

Doar to Ask Subpoena for Tape Data

By Richard L. Lyons and William Chapman
Washington Post Staff Writers

The chief counsel for the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiry stated emphatically yesterday that President Nixon has "definitely not" given the committee the full Watergate story, despite repeated White House assurances that he has.

Counsel John Doar told newsmen he will recommend that the committee issue a subpoena demanding the 76 tapes of White House Watergate conversations which the committee requested last month. The President's lawyer, James D. St. Clair, turned down this request on Tuesday and said that no further Watergate materials will be turned over, even if subpoenaed, because the President feels the committee has the full story.

More than any member of the committee, Doar knows what material has been obtained and what gaps remain regarding the President's involvement in the Watergate break-in and cover-up. The staff will begin presenting evidence on Watergate to the full committee at a series of closed hearings beginning at 1 p.m. today.

But most members seemed to have adopted a go-slow reaction to the White House turndown on any more requests for Watergate materials.

Rep. Edward Hutchinson of Michigan, senior committee Republican who appeared with Doar and Chairman Peter W. Rodino (D-N.J.) at a news briefing, suggested that the committee begin hearing the case and find out what gaps need to be filled with more information.

St. Clair will be sitting with the committee as the case is presented, and when the committee decides it needs something it could turn to St. Clair and ask for it, said Hutchinson.

If the request were turned down, a subpoena could then be issued for the specific item, other members pointed out.

A number of members of both parties said this idea of piecemeal subpoenas seemed preferable to firing off a blanket subpoena that might be subject to a White House

charge of a "fishing expedition."

Rodino seemed in no hurry to issue a subpoena. He said next week—when committee members will know what they have and lack on Watergate—would be plenty of time. Rodino left no doubt, however, that the committee will subpoena what it needs.

Doar reacted with unusual vigor when asked whether he had "all the evidence you feel you need to complete the Watergate phase of the inquiry?"

"Definitely not," he replied. He said he will recommend a

See IMPEACH, A6, Col. 1

IMPEACH, From A1

subpoena because it is "the businesslike, orderly and legal way to proceed."

Rodino said again that if the White House rejects all requests for needed information, committee members could decide whether to make this action an impeachable offense by the President.

Committee Republicans were distressed by the White House refusal to cooperate, but seemed generally agreed that they should start hearing the case and make further requests or issue subpoenas as specific needs arise.

Rep. Charles Wiggins (R-Calif.), a strong defender of the President, said the White House might back down if confronted with individual requests for tapes. "If we are precise and justify our requests in St. Clair's presence, there might be some relaxation" of the White House position, Wiggins said.

Rep. William S. Cohen (R-Maine), the only Republican to

join in a committee declaration last week that the President had failed to comply with a previous subpoena by providing transcripts instead of tapes, agreed. He said it would avoid criticism of a fishing expedition.

Rep. M. Caldwell Butler (R-Va.) said: "When we get to the point where we need certain evidence, we can ask for it again and then go forward with a specific subpoena of a given conversation. The Judiciary Committee has an absolute right to any material that we consider revelant."

Rep. Lawrence Hogan (R-Md.), conservative and partisan Republican, said he would support a second subpoena. "I think we should get the material; we have the whip hand," he said.

Most Republicans joined in the 33-to-3 vote that sent off the first subpoena to the President last month.

While refusing to turn over any more Watergate material, St. Clair expressed a willingness to cooperate with the committee in some other areas. He said the White House would turn over material on the leak-plugging White House "plumbers."

The committee has also asked for 46 tapes on dairy campaign contributions and 20 tapes relating to the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp's settled antitrust suit. St. Clair said he didn't think the requested conversations had been recorded, but told newsmen:

"If there is more that has not been produced that relates" to these two areas, "we are going to get it prepared, present it to the President and I have confidence he will release it."

Doar said St. Clair told him that at the time of the dairy conversations in March, 1971, the system for recording White House conversations had not been fully installed and did not tape talks in the Executive Office Building. The ITT tapes were of conversations a year later.

Until now, no committee members except Rodino and Hutchinson have been allowed to hear tapes and read other confidential materials that Doar's staff has assembled over the last five months.

Rodino said that beginning this afternoon and extending over three days next week, the staff will present to the committee evidence obtained on the President's involvement in the Watergate break-in and cover-up.

A wiring system has been installed in the committee room so members can plug in earphones and hear tapes. They also will see for the first

time the briefcase of material turned over by the Watergate grand jury, as well as material from other congressional committees and federal agencies.

It was still not clear yesterday whether the committee will hear the entire case against the President—ranging from bombing Cambodia to his tax situation—in one long series of closed sessions, or hear the staff's evidence on Watergate and then open up the proceedings to call witnesses on that one allegation. Members had different understandings, and Rodino was not precise.

The entire fact-finding process is expected to take at least six weeks. Then the committee is to vote for the first time in more than a century on whether the President should be impeached.