Comply With Subpoena

SEES A NEED FOR TAPES

Discrepancies Attributed to  
Better Equipment Used by  
Judiciary Committee

By JAMES M. NAUGHTON  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 1—Lawyers for the House Judiciary Committee disclosed tonight that discrepancies, perhaps minor, existed between some of the transcripts of the White House tape recordings President Nixon made public yesterday and transcripts of the same tapes made by the committee staff.

John M. Doar, the special counsel on impeachment, urged the committee at a rare evening meeting to insist that Mr. Nixon comply with a subpoena for tapes of 42 conversations to clear up the discrepancies.

Other Congressional sources said privately that there might be an innocent explanation for the discrepancies but that there were "variations" between the transcripts prepared by the White House and transcripts of the same conversations prepared earlier by the committee staff.

Although the discrepancies were not immediately des-

## Transcripts

The New York Times continues today, on Pages 29-40, the publication in full and in chronological order of the tape transcripts concerning Watergate that the White House has edited and made public. The additional transcripts will appear on subsequent days.

cribed, officials familiar with the work of the impeachment inquiry said that in most cases the committee had been able to fill in gaps in White House transcripts that were marked as "unintelligible" portions of the conversations.

### Prodding by Rodino

The committee chairman, Representative Peter W. Rodino Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, urged the panel to seek access to the full tapes of the conversations covered in the edited White House transcripts.

"The President's suggestion that the committee have only the transcripts," Mr. Rodino said, "is not something that I or any member of the committee can explain to the American people. It would only raise questions about the thoroughness, fairness and objectivity of the committee's work."

The sources who reported on the transcript variations said that there was no suggestion that the White House had deliberately left out material or sought to mislead the committee.

Rather, the officials said, the White House apparently did not have audio equipment of the same high quality as that used by the Judiciary Committee staff in making transcripts from the first 17 tape recordings it obtained for its inquiry.

### Republicans Under Pressure

The point, the officials said, was that the committee's equipment could reproduce portions of conversations that were listed as "inaudible" or "unintelligible" in the White House transcripts released yesterday by Mr. Nixon.

According to the officials, the Judiciary Committee sound equipment was also able to reproduce segments of conversations not reproduced by equip-

Continued on Page 42, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8

ment used by the special Watergate prosecutor in transcribing tapes.

Democratic members of the committee sought at the meeting tonight to persuade colleagues in the Republican minority to consent to a plan to send a letter to Mr. Nixon asserting that the transcripts were not a satisfactory reply to the subpoena demanding tapes of 42 White House conversations.

Republicans initially opposed any effort to cite the President for noncompliance with the subpoena. But the minority caucused privately late this afternoon in an effort to seek a united position on some modification of the Democratic proposal.

"Our proceedings must be clean and straightforward and complete," Mr. Rodino said, if the inquiry is to be thorough and its ultimate conclusions persuasive to Congress and the nation.

### Hearings Next Week

The chairman announced that the committee would begin hearings sometime next week on the evidence assembled by the staff. The hearings are expected to take six weeks before the panel begins to draw any conclusions from the evidence and votes either to exonerate the President or recommend his impeachment.

Mr. Rodino also said that Mr. Doar would equip the committee's hearing room with listening devices to enable the members to hear conversations on those tapes obtained by the panel.

The chairman said that the committee should be prepared to meet at least three days each week, morning and afternoon, until its work was completed.

Earlier in the day, a Judiciary subcommittee drafted tentative rules for the impeachment that would "invite" Mr. Nixon to attend and observe "the committee proceedings authorize the President's law years to challenge testimony of witnesses and permit live television coverage.

Committee members were poring over, bit by bit, some 1,300 pages of transcripts delivered to them yesterday. Most were reluctant to draw any firm conclusions about the potential impact the transcripts could have upon the impeachment inquiry.

But Representative Robert F. Drinan, Democrat of Massachusetts, told newsmen after reading most of the White House material that it seemed apparent to him "from [the President's] own words he was deeply involved" in a Watergate cover-up.

Another Democrat, Representative George E. Danielson of California, said that a transcript of a March 21, 1973, meeting at which the President seemingly approved the idea of payments to silence E. Howard Hunt Jr., a convicted Watergate conspirator, was "pretty damning of the President."

