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Prior to August 2, 1969 Milton Semer, a lawyer for the predecessor organization of Associated Milk Producers, Inc. (AMPI), a large milk producers' cooperative, told Herbert W. Kalmbach, the President's personal attorney and political fundraiser, that Semer's client wanted to make a political contribution. Semer told Kalmbach that his client had three goals: (1) milk price supports at a level of 90% of parity; (2) a Presidential address to the AMPI convention the following year; and (3) some identity or audience with the President, such as picture taking and the ability to talk to various people within the White House. Kalmbach has testified that he informed Haldeman of AMPI's goals and its desire to make contributions and that Haldeman authorized Kalmbach to accept the contribution. Haldeman has stated that Kalmbach reported to him generally on fundraising activities but that he does not recall Kalmbach's reporting on the milk producer's contribution.

1.1 Milton Semer statement, SSC Executive Session, February 5, 1974, Semer Exhibit 1.
1.2 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, 5 SSC 2092.
1.3 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 3-6, 10-13.
1.5 H. R. Haldeman unsworn testimony, SSC Executive Session, January 31, 1974, 2.
2. On August 2, 1969 Semer on behalf of AMP delivered $100,000 in cash to Kalmbach. Kalmbach added the cash to the surplus funds from the President's 1968 campaign that were in Kalmbach's custody. Kalmbach used this fund on behalf of the White House for, among other things, making payments to Tony Ulasewicz and to the Albert Brewer campaign against George Wallace.

2.1 Milton Semer statement, SSC Executive Session, February 5, 1974, Semer Exhibit 1.


2.3 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 14, 18, 10.

2.4 John Ehrlichman testimony, SSC Executive Session, February 8, 1974, 14-15.

2.5 H. R. Haldeman unsworn interview, SSC Executive Session, January 31, 1974, 2.
3. Kalmbach has testified that between August 2, 1969 and August 9, 1969 he reported to Haldeman that he had received the $100,000 and again stated to Haldeman the objectives Semer had given. Kalmbach also informed John Ehrlichman, Maurice Stans, Jack Gleason (then an aide to Maurice Stans and later a White House aide), and Assistants to the President Peter Flanigan and Harry Dent of the contribution, and he telephoned one or more of them to arrange for meetings between AMPI representatives and White House aides. On August 19, 1969 Semer, AMPI General Manager Harold Nelson and AMPI special counsel David Parr met with Dent at the White House to discuss dairy industry problems and to invite the President to address an AMPI annual meeting.

3.1 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 13-18.

3.2 John Ehrlichman testimony, SSC Executive Session, February 8, 1974, 1-5.


3.5 Memorandum from Harold Nelson to Harry S. Dent, August 19, 1969 (received from SSC).

3.6 Letter from Jack Gleason to Milton Semer, September 16, 1969 (received from SSC).
4. By memorandum dated June 24, 1970 White House aide Jack Gleason turned over most of the responsibilities with regard to the milk producers to Special Counsel to the President Charles Colson. Gleason stated that Colson would handle outstanding items including the possibility of the President speaking in September at the AMPI annual meeting in Chicago and the possibility of the President making an emergency reduction of import quotas on dairy products. Attached to the memorandum was a draft letter prepared by Parr that could be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend that the President take immediate action imposing limitations on imports of certain cheeses and other dairy products.

4.1 Memorandum from Jack Gleason to Charles Colson, June 24, 1970 and attached draft letter (received from White House).
5. In the June 24, 1970 memorandum from Gleason to Colson referred to in the preceding paragraph, Gleason stated that AMPI special counsel Parr would coordinate directly with Gleason on collection and distribution of support. During 1970, AMPI and other dairy organizations pledged or contributed approximately $135,000 to a special White House project administered by Gleason and Kalmbach that designated certain congressional candidates to receive contributions and distributed the contributions.

5.1 Memorandum from Jack Gleason to Charles Colson, June 24, 1970 (received from White House).

5.2 Memorandum from Herbert Kalmbach to file, April 22, 1970 (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.3 Herbert Kalmbach notes on 1970 congressional campaign fundraising (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.4 Letter from Herbert Kalmbach to H. R. Haldeman, November 6, 1970 (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.5 Letter from Jack Gleason to Mrs. Joan Payson, July 20, 1970 (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.6 Letter from Patrick J. Hillings to the President, December 16, 1970 (received from SSC).

5.7 Memorandum from Jack Gleason to Harry Dent, June 18, 1970 (received from SSC).
6. Before September 9, 1970 AMPI representatives stated to Colson that AMPI would arrange for $2 million to be contributed to the President's 1972 re-election campaign.

6.1 Memorandum from Charles Colson to the President (received from White House).


6.3 David Parr testimony, SSC Executive Session, December 21, 1973, 205-06.
7. On September 4, 1970 the President telephoned AMPI General Manager Nelson at the AMPI convention in Chicago, expressed his regret at being unable to attend the AMPI convention and invited Nelson to meet with him in Washington to arrange a meeting with a larger delegation of dairy leaders at a later date. On September 9, 1970 Parr and Nelson had a nine-minute "photo opportunity" meeting with the President and Colson at the White House. In preparing for the meeting, the President reviewed a memorandum by Colson which stated that the milk producers had pledged $2 million to the 1972 campaign. Colson said in the memorandum that it would be most helpful if the President would tell Nelson and Parr that he was aware of their political support, what they had already done that year to assist and what they were committed to do in the future. Colson said that if the visitors realized that the President was aware of what they were doing, it would strengthen very much Colson's hand in dealing with them. Parr has testified that during the meeting, the President stated that he had heard some very good things about AMPI and that he wanted to address an AMPI convention.


7.2 Memorandum from Charles Colson to the President re September 9, 1970 meeting, attached to memorandum from Stephen Bull to the President (received from White House).

7.3 David Parr testimony, SSC Executive Session, December 21, 1973, 13-14, 17.
On September 16, 1970 Charles Colson wrote a memorandum to John Dean saying that a group that provides strong political and financial backing had asked for information regarding limitations on campaign contributions. Colson asked Dean to get a quick reading from the Justice Department because Colson did not want to keep the group hanging and their funds were needed. At the bottom of the carbon copy of the memorandum is the handwritten name and telephone number of Bob Isham, the AMPI comptroller.

8.1 Memorandum from Charles Colson to John Dean, September 16, 1970 and undated attachments (received from White House).

8.2 Bob Lilly testimony, SSC Executive Session, November 14, 1973, 4-5.
9. In the fall of 1970, at Haldeman's direction, Colson began coordinating outside funding activities for various White House projects including the use of a Washington, D. C. public relations firm to place advertisements and undertake other activities in support of Administration policies. The project contemplated the use of "front" organizations. Colson stated that some friends had retained a public relations outfit which gave them the financial resources to do things for the White House. Colson stated in a memorandum to Haldeman that once the project was fully set up, the White House would have available about $100,000 per year through this resource. During 1971 and 1972 the Washington, D. C. public relations firm of Wagner & Baroody placed advertisements in the name of various private groups in support of Administration policies.

