DOAR AND JENNER **BID PANEL REJECT** TAPE TRANSCRIPTS

Tell House Committee That the Edited Versions Are Inadequate Substitute

MAY 24 1974 MOVE TO GAIN SUPPORT

- F& A K

Rodino Says Start of Open Hearings in Impeachment Inquiry Is Postponed **NYTimes**

By JAMES M. NAUGHTON Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 23-Lawyers for the House impeachment inquiry declared today that the Judiciary Committee had a constitutional obligation to reject President Nixon's edited Watergate transcripts as a substitute for subpoenaed tape recordings.

The concerted verbal assault on the White House transcripts represented an apparent attempt by the Judiciary Committee to generate public support for a more formal move next week to gain access to the controversial tapes themselves.

John M. Doar, the special counsel on impeachment, told the committee that the transcripts of White House conversations were "inadequate and unsatisfactory" for a fair and thorough investigation of the President's conduct in office.

Backed by Jenner

The strong statement by Mr. Doar was endorsed by the chief Republican counsel, Albert E. Jenner Jr., who said that the American people "cannot accept" unverified White House transcripts to resolve charges against the President and that n "the House of Representatives would not be acting responsi-- bly if it does."

The committee chairman, r Representative Peter W. Rodino Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, charged at the same time e that some portions of the ext purgated White House trans scripts contained what were I later described as paraphrases 3 rather than verbatim conversa-

Mr. Rodino said that, in addition to deciding how to deal with the President's rejection of the subpoenas, the committee would consider next week whether to make public evidence presented to the panel over seven days of closed hearings on the Watergate break-in and its cover-up.

Open Hearings Delayed

As a consequence, he added, the plans he announced yesterday to begin open hearings next week on non-Watergate phases of the inquiry will have to be delayed. The committee's first open hearing on impeachment evidence now appears likely to be held June 4.

The unusually strong attack on the transcripts by the committee officials occurred first at a closed committee hearing and was repeated later at a news conference. It followed by one day President Nixon's blunt refusal to honor two committee subpoenas, one of which demanded 11 Watergate-related recordings.

Mr. Doar said that his remarks had been prompted not by the President's defiance of the subpoenas but by what he saw as the necessity to point out to the committee members in the hearing today that White House transcripts covering key meetings from March 23 through April 12 last year were 'a very unsatisfactory kind of evidence."

"What is important," Mr. Doar said in the news briefing, "is that the American people believe that the [impeachment] process was fair, straightforward, clean, open, thoroughwith an analysis and study of

Continued on Page 12, Column I

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8

the very best evidence available."

Several committee members said that they had never heard Mr. Doar speak with such evident fervor as he did today about the transcripts. The special counsel customarily addresses the committee with detachment, and in a montone. At one point last Tuesday, as Mr. Doar read documentary evidence into the record, James St. Clair, the President's defense counsel, fell chief asleep.

Mr. Rodino said that he would schedule a meeting late next month to decide formally what action the committee would take to deal with the President's defiance of the subpoenss. Mr. Doar added that he would recommend, perhaps at that meeting, that the panel subpoena all or most of 65 subpoena all or most of 65 other Watergate-related con-versations the President has declined to hand over volun-

tarily.
The White House has offered to let Mr. Rodino and the committee's ranking Republican, Representative Edward Hutchinson of Michigan, listen to the withheld recordings on behalf of the full committee. Mr. Rodino and Mr. Doar rejected the proposal again today, and, for the first time, said why.

Misstatements Alleged

"Every member of the committee, every member of the House of Representatives is required under the Constitution," Mr. Doar said, "to make a personal judgment with respect to what's on or what is not one what is not one what is not or what is meant or what is not onmeant by—those recorded conversations. I do not believe that
the members of this committee can constitutionally delegate that power, that authority, that responsibility to the chairman and ranking minority member."

Mr. Rodino, underscoring previous complaints by Repubunderscoring lican and Democratic members lican and Democratic members of the committee that there were inaccuracies in the White House transcripts, gave the following catalogue of their alleged flaws:

"There are misstatements. There are omissions of words

and paragraphs. There are misattributions of statements made attributions of statements made by individuals. There are ad-ditions. There are 'inaudibles.' And then, together with that, there is a category that we still are unable to interpret or de-fine that is material which is supposedly 'unrelated to Presi-dential action' and that has been deleted. What that ma-terial is we do not know."

Cited as Deficiencies

Asked to explain what Mr. Rodino called "additions," the chairman and Mr. Doar said it was a reference to some "pa phrases" in the transcripts. 'para-

phrases" in the transcripts.

In some passages, Mr. Doar asserted, "sentences will be paraphrased and the result is that there will be more words there than were on the tape."

Mr. Doar said that he was "not suggesting this was deliberate" but was citing the paraphrases to illustrate the deficiencies of the transcrips as evidence. He said:

"Assume that there was not

"Assume that there was not one mistake in substance in those edited transcripts. Assume that, for a matter as awesome as this process we ought not leave anything in doubt,

whether it's inculpatory or exculpatory." etom.

The dispute over the tapes has become a central, and almost predominant, element of the impeachment proceedings. The Judiciary Committee obtained 19 tape recordings from a Watergate grand jury and the White House last March and has been listening to them, and comparing them with edited transcripts, over the last two

In reply to an April 11 sub-poena for 42 more Watergate

conversations, Mr. Nixon de-clined to produce the record-ings and instead made public partial transcripts three weeks ago. Some of the transcriptse were of the tapes turned over

were of the tapes turned over to the committee.

On May 15, the committee voted, 37 to 1, to subpoena 11 more taped Watergate conversations and a number of the President's daily diaries showing the persons with whom he talked during periods Mr. Doar described as "critica" junctures in the alleged Watergate coverup. It was those two subpoenas up. It was those two subpoenas that Mr. Nixon refused yesterday to honor.

A few Republicans on the

committee have proposed that the panel seek a Supreme Court judgment compelling Mr. Nixon to yield these tapes and others

yet to be subpoenaed.

But Representative Robert
McClory of Illinois, the secondranking Republican member,
agreed today with Mr. Rodino that the courts have no proper role in the impeachment proc-

Role of House Alone

Mr. McClory said the Constitution gives the House the "sole power" of impeachment and that he had "great apprehension" about proposals for "subjecting this unique responsibility to the jurisdiction of the Court."

Although Mr. Rodino would Although Mr. Rodino would not specify what course of action he would propose to the committee next week, he intimated that he would prefer to complete the inquiry without the White House tapes, if necessary, and then draw the legal presumption that Mr. Nixon was withholding incriminating evidence. evidence.

He made that suggestion by saying, "I'm going to recommend that we proceed with the inquiry, that where we believe it is necessary to pursue further requests—notwithstanding the President's letter [of refusal] to us—that we discharge our constitutional responsibility. And then that the committee will have to take into account the President's responses to our requests and to our subpoenas." He made that suggestion by