Mr. Danielson, a former field agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and criminal trial lawyer, said that the March 21 transcript would contain grounds for impeaching Mr. Nixon unless it was successfully rebutted by the President's attorneys.

Representative Robert McClory of Illinois, the second-ranking Republican, said, however, that he found the March 21 transcript "ambiguous" — as the White House had characterized it — and unlikely either to "help or hurt" the President.

The more typical response of the Congressmen who will first weigh the President's conduct in office was that they

would withhold any judgment until they had examined all the evidence.

Representative Wiley Mayne, Republican of Iowa, said that the transcripts contained "a tremendous amount of information we've never had before" but that it should be "digested" before the committee took any action based on it.

The Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin hearings on the evidence next Thursday, but Representative Robert W. Kastenmeier, Democrat of Wisconsin, predicted that the hearings would be delayed a week or more.

The subcommittee, headed by Mr. Kastenmeier, approved a draft of the hearings rules with surprisingly little difficulty and no partisan wrangling. The rules were subject to approval by the full committee.

As drafted by the subcommittee, the rules provide that the inquiry staff would present to the committee and to the White House a written "statement of facts" relevant to Mr. Nixon's conduct in office.

The President's attorneys would be "invited to respond" either in writing or orally. If the White House wanted to offer evidence or testimony to the committee, Mr. Nixon's attorneys would first have to submit a written summary of what the evidence or testimony would show. The committee would decide whether to accept the material or admit the witness.



#### Rulings Up to Chairman

The White House lawyers would also be entitled to raise objections to the admissibility of evidence or testimony of witnesses. The chairman's ruling would be final, unless countermanded by a vote of a committee majority.

The rules would also permit Mr. Nixon's attorneys to question witnesses, "subject to instructions" of the chairman with respect to "the time, scope and duration of the examination."

The White House has demanded, and Republicans had endorsed, such a role for the President's attorneys, but Democrats initially opposed it.

Mr. Kastenmeier said that the tentative rules would show that the committee was trying

the evidence.

Representative Wiley Mayne, Republican of Iowa, said that the transcripts contained "a tremendous amount of information we've never had before" but that it should be "digested" before the committee took any action based on it.

The Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin hearings on the evidence next Thursday, but Representative Robert W. Kastenmeier, Democrat of Wisconsin, predicted that the hearings would be delayed a week or more.

The subcommittee, headed by Mr. Kastenmeier, approved a draft of the hearings rules with surprisingly little difficulty and no partisan wrangling. The rules were subject to approval by the full committee.

As drafted by the subcommittee, the rules provide that the inquiry staff would present to the committee and to the White House a written "statement of facts" relevant to Mr. Nixon's conduct in office.

The President's attorneys would be "invited to respond" either in writing or orally. If the White House wanted to offer evidence or testimony to the committee, Mr. Nixon's attorneys would first have to submit a written summary of what the evidence or testimony would show. The committee would decide whether to accept the material or admit the witness.

#### Rulings Up to Chairman

The White House lawyers would also be entitled to raise objections to the admissibility of evidence or testimony of witnesses. The chairman's ruling would be final, unless countermanded by a vote of a committee majority.

The rules would also permit Mr. Nixon's attorneys to question witnesses, "subject to instructions" of the chairman with respect to "the time, scope and duration of the examination."

The White House has demanded, and Republicans had endorsed, such a role for the President's attorneys, but Democrats initially opposed it.

Mr. Kastenmeier said that the tentative rules would show that the committee was trying to "lean over backward" to give due process to Mr. Nixon. Mr. Danielson sought to eliminate the White House right to raise procedural objections, but six other members of the bipartisan subcommittee defeated his motion and the rules were subsequently approved unanimously.

The draft specified that the committee meetings would be "Hearings." Under regular House rules, all hearings are open to the public, and to television coverage, unless the committee should decide by majority vote, to close a given hearing.

Mr. Kastenmeier said he would "guess" that a majority of the panel would consent to television coverage of the hearings.



The New York Times

Telegrams relating to transcripts and Presidential tapes being sorted in an office of House Judiciary Committee.