9.1 Memorandum from H. R. Haldeman to Colson, Dent, Klein, Magruder, August 7, 1970 (received from SSC).

9.2 Memorandum from Jeb Magruder to Haldeman and Klein, August 18, 1970 (received from SSC).

9.3 Memorandum from Charles Colson to H. R. Haldeman, September 15, 1970 (received from SSC).

9.4 Joseph Baroody affidavit to the SSC, January 30, 1974 (received from SSC).

10. On or about November 3, 1970 Colson sent a memorandum to Murray Chotiner noting that AMPF's political trust had contributed to unopposed Democratic congressional candidates and asking Chotiner to tell AMPF's lawyer Marion Harrison that if he wanted to play both sides, that's one game, but if he wanted to play the Administration's side, it was entirely different. Colson said that this would be a good way to condition Harrison before putting the screws to him on imports, which they were about to do.

10.1 Memorandum from Charles Colson to Murray Chotiner, November 3, 1970 (received from White House).

10.2 Memorandum from Charles Colson to Jack Gleason, November 2, 1970 with attachment (received from White House).
11. In late November, 1970 Colson, Kalmbach, Nelson, Parr, AMPI lawyers Harrison and Patrick Hillings and Presidential campaign fundraiser Tom Evans met in Kalmbach's hotel room in Washington, D. C. and discussed procedures whereby AMPI's contributions to the President's re-election campaign could meet statutory reporting requirements without resulting in publicity.

11.1 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 32-34, 38.


11.3 Marion Harrison testimony, SSC Executive Session, December 4, 1973, 32-34.

11.4 Letter from Marion Harrison to Harold Nelson, November 2, 1970 (received from SSC).
12. On December 16 or 17, 1970 AMPI lawyer Hillings hand-delivered to the White House a letter to the President requesting that the President adopt a Tariff Commission recommendation to restrict imports of chocolate crumb and other dairy products. The letter stated that AMPI had contributed about $135,000 to Republican candidates in the 1970 election, was now working with Tom Evans and Herb Kalmbach in setting up appropriate channels for AMPI to contribute $2 million for the President's re-election, and also was funding a special project. The letter was routed to Haldeman, Ehrlichman and Colson. According to the White House "White Paper" on the milk price support decision, the President did not see the letter.

12.1 Letter from Patrick Hillings to the President, December 16, 1970, with attached memorandum, October 16, 1970, and attached routing slips (received from SSC).

13. By memorandum dated December 18, 1970 Charles Colson complained to Murray Chotiner regarding the behavior of AMPI lawyers Harrison and Hillings. Colson stated that they had so muddled up the present dairy import situation that he almost thought there was no way to help them. He also stated that they had refused to help recently in a matter of great importance.

---

13.1 Memorandum from Charles Colson to Murray Chotiner, December 18, 1970 (received from White House).
14. On December 31, 1970 the President signed a proclamation lowering import quotas on certain chocolate and other dairy products.


14.4 AMPI news release, January 5, 1971 (received from SSC).
1. Prior to August 2, 1969 Milton Semer, a lawyer for the predecessor organization of Associated Milk Producers, Inc. (AMPI), a large milk producers' cooperative, told Herbert W. Kalmbach, the President's personal attorney and political fundraiser, that Semer's client wanted to make a political contribution. Semer told Kalmbach that his client had three goals: (1) milk price supports at a level of 90% of parity; (2) a Presidential address to the AMPI convention the following year; and (3) some identity or audience with the President, such as picture taking and the ability to talk to various people within the White House. Kalmbach has testified that he informed Haldeman of AMPI's goals and its desire to make contributions and that Haldeman authorized Kalmbach to accept the contribution. Haldeman has stated that Kalmbach reported to him generally on fundraising activities but that he does not recall Kalmbach's reporting on the milk producer's contribution.

1.1 Milton Semer statement, SSC Executive Session, February 5, 1974, Semer Exhibit 1.

1.2 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, 5 SSC 2092.

1.3 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 3-6, 10-13.


1.5 H. R. Haldeman unsworn testimony, SSC Executive Session, January 31, 1974, 2.

NOTE 1.1

At Milton Semer's Executive Session testimony before the Senate Select Committee on February 5, 1974 the following statement provided by Semer was introduced into evidence as Exhibit 1.
My name is Milton P. Semer; I am an attorney practicing law in Washington, D. C. I am appearing to describe my relationship with a former client, the Associated Milk Producers, Inc. of San Antonio, Texas.

From discussions with your staff, I understand your interest in my testimony to center on representation of the client during 1969 and 1970.

Also, in light of your staff's interest, I should note that in 1968 I was Treasurer for Senator Muskie's Vice Presidential campaign, and when Senator Muskie ran for reelection to the Senate in 1970, I was Treasurer of the Muskie Election Committee.

Attached to my statement are copies of letters from the client to this Committee's staff setting forth the extent to which the client has waived the attorney-client privilege in connection with my testimony.

My relationship with the client commenced on March 21, 1969, when representatives came to see me in Washington. We discussed how our Washington firm might assist them, when circumstances required, in making a persuasive case on the merits to the Federal Government on substantive issues of interest to them, including price supports and import competition. In part, it appeared that this would involve presenting their arguments to the White House—which, during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, had actively participated in decisions on such issues, and presumably would continue to do so.

At the same time, it was explained to me that the client was organizing a political fund, the Trust for Agricultural and Political Education, to raise funds from their members for distribution to candidates of both major parties in local, State, Congressional, and Presidential campaigns. TAPE was described to me as a fund modeled after the AFL-CIO's Committee for Political Education, COPE, whose purpose would be to support and win friends on Capitol Hill and in the Administration and promote the milk farmer's position on the issues.

Shortly after my initial meeting with the client, I began an unsuccessful effort to help it find out how the White House was to be organized, and to whom it should make its case.
I have related the details of these efforts to your staff, and my purpose in this statement is to highlight the basic events in the chronology.

On October 25, 1968, just before the Presidential election, I called Mr. John Mitchell who had served on an advisory committee when I was General Counsel of the housing department in the early 1960's. I phoned him at the behest of a client wishing to contribute to the Nixon campaign. Mr. Mitchell had put me in touch with Mr. Maurice Stans, who in turn referred me to Mr. Jack Gleason.

On March 25, 1969, following my initial meeting with the client, I called Jack Gleason at the White House to describe my firm's new client and its interest in finding out to whom at the White House it should direct its case. Mr. Gleason in turn suggested I deal with Mr. Herbert Kalmbach, and it shortly was arranged for me to meet Mr. Kalmbach in Washington.

On April 3, 1969, I explained to Mr. Kalmbach the interests of my client. Mr. Kalmbach did not ask for a political contribution, but did inquire about the contribution potential of the client's political trust fund, TAPE.

On July 10, 1969, I visited with Mr. Kalmbach at his office in Newport Beach, California. On this occasion Mr. Kalmbach inquired how TAPE's fund-raising was progressing. When I explained that my client hoped its trust fund would collect sufficient funds to make contributions to a large number of candidates of both parties at all levels of government, Mr. Kalmbach told me that contributions would be appreciated by the Administration.

At this time it was my understanding, and I thought it was Mr. Kalmbach's, that the client would be making, through its trust fund, a series of political contributions to committees for 1970 Congressional candidates, to be reported by TAPE and by the recipient committees. It had been a common practice for past Administrations to "piggy-back" such contributions — that is, to transmit them through the incumbent Administration, allowing it to share credit for the contributions with the donor — and I had discussed this political technique both with the client and with Mr. Kalmbach.

