

Evidence of Nixon Guilt Is Foreseen by Jaworski

WASHINGTON, Oct. 16 (UPI)—Leon Jaworski, the outgoing special Watergate prosecutor, and his former top assistant, Philip A. Lacovara, said today that "substantial evidence" would soon be made public showing that former President Richard M. Nixon had played a major role in the Watergate cover-up.

Mr. Jaworski, who is leaving his post next week to resume his law practice in Houston, also indicated that he had no quarrel with President Ford's decision to grant Mr. Nixon a full pardon.

But Mr. Lacovara, who resigned five weeks ago reportedly because of the pardon, said that the decision had been "fundamentally erroneous and inconsistent with the values that I, at least, had been working to achieve in the AMERICAN judicial system."

Separate Interviews

Mr. Jaworski gave his views in an interview published today in the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Lacovara was interviewed on the National Broadcasting Company's Today show.

Mr. Jaworski, who held the top prosecutor's job for 11 months, said that he had waited to offer his views on the pardon and Mr. Nixon's role in the cover-up until a jury in the Federal trial of five former Nixon aides and campaign officials had been sequestered and until after he had announced his resignation.

The special prosecutor said that evidence to be presented at the trial would further involve Mr. Nixon in the cover-up.

"The evidence will show he's

guilty, just as much as a guilty plea," he said.

Mr. Jaworski said that acceptance of the pardon by Mr. Nixon had clearly shown the former President's guilt.

"A pardon isn't just a beautiful document to frame and hand hang on the wall," Mr. Jaworski said. "You are offered a pardon only because it is believed you can be charged and convicted. You accept it only if you want to be cleared."

'Evidence of Involvement'

Mr. Lacovara said, "If you take at face value the representations by the prosecutors at the opening of the trial you can fairly well assume that substantial evidence of Mr. Nixon's criminal involvement will be presented to the jury." Mr. Jaworski said if Mr. Nixon's case had been allowed to proceed to indictment and trial, the public would have gained no new information about Mr. Nixon's involvement.

"It's a mistake to believe there would have been more evidence for the public if he had been tried," Mr. Jaworski said. "If he had been pardoned after indictment, the public would have no new information."

"If he had gone to trial, he could have invoked his Fifth Amendment guarantees against self-incrimination, pleaded guilty, and we wouldn't have learned any new details."