Thus it was that on August 1, 1969, I flew to Dallas, Texas, to receive from the client for delivery to Mr. Kalmbach the next day a contribution of one hundred thousand dollars in cash. Although more than a little surprised at the amount, which was much larger than I had supposed it would be, I delivered the funds to Mr. Kalmbach as I had agreed to do. Neither then nor later did he tell me anything inconsistent with my understanding of the nature of this transaction, as summarized above.
2092

and in Arizona. In 1967, the present firm of Kalmbach, DeMarco, Knapp & Chillingworth was founded with offices in Los Angeles and Newport Beach. Also, for more than 20 years, I have been active in political work—particularly in recent years in the area of campaign finance.

Since early 1969, I have been engaged in activities on the President's behalf in three major areas. First, it has been the source of great pride and personal satisfaction to me and to my partners to have had the responsibility for handling personal legal matters for President Nixon and members of his immediate family for the past 4 years. During this period, practically all of the contacts that I had relative to these matters were handled through either John Ehrlichman or John Dean.

Second, I acted as trustee during the period from January of 1969 to early February of 1972 for certain surplus funds which had accrued principally from the primary period of the 1968 campaign. While Maurice H. Stans was the individual with whom I dealt at the time I accepted such trusteeship, I disbursed from such funds only at the express direction of H. R. Haldeman or others clearly having the authority to direct such disbursements.

Third, I agreed to solicit early pledges of financial support for the President's 1972 campaign beginning in November of 1970. This assignment was completed in the spring of 1972. The original records of this activity were turned over to the finance committee after Mr. Stans had assumed the post of finance chairman on February 15, 1972. I thereupon directed my secretary to destroy my files which were wholly personal and supportive of the original files earlier transferred to the finance committee. This action on my part was intended to insure the continued confidentiality of the contacts that I had had with various contributors with whom I had dealt during this period. Copies of what remaining records I have and such bank records as I have been able to retrieve have been supplied to the committee's staff prior to my appearance here today.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to deny any prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in, in or participation in, the formulation of any planned conspiracy to cover up that incident or act of campaign sabotage or unethical activity. My actions in the period immediately following the break-in which involved the raising of funds to provide for the legal defense of the Watergate defendants and for the support of their families were prompted in the belief that such was proper and necessary to discharge what I assumed to be a moral obligation that had arisen in some manner unknown to me by reason of earlier events. The fact that I had been directed to undertake these actions by the No. 2 and No. 3 men on the White House staff made it absolutely incomprehensible to me that my actions in this regard could have been regarded in any way as improper or unethical.

I am here before you today to tell the truth about my activities during the period in question. It is not my purpose to testify for or against any individual. I wish to cooperate fully with the committee, and in that spirit, I am now ready to answer your questions to the very best of my ability.

Thank you.

Mr. Dash. Thank you, Mr. Kalmbach.
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Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, and of course these funds came into
my -- under my control at a later date subsequent to that
January 14th, 1969 meeting with Mr. Stans.

Mr. Weitz. Now, did there come a time, in 1969, when you
were contacted by a representative of the Dairy Lobby, or
Dairy Industry?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, on or about April -- the early part
of April -- as I remember it. I was contacted by telephone
by a man by the name of Milton Semer, S-e-m-e-r, who identified
himself as an attorney in Washington, D. C., and indicated,
as I remember it, that he was calling at the suggestion of
John Mitchell.

Mr. Weitz. Did he say in what connection he was calling
you?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, he did not. As I recall that very
first telephone conversation, I think I was at the Madison
Hotel and he called me from his office, which, as it turned
out, is right across the street. And as a result of that
conversation we met in the Madison Hotel Coffee Shop, I think
within either that day or the next day, for ten or fifteen
minutes as I remember it.

And I think it was at that time that he identified himself
as an attorney, or the attorney, for the milk producers.

Mr. Weitz. What was the purpose of his contact, did he
indicate what he wanted to discuss with you, or what in fact,
did you discuss with him?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, he indicated, in the coffee shop, that his client, or clients -- I don't remember if he was representing more than one of the milk cooperatives, or not, but he indicated that his client, or clients, wanted to make a contribution and that he had been referred to me by John Mitchell, who he said was a friend of his.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate anyone else in the White House with whom he had talked, and who might have suggested that he contact you, that you recall at this point?

Mr. Kalmbach. I don't recall it. He might have mentioned Jack Gleason, but my best memory is that he said that he was calling -- had called me at the suggestion of John Mitchell.

Mr. Weitz. Did he discuss in that first conversation anything with respect to the organization or political activity of his client?

Mr. Kalmbach. I think that he said that -- words to the effect that his client, or clients, had been very much involved in the 1968 election, but that they had been on the side and had been very supportive of Senator Humphrey in that campaign. And now, words to the effect, that they were without friends in the Administration and this was the reason they wanted to make a contribution.

Mr. Weitz. Did they indicate -- did Mr. Semer indicate the amount of the contribution, or the range of the contribution?
Mr. Kalmbach. I seem to recall that at that first meeting he indicated $100,000.00, but I'm not certain on that -- of the early April meeting.

Mr. Weitz. Did he specify the recipient, or the intended purpose or use of the funds?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, he did not. He simply used the word "contribution", and, again, as I say, he told me that he had been referred to me by John Mitchell. And I don't recall that he indicated any use of the funds, other than categorizing the funds as a contribution.

Mr. Weitz. And was it your understanding that it was at least for the purpose, or in connection with, the matter of counteracting the fact that they had no friends, so to speak, as he put it, in the Administration?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Did he say in what form he intended to make the contribution?

Mr. Kalmbach. Again, on this my memory is that he indicated that -- and I don't know whether it was at this conversation or at subsequent conversation. We had several conversations, many conversations, in fact, prior to the time that I actually received the funds in August of 1969. And either at the -- at this very early time, or subsequently, at some point, it's my memory -- and my best memory -- that it became clear that they were talking of contributing cash as their
contribution.

Now, one of the reasons, as I try to reconstruct this in my mind and it's of course five years old now, is that there were no Committees outstanding that could receive those funds that I know of, and it's just my memory that he suggested cash. And that is my best memory now.

Mr. Weitz. When you took over responsibility as trustee for the surplus funds from the 1968 campaign, or at anytime thereafter, in connection with that responsibility, did you have any discussions with either Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Stans, or anyone else in connection with the preferred form of monies that you would either handle or receive from the outside?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

At the outset it was made clear to me that Mr. Haldeman would be the one to whom I would report as far as my duties as trustee for these funds. And Mr. Haldeman made it clear to me in many conversations that I was to retain the nature of the funds as I received them, insofar as it was possible for me to do so. By that I mean that the cash I received should remain as cash, and there was a checking account that I was that was established in New York City, some $570,000.00, and that was to remain as a checking account until I was ordered to change that, by him.

But it was credited. Cash was to remain cash and the check was to remain in that form.
Thank you.

Mr. Weitz. Just one more question before we leave this area. From the cash in these various safe deposit boxes during the period from 1969 to 1972, I take it that it was those funds that were used for purposes such as disbursements to Anthony Ulasewicz and also part of the funds disbursed for the candidacy of Governor Brewer in Alabama in 1970?

Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.

Mr. Weitz. Now, returning to the contacts between you and Mr. Semer on behalf of the dairy cooperative in 1969, did you have occasion to meet with Mr. Semer out in California before the delivery of the contribution?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, and my memory has been refreshed on that from notes, and I find that I think I met him in early July of 1969 in Newport Beach, California, and then I met him on or about August 2, I think, of 1969 in Newport Beach.

Mr. Weitz. Now, in the conversations and meetings leading up to the actual delivery of the contribution, is there anything else that you can now recall that took place or was discussed, in addition to what you have already mentioned?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, yes. I think, again from my memory being refreshed, I find that at some point, and I think more than once, it was stated to me by Mr. Semer that his client or clients were talking of contributing in the aggregate or as a goal figure for 1969 $250,000. And he gave me a range, as I
remember, of from $100,000 to $250,000 that they had as their
goal to contribute in 1969, by 12-31-1969.

Also, my memory is now refreshed, and it's my recollection
that the made it clear to me that he had three objectives in
mind. He, as the attorney for these clients; these objectives
were, one, I think 90 percent of parity was a goal. Two was
that they would like to have the President address their con-
vention, I think, the convention that was scheduled to be held
in Kansas City the next year. And three, that they wanted to
have some identity or an audience or --

Mr. Weitz. Contact.

Mr. Kalmbach. -- contact with the President so that they
could meet him. And, of course, that was also included. And
they wanted to be able to talk to various people within the
White House, meaning Milton Semer and his clients making their
case.

Mr. Weitz. And the range of $100,000 to $250,000 was
in no way distinguished from the original discussion, in terms
of amount, source, use of the money, than the original $100,000
figure mentioned by Mr. Semer?

Mr. Kalmbach. It was not.

Mr. Weitz. Do you remember any discussions with Mr. Semer
before or at the time of the delivery of the contribution of
any alternate method of reporting or receipt of the monies to
committees and so forth?
Mr. Kalmbach. Absolutely not. He transferred the funds
to me on or about August 2, and there was no mention of any
reporting requirements or no request for a receipt for funds at
all that I can remember.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall any discussion as to the source
of the funds?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, I do not.

Mr. Weitz. What was your understanding of the source of
the money?

Mr. Kalmbach. My understanding of the source of the money
was from his clients, and beyond that I have no memory at all
of him telling me how these funds were in fact raised.

Mr. Weitz. Do you remember any discussion as to the
existence of political trusts as adjuncts to the cooperatives?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, I do, and I think at some point during
these rather — and there were numerous conversations that I
had with Mr. Semer, dating from early April through to the time
that I received the $100,000 in cash — that at various points
during this time, he gave me background on the way these people,
these cooperatives, raised political funds.

Mr. Weitz. But at no time did he specify, and particularly
at the time of the delivery of the money, did he specify the
source of the money?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, I have no memory at all that he told
me of the source of it, that it was just my understanding that
these funds had come from his clients.

Mr. Weitz. Did you understand whether or not there were more than -- whether there were as many as 20 sources for the money?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, I did not understand that. Again, as I say, I don't remember that he particularized as to the source, and it was just my assumption that he obtained these funds from his clients. But I was not aware of how, in fact, they were obtained.

Mr. Weitz. Now, you've mentioned -- but first, before we get to that -- before receipt of the money, did you check with or report to Mr. Haldeman with respect to the offer of a contribution offered by Mr. Semer?

Mr. Kalmbach. Of course.

Mr. Weitz. Did you explain to him what you've told us today?

Mr. Kalmbach. I did. I told Mr. Haldeman that I had been approached by Mr. Semer and I know, too, that I talked to I confirmed with Mr. Mitchell that Mr. Semer was known to him, and I did talk to Mr. Mitchell, I think it was within a day or two after I talked to Mr. Semer, just to make certain that this person was what he said he was. And it's my clear memory that Mr. Haldeman authorized me to receive any contribution that was offered by these people.

Mr. Weitz. Did you also indicate to Mr. Haldeman to disuc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 4/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>Court of Appeals Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:15</td>
<td>Mr. Fleming arrives from NY, 4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:30</td>
<td>Meeting with 3 of the 4 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:45</td>
<td>فلمنن</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Thursday, 6-12

3:45 to office

3:45 CAF Plane

5:00 CAF Plane

10:00 by Mr. X
1. Meet with clients to review work

2. Coordinate with clients

3. Support for daily functions

4. Participate in a gathering

5. Copy of minutes from

6. Inquire with the
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tives of some dairy cooperatives?

STATEMENT OF H. R. HALDEMAN; ACCOMPANIED

BY FRANK H. STRICKLER, COUNSEL

Mr. Haldeman. I am not able to identify either time or
individual as to when and how I became aware of the interest
on the part of the dairy industry or intention on the part of
the dairy industry to supply contributions.

I did at some point become aware of that. I don't
believe it was in 1969. I would expect it was probably in '70.

Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this.

Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in cash
was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to
Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Haldeman. In 1969?

Mr. Weitz. In 1969.

Mr. Haldeman. I don't recall that. I am not currently
aware of it. That is something I may or may not have known
at the time, and I have no recollection of knowing it.

Kalmbach reported some things to me, he generally kept me in-
formed on what he was doing —

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall whether in 1969 he asked your
advice or notified you of any contacts he was having in
connection with soliciting contributions, contributions for
the trust account, or whether or not they were with regard to
the trust account in general?
Mr. Faidley was not able to identify who the individual was who told him about the fraudulent activities in the part of the dairy industry or indicate on an active part of the dairy industry to supply examinations.

I did not have time become aware of that. I don’t believe it was in 1969. I would expect it was probably in 1970.

Mr. Faidley. Let me ask you this.

Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to

Mr. Faidley?

Mr. Faidley. In 1969.

Mr. Faidley. In 1969.

Mr. Faidley. I don’t recall that. I am not currently aware of it. Back in 1969 I may or may not have known of the time in that I have no recollection of knowing it.

Faidley reported some change in 1969. He generally kept me informed on what he was doing —

Mr. Faidley. As you recall, he was in 1969 he asked you

Mrs. Faidley to come to the house and was paying for

Mrs. Faidley to come to the house. He was paying for the rent and expenses as well as contributions for

the trust account. He always was the one who was

himself was the one who
The United States Senate

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before:

Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities

SENATE RESOLUTION 60 — GENERAL INVESTIGATION

CONFIDENTIAL

Tuesday, December 18, 1973

Washington, D.C.

WARD & PAUL
410 FIRST STREET, S.E.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003

(202) 544-6000

Duplication or copying of this transcript by photographic, electrostatic or other facsimile means is NOT AUTHORIZED. Copies available, when authorized by Committee, only through Official Reporters.
Mr. Weitz. Are you suggesting that you thought that you would be asked to retain Mr. Kalmbach, AMPI would be asked to retain?

Mr. Nelson. That's one of the possibilities that -- yes, we weren't sure.

Mr. Weitz. How would he effect your access to the Administration?

Then Mr. Kalmbach would act on your behalf as your attorney?

Mr. Nelson. Mr. Kalmbach or someone associated with him.

Mr. Weitz. I see.

Now, could you tell us what transpired in that context?

How many contacts were there, do you know, between Mr. Semer or anyone else on your behalf in 1969 and Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Nelson. Well, no, I don't. I don't know how many contacts. I know that Mr. Semer came back and said that it had been suggested that he see Mr. Kalmbach. As I recall, at the time he didn't tell us it was Mr. Kalmbach. He said, see a California lawyer. He may have said Kalmbach. I don't really think so at that time. And I don't know whether he told Mr. Jacobsen or whether he told me. I rather think it was Mr. Jacobsen that he told.

And so we said, go ahead and see, which he did. And then, as I recall, he came back and said, if we want to go forward with the relationship, that we should deliver $100,000 in cash.
Mr. Weitz. This was Mr. Kalmbach's suggestion to Mr. Semer?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Weitz. Which Mr. Semer in turn related to you?

Mr. Nelson. Related to me.

Mr. Weitz. Through Mr. Jacobsen?

Mr. Nelson. Either way. He may have related it to me personally. It was either through Jacobsen or personally. I don't recall which it was.

Mr. Weitz. Now, before Mr. Semer made contact with Mr. Kalmbach, did he tell you what Mr. Mitchell had suggested?

First of all, were there any --

Mr. Nelson. Yes, he told us that Mr. Mitchell had -- as I recall, he said that he went to Mr. Mitchell. I don't remember whether at that time he told me that, or whether I found that out after we got involved in all of this, and I started trying to recall them talking to them about how it happened. It may be that I found out that it was actually Mitchell that he talked to after I first talked to you, or just prior to that sometime. Anyway, it is my present understanding that he talked to Mitchell, is who he talked to.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether Mr. Mitchell suggested or discussed anything else with him besides contacting Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Nelson. No.

Mr. Weitz. Now, you say it was -- the two possibilities, as
Mr. Peterson and others in the office and the
were in the

Mr. Peterson in the office was asked to the

Then Mr. Gableman will put up an offer at your attorney?

Mr. Jacobsen is a company associated with Mr.

Mr. Hatte. I see.

Mr. wild and was described in the manner

Anybody knows of any talk, do you know, between or,

Then we were out of it and Mr. Hatte.

Mr. Hatte, yes. He said I don't know how any cont-

I knew that he was one and said that he had

been suggested that he and Mr. Hatte. As I recall, at the
time he didn't talk as it were at all much. He said, I'm a
California lawyer, he was more said to me. I don't really

think so an that time. And I don't know whether he told Mr.

Jacobsen or whether he told us. I rather think it was Mr. Jac-

sen that he told,

And so we said, go ahead and see which he did. And then,
as I recall, he came back and said, I'm not sure to go forward

with the relationship, and so about fifteen $60,000 or so.
Mr. Nelson, do you recall whether Mr. Mitchell suggested or
discussed anything else with the advisors regarding Mr. Kalenchuk?
2. On August 2, 1969 Semer on behalf of AMPI delivered $100,000 in cash to Kalmbach. Kalmbach added the cash to the surplus funds from the President's 1968 campaign that were in Kalmbach's custody. Kalmbach used this fund on behalf of the White House for, among other things, making payments to Tony Ulasewicz and to the Albert Brewer campaign against George Wallace.

2.1 Milton Semer statement, SSC Executive Session, February 5, 1974, Semer Exhibit 1.


2.3 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 14, 18, 10.

2.4 John Ehrlichman testimony, SSC Executive Session, February 8, 1974, 14-15.

2.5 H. R. Haldeman unsworn interview, SSC Executive Session, January 31, 1974, 2.
NOTE 2.1

At Milton Semer's Executive Session testimony before
the Senate Select Committee on February 5, 1974 the following
statement provided by Semer was introduced into evidence as
Exhibit 1.
My name is Milton P. Semer; I am an attorney practicing law
in Washington, D. C. I am appearing to describe my relationship
with a former client, the Associated Milk Producers, Inc. of San
Antonio, Texas.

From discussions with your staff, I understand your interest
in my testimony to center on representation of the client during

Also, in light of your staff's interest, I should note that in
1968 I was Treasurer for Senator Muskie's Vice Presidential cam-
paign, and when Senator Muskie ran for reelection to the Senate in
1970, I was Treasurer of theMuskie Election Committee.

Attached to my statement are copies of letters from the client
to this Committee's staff setting forth the extent to which the
client has waived the attorney-client privilege in connection with
my testimony.

My relationship with the client commenced on March 21, 1969,
when representatives came to see me in Washington. We discussed
how our Washington firm might assist them, when circumstances re-
quired, in making a persuasive case on the merits to the Federal
Government on substantive issues of interest to them, including
price supports and import competition. In part, it appeared that
this would involve presenting their arguments to the White House —
which, during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, had actively
participated in decisions on such issues, and presumably would
continue to do so.

At the same time, it was explained to me that the client was
organizing a political fund, the Trust for Agricultural and Politici-
rical Education, to raise funds from their members for distribution
to candidates of both major parties in local, State, Congressional,
and Presidential campaigns. TAPE was described to me as a fund
modeled after the AFL-CIO's Committee for Political Education, COPE,
whose purpose would be to support and win friends on Capitol Hill
and in the Administration and promote the milk farmer's position
on the issues.

Shortly after my initial meeting with the client, I began an
unsuccessful effort to help it find out how the White House was to
be organized, and to whom it should make its case.

Since 5/30 6/1974
[5932]
I have related the details of these efforts to your staff, and my purpose in this statement is to highlight the basic events in the chronology.

On October 25, 1968, just before the Presidential election, I called Mr. John Mitchell who had served on an advisory committee when I was General Counsel of the housing department in the early 1960's. I phoned him at the behest of a client wishing to contribute to the Nixon campaign. Mr. Mitchell had put me in touch with Mr. Maurice Stans, who in turn referred me to Mr. Jack Gleason.

On March 25, 1969, following my initial meeting with the client, I called Jack Gleason at the White House to describe my firm's new client and its interest in finding out to whom at the White House it should direct its case. Mr. Gleason in turn suggested I deal with Mr. Herbert Kalmbach, and it shortly was arranged for me to meet Mr. Kalmbach in Washington.

On April 3, 1969, I explained to Mr. Kalmbach the interests of my client. Mr. Kalmbach did not ask for a political contribution, but did inquire about the contribution potential of the client's political trust fund, TAPE.

On July 10, 1969, I visited with Mr. Kalmbach at his office in Newport Beach, California. On this occasion Mr. Kalmbach inquired how TAPE's fund-raising was progressing. When I explained that my client hoped its trust fund would collect sufficient funds to make contributions to a large number of candidates of both parties at all levels of government, Mr. Kalmbach told me that contributions would be appreciated by the Administration.

At this time it was my understanding, and I thought it was Mr. Kalmbach's, that the client would be making, through its trust fund, a series of political contributions to committees for 1970 Congressional candidates, to be reported by TAPE and by the recipient committees. It had been a common practice for past Administrations to "piggy-back" such contributions — that is, to transmit them through the incumbent Administration, allowing it to share credit for the contributions with the donor — and I had discussed this political technique both with the client and with Mr. Kalmbach.

Thus it was that on August 1, 1969, I flew to Dallas, Texas, to receive from the client for delivery to Mr. Kalmbach the next day a contribution of one hundred thousand dollars in cash. Although more than a little surprised at the amount, which was much larger than I had supposed it would be, I delivered the funds to Mr. Kalmbach as I had agreed to do. Neither then nor later did he tell me anything inconsistent with my understanding of the nature of this transaction, as summarized above.
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iaries, and a purpose.

Now, I guess Mr. Stans, in the position of the settlor, and you were certainly the trustee, but who was the beneficiary, or what was the purpose for which the trust was established?

A I simply understood that these funds were to be expended for political purposes at the direction of Mr. Haldeman.

Q So if they were expended for anything, other than political purposes, that would not have been within the terms of your trust?

A No. I think I've stated, Mr. Dobrovir, that the purposes of the trust were never stated. I'm simply -- I've just simply stated to you an assumption.

Q I see.

But as far as you were concerned, whatever Mr. Haldeman said to do with the money, you would do with it?

A Absolutely.

Q Well, so, anyway, you received the hundred thousand dollars, and it was in cash?

A Yes.

Q Were the bills new?

A I don't recall that they were.

Q What denominations were they in?

A My memory is that they were in hundred dollar denominations.

Q Did he bring them in a brief case or a suitcase?

A Just a little valise.

Q A little valise. And did you count the money?
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with him the goals or interests of Mr. Semar's clients?

Mr. Kalmbach. I don't think at the outset these goals
or interests were made known to me. But when they were made
known to me later in our conversation, I'm certain that I made
those known to Mr. Haldeman, inasmuch as he was the one to who
I was reporting as trustee.

Mr. Weitz. When you said "later," would this have been
later in your series of meetings but before or contemporaneous
with the delivery of the first contribution?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Did you also report to Mr. Haldeman upon
receipt of the contribution?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, I did, and I'm certain that I told
Mr. Haldeman immediately or within a week or so after I received
the $100,000 that I had, in fact, received that money, and again
stated to him the objectives that Mr. Semar had given to me.

Mr. Weitz. What did you do with the money?

Mr. Kalmbach. I put it in a safe deposit box in the
Security Pacific National Bank, Newport Center branch, Newport
Beach, California.

Mr. Weitz. And it was out of those funds, commingled with
others, that was applied to the various purposes, some of the
purposes to which you referred to today?

Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.

Mr. Weitz. And the surplus from those monies was transfe...
Mr. Kalmbach. I don't know if this is responsive to your question, but it was clear in my own mind that as a result of this contribution and contributions by, or further contribution by, Mr. Semer and his clients, that meetings would be arranged for Mr. Semer and his clients to meet with certain people within the White House to put forth his case on behalf of his clients.

Now, I don't recall that I had any understanding beyond that as to any substantive results that would be forthcoming. I simply stated to one or more of these people in the White House or in the Administration the objectives that Mr. Semer had made known to me.

(Discussion off the record.)
Mr. Kalmbach. I don't know if this is responsive to you question, but it was clear in my own mind that as a result of this contribution and contributions by, or further contributions by, Mr. Semer and his clients, that meetings would be arranged for Mr. Semer and his clients to meet with certain people with the White House to put forth his case on behalf of his client.

Now, I don't recall that I had any understanding beyond that as to any substantive results that would be forthcoming. I simply stated to one or more of these people in the White House or in the Administration the objectives that Mr. Semer had made known to me.

(Discussion off the record.)
Thank you.

Mr. Weitz. Just one more question before we leave this area. From the cash in these various safe deposit boxes during the period from 1969 to 1972, I take it that it was those funds that were used for purposes such as disbursements to Anthony Ulasewicz and also part of the funds disbursed for the candidacy of Governor Brewer in Alabama in 1970?

Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.

Mr. Weitz. Now, returning to the contacts between you and Mr. Semer on behalf of the dairy cooperative in 1969, did you have occasion to meet with Mr. Semer out in California before the delivery of the contribution?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, and my memory has been refreshed on that from notes, and I find that I think I met him in early July of 1969 in Newport Beach, California, and then I met him on or about August 2, I think, of 1969 in Newport Beach.

Mr. Weitz. Now, in the conversations and meetings leading up to the actual delivery of the contribution, is there anything else that you can now recall that took place or was discussed, in addition to what you have already mentioned?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, yes. I think, again from my memory being refreshed, I find that at some point, and I think more than once, it was stated to me by Mr. Semer that his client or clients were talking of contributing in the aggregate or as a goal figure for 1969 $250,000. And he gave me a range, as I
2.4 John Ehrlichman testimony
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Benjamin Plotkin, Minority Investigator; Gordon Freedman, Re-
search Assistant; Emily Sheketoff, Research Assistant
Mr. Weitz. When was that for the Domestic Council organized?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Well, sometime after Congress approved the Domestic Council formation which would have been late '70, I would guess, or early '71. I would have to check that. It would be a matter of record, but, you know, there was a reorganization and it came up and the Congress had 90 days and they didn't veto it and it then went into effect and we assembled it and we'd have to check and see what the dates would be.

Mr. Weitz. The third paragraph in the letter from Mr. Billings to the President, it refers to the fact that AMP, which is a dairy cooperative, contributed about $135,000 to Republican candidates in the 1970 election. Do you have any knowledge of that?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Well, to the extent —

Mr. Weitz. Whether in specific or general terms?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I would think that I did because I assume that would be money Kalmbach got from Semer because I think it was at that time that he was raising money for Congressional candidates in the '70 election.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether Mr. Kalmbach used any of these moneys for any purposes other than the 1970 election of Senatorial candidates?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes, I am sure he must have and some of
that money, I am sure, carried over to the Presidential election.

I can't assure you, but I guess that's just a general understanding.

Mr. Weitz. Did you ever give him instructions with respect to payment of expense to Mr. Ulasewicz?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes, sure.

Mr. Weitz. And you were aware that he was using funds received from Mr. Kalmbach for those sources?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. What about Mr. Brucker's candidacy in 1970?

Mr. Ehrlichman. That's that Alabama business?

Mr. Weitz. Yes.

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Now the next sentence in the letter goes on to say "We are now working with Tom Evans and Herb Kalmbach in setting up appropriate channels for AMPI to contribute two million dollars for your re-election." Did you have any knowledge of that?

Mr. Ehrlichman. No, I didn't.

Mr. Weitz. And finally, "AMPI is funding a special project." Did you have any knowledge of what that reference meant?

Mr. Ehrlichman. No.

Mr. Weitz. Now in an accompanying memorandum, White House Memorandum, "Routing Slip" really, there are two accompanying
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Mr. Haldeman. I am not able to identify either time or individual as to when and how I became aware of the interest on the part of the dairy industry or intention on the part of the dairy industry to supply contributions.

I did at some point become aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1969. I would expect it was probably in '70.

Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this.

Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in cash was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Haldeman. In 1969?

Mr. Weitz. In 1969.

Mr. Haldeman. I don't recall that. I am not currently aware of it. That is something I may or may not have known at the time, and I have no recollection of knowing it.

Kalmbach reported some things to me, he generally kept me informed on what he was doing --

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall whether in 1969 he asked your advice or notified you of any contacts he was having in connection with soliciting contributions, contributions for the trust account, or whether or not they were with regard to the trust account in general?
Mr. Weitz. I do not. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.

Mr. Goldman. I do not recall that. I am not sufficiently abreast of it. That is uncertain. I say so again. I think it was at some point became aware of that. I don't believe it was in 1939. I would expect it was probably in '76. Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you this. Are you aware that the hundred thousand dollars in each was delivered by a representative of the dairy industry to Mr. Goldman? Mr. Weitz. In 1939. Mr. Goldman. I do not. Mr. Weitz. In 1939.
3. Kalmbach has testified that between August 2, 1969 and August 9, 1969 he reported to Haldeman that he had received the $100,000 and again stated to Haldeman the objectives Semer had given. Kalmbach also informed John Ehrlichman, Maurice Stans, Jack Gleason (then an aide to Maurice Stans and later a White House aide), and Assistants to the President Peter Flanigan and Harry Dent of the contribution, and he telephoned one or more of them to arrange for meetings between AMPI representatives and White House aides. On August 19, 1969 Semer, AMPI General Manager Harold Nelson and AMPI special counsel David Parr met with Dent at the White House to discuss dairy industry problems and to invite the President to address an AMPI annual meeting.

3.1 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 13-18.

3.2 John Ehrlichman testimony, SSC Executive Session, February 8, 1974, 1-5.


3.5 Memorandum from Harold Nelson to Harry S. Dent, August 19, 1969 (received from SSC).

3.6 Letter from Jack Gleason to Milton Semer, September 16, 1969 (received from SSC).
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these funds had come from his clients.

Mr. Weitz. Did you understand whether or not there were more than -- whether there were as many as 20 sources for the money?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, I did not understand that. Again, as I say, I don't remember that he particularized as to the source, and it was just my assumption that he obtained these funds from his clients. But I was not aware of how, in fact, they were obtained.

Mr. Weitz. Now, you've mentioned -- but first, before we get to that -- before receipt of the money, did you check with or report to Mr. Haldeman with respect to the offer of a contribution offered by Mr. Semer?

Mr. Kalmbach. Of course.

Mr. Weitz. Did you explain to him what you've told us today?

Mr. Kalmbach. I did. I told Mr. Haldeman that I had been approached by Mr. Semer and I know, too, that I talked to -- I confirmed with Mr. Mitchell that Mr. Semer was known to him, and I did talk to Mr. Mitchell, I think it was within a day or two after I talked to Mr. Semer, just to make certain that this person was what he said he was. And it's my clear memory that Mr. Haldeman authorized me to receive any contribution that was offered by these people.

Mr. Weitz. Did you also indicate to Mr. Haldeman, discuss
with him the goals or interests of Mr. Semer's clients?

Mr. Kalmbach. I don't think at the outset these goals or interests were made known to me. But when they were made known to me later in our conversation, I'm certain that I made those known to Mr. Haldeman, inasmuch as he was the one to whom I was reporting as trustee.

Mr. Weitz. When you said "later," would this have been later in your series of meetings but before or contemporaneous with the delivery of the first contribution?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Did you also report to Mr. Haldeman upon receipt of the contribution?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, I did, and I'm certain that I told Mr. Haldeman immediately or within a week or so after I received the $100,000 that I had, in fact, received that money, and again stated to him the objectives that Mr. Semer had given to me.

Mr. Weitz. What did you do with the money?

Mr. Kalmbach. I put it in a safe deposit box in the Security Pacific National Bank, Newport Center branch, Newport Beach, California. Mr. Weitz. And it was out of those funds, commingled with others, that was applied to the various purposes, some of the purposes to which you referred to today?

Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.

Mr. Weitz. And the surplus from those monies was transfer-
together with the amounts in the checking account, to Mr. Sloan in 1972?

Is that correct?

Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.

Mr. Weitz. Did you report or discuss your contacts with Mr. Semer with anyone else that you can recall in 1969 in the White House, other than Mr. Mitchell, who, of course, was the Attorney General, and Mr. Haldeman?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes. I think I advised Mr. Flanigan, Mr. Ehrlichman, and Mr. Stans. Of course, Mr. Stans was not in the White House as such, but he was in the Administration.

Mr. Weitz. I should enlarge that question to include anyone in the Administration.

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Were there any reactions or comments or messages that you recall from those gentlemen?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, there were no particular reactions, other than -- oh, Mr. Dent would be another man that I would have advised of this. And I think the reactions were simply that I told them, either one or all of them, told them of Mr. Semer's objectives, certainly, as to the objectives that he had, that he wanted to meet with certain of the people within the White House.

And Mr. Gleason, incidentally, would be another one that probably I advised of this.
And it was made clear to me by one or more of these people that meetings would and could be arranged between Mr. Semer and one or more people within the White House.

Mr. Weitz: Not the President, yet, but at least some aides?

Mr. Kalmbach: Yes. And I don't recall that the President was mentioned.

Mr. Weitz: By them?

Mr. Kalmbach: By them.

Mr. Weitz: But you, in fact, mentioned to them the dairy people's interest in meeting with the President?

Mr. Kalmbach: That is correct. And also, of course, their interest in having the President address their convention, I think, the following year in Kansas City, as I remember.

Mr. Weitz: And the setting of parity at 90 percent?

Mr. Kalmbach: That is correct.

Mr. Weitz: Do you remember taking any steps within the next several weeks after the receipt of the contribution to, in fact, arrange or assist in the arrangement of a meeting between Mr. Semer and Mr. Dent?

Mr. Kalmbach: Yes, I do.

Mr. Weitz: How did you go about that?

Mr. Weitz: I think I called Mr. Dent. It was subsequent to the time that Mr. Semer gave me the $100,000, on or about August 2, 1969, and I think I called Mr. Dent, and Mr. Dent agreed to see Mr. Semer. And I think I also talked to one or
more of the others in the White House to set up other appointments for Mr. Semer.

Now, I'm not -- my memory is not clear as to what people he met in the Administration.

Mr. Weitz. You were not present?

Mr. Kalmbach. But I was never present at any of those meetings that I remember at all. But I'm certain that the people that he did meet in the Administration were -- it was probably the result of calls that I made to either Bob Haldeman or John Erlichman or Harry Dent or some of the others that I've named.

Mr. Weitz. Did either you, in your conversations with people in the Administration in connection with this contribution and the contract with the dairy people, or did any of those individuals with whom you talked express any concern about the discussion, both contribution or contributions, substantial contributions, and certain aims or interests that they had in substantive policies and in contacts with the Administration?

Mr. Kalmbach. Excuse me. I'm not certain as to your question.

Mr. Weitz. Essentially, to boil it down, did either you express concern about -- well, let me start it this way.

Did you perceive the dairy people as hoping that their contribution would assist them in gaining, number one, access to the White House, meetings with the President, and some substantive policy decision with regard to parity, the setting of
Mr. Kalmbach. I don't know if this is responsive to your question, but it was clear in my own mind that as a result of this contribution and contributions by, or further contribution by, Mr. Semer and his clients, that meetings would be arranged for Mr. Semer and his clients to meet with certain people within the White House to put forth his case on behalf of his clients.

Now, I don't recall that I had any understanding beyond that as to any substantive results that would be forthcoming. I simply stated to one or more of these people in the White House or in the Administration the objectives that Mr. Semer had made known to me.

(Discussion off the record.)
Mr. Kalmbach. I don't know if this is responsive to your question, but it was clear in my own mind that as a result of this contribution and contributions by, or further contributions by, Mr. Semer and his clients, that meetings would be arranged for Mr. Semer and his clients to meet with certain people with the White House to put forth his case on behalf of his clients.

Now, I don't recall that I had any understanding beyond that as to any substantive results that would be forthcoming. I simply stated to one or more of these people in the White House or in the Administration the objectives that Mr. Semer had made known to me.

(Discussion off the record.)
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Mr. Weitz. Mr. Ehrlichman, let me direct your attention to 1969. Did you become aware at anytime during 1969 of any contacts between either White House people or Republican fundraisers with the dairy cooperatives? Particularly Associated Milk Producers?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Can you tell us how you came to that knowledge?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I am not sure what my first knowledge was but I became aware of the fact that Herb Kalmbach was in touch with an attorney here in Washington who represented or at least I was told he represented the Milk Producers or some part of the Milk Producers. And from time to time in that -- I think it was 1969, Kalmbach mentioned that he was getting campaign contributions from that attorney in behalf of the Milk Producers.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall the name of the attorney?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I can't remember the name. It starts with a 'S' as I recall.

Mr. Weitz. Does Semer ring a bell?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Had you heard of or seen Milton Semer before that time?

Mr. Ehrlichman. No.

Mr. Weitz. Was Mr. Kalmbach specific or any more specific than you mentioned with what the dairy group was that was making the contributions?
Mr. Ehrlichman. I was never very clear about what specific unit or branch or interest it was.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate whether they had -- earlier had been supporters, for instance, in the previous election of the President or whether this was a new group or new contribution of some sort?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I don't recall that.

My impression was that this was a new contact for Kalmbach. That he had had no previous experience with this man.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate how the dairy people or at least Mr. Semer came to contact Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Through an intermediary and I can't recall who it was. I recall Kalmbach telling me about another attorney named Morgan and whether Morgan was the intermediary or whether Morgan was in relation to some other transaction, I can't remember, but it may have been Morgan.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know which attorney Morgan he was talking about?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Edward Morgan who apparently is a long time lawyer, not the Assistant Treasurer of Treasury, another one.

Mr. Wilson. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. Weitz. Back on the record.

Was Mr. Kalmbach reporting to you with respect to any other
contributions he received in 1969?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Well, he wasn't really reporting to me on this. I mean, this was a matter of passing conversation rather than a report as such.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know who he was reporting to?

Mr. Ehrlichman. No, I don't. The reason that I recall this specifically is because of a set of circumstances where he broke off this contact and there he did report to me in a sense. He came to me with a concern that he had about it and we discussed it.

Mr. Weitz. That was much later?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Well, no, not much. It would have been within the year I would think.

Mr. Weitz. 1969 or 1970?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Let me -- see, I can't fix it as to date but my impression is that his contact with -- Semer is it?

Semers?

Mr. Weitz. Semer, S-e-m-e-r.

Mr. Ehrlichman. Didn't go on for more than about a year and on one occasion he came and said, "I have real concerns about this fellow. He is beginning to suggest that there ought to be quid pro quo." And he said, "I just don't like the feel of it." And I said, "Well, Herb, that sounds to me like something that you ought to discontinue."

And he -- my understanding is that he did discontinue any
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Mr. Weitz. Mr. Ehrlichman, let me direct your attention to 1969. Did you become aware at anytime during 1969 of any contacts between either White House people or Republican fund raisers with the dairy cooperatives? Particularly Associate Milk Producers?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Can you tell us how you came to that knowledge?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I am not sure what my first knowledge was but I became aware of the fact that Herb Kalmbach was in touch with an attorney here in Washington who represented or at least I was told he represented the Milk Producers or some part of the Milk Producers. And from time to time in that -- I think it was 1969, Kalmbach mentioned that he was getting campaign contributions from that attorney in behalf of the Milk Producers.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall the name of the attorney?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I can't remember the name. It starts with a 'S' as I recall.

Mr. Weitz. Does Semer ring a bell?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Had you heard of or seen Milton Semer before that time?

Mr. Ehrlichman. No.

Mr. Weitz. Was Mr. Kalmbach specific or any more specific than you mentioned with what the dairy group was that was making the contributions?
Mr. Ehrlichman. I was never very clear about what specific unit or branch or interest it was.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate whether they had -- earlier had been supporters, for instance, in the previous election of the President or whether this was a new group or new contribution of some sort?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I don't recall that.

My impression was that this was a new contact for Kalmbach. That he had had no previous experience with this man.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate how the dairy people or at least Mr. Sener came to contact Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Through an intermediary and I can't recall who it was. I recall Kalmbach telling me about another attorney named Morgan and whether Morgan was the intermediary or whether Morgan was in relation to some other transaction, I can't remember, but it may have been Morgan.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know which attorney Morgan he was talking about?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Edward Morgan who apparently is a long time lawyer, not the Assistant Treasurer of Treasury, another one.

Mr. Wilson. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. Weitz. Back on the record.

Was Mr. Kalmbach reporting to you with respect to any other
Mr. Ehrlichman. Well, he wasn't really reporting to me on
this. I mean, this was a matter of passing conversation rather
than a report as such.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know who he was reporting to?

Mr. Ehrlichman. No, I don't. The reason that I recall
this specifically is because of a set of circumstances where
he broke off this contact and there he did report to me in
a sense. He came to me with a concern that he had about it
and we discussed it.

Mr. Weitz. That was much later?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Well, no, not much. It would have been
within the year I would think.

Mr. Weitz. 1963 or 1970?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Let me -- see, I can't fix it as to date
but my impression is that his contact with -- Semer is it?

Semers?

Mr. Weitz. Semer, S-e-m-e-x.

Mr. Ehrlichman. Didn't go on for more than about a year
and on one occasion he came and said, "I have real concern about
this fellow. He is beginning to suggest that there ought to be
quid pro quo." And he said, "I just don't like the feel of it."
And I said, "Well, Herb, that sounds to me like something that
you ought to discontinue."

And he -- my understanding is that he did discontinue any
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Mr. Weitz. Is that consistent with what he told you in 1973?

Mr. Semer. Well, if he took money out of that fungible source, it raises a tracing problem that is beyond my talents to figure out without any more information than what you've read.

Mr. Weitz. And if, in another deposition, Mr. Kalmbach has testified that he used the moneys in that box in California to finance the activities of Anthony Ulasewicz and also to finance the candidacy of Mr. Brewer in Alabama against Governor Wallace in 1970, is that consistent with what he told you in 1969 or 1973?

Mr. Semer. No, it is not. As a matter of fact, I just learned for the first time on the radio this morning, as to the possible use of that fund, and this is almost beyond belief.

Mr. Weitz. Now I just have several more questions in connection with the aftermath of the contribution, and then we can take a recess.

Shortly after the delivery of the money to Mr. Kalmbach, did you again speak with him with respect to making contact with a particular individual or other individuals in the White House?

Mr. Semer. I received over the telephone a message, possibly from Kalmbach, more likely from Gleason, to call Harry Dent of the White House staff to make an appointment for the
client to see Dent, and that appointment was made for August 15th
when Mr. Nelson and Mr. Parr and I went to the White House and
saw Mr. Dent, and possibly Gleason, who was then working for Mr. Parr.

Mr. Weitz. Did Mr. Kalmbach tell you that he had been
in contact with anyone in the White House to inform them
of your interest to meet with someone there?

Mr. Semer. He never mentioned anyone specifically that
he would be in touch with, but increasingly he gave me the
impression that he was not only acquainted but influential with
the White House people.

Mr. Weitz. Did he tell you that he called Harry Dent, or
was going to call Harry Dent?

Mr. Semer. He did not say that, as I recall.

Mr. Weitz. But if he has testified that he, in fact,
did, that would not be inconsistent with the circumstances?

Mr. Semer. No.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate that he had talked to anybody
else in the White House about your client and their interest
with meeting with people in the White House?

Mr. Semer. Not that I recall.

Mr. Weitz. Did he ever tell you that he talked to Mr.
Ehrlichman about this?

Mr. Semer. No, he did not mention Mr. Ehrlichman's name,
although on one occasion, I think the first occasion, in his
office, it was a White House call -- I don't know whether it
was from the White House or whether it was one that was put
in by Mr. Kalmbach -- that I believe might have been Mr. Ehrl-
ichman.

Mr. Weitz. Did he tell you that he reported the fact of
the contribution to Mr. Haldeman?

Mr. Semer. No, he did not, that I recall.

Mr. Weitz. What was the purpose of the meeting with Mr.
Dent?

Mr. Semer. The purpose of the meeting with Mr. Dent was
twofold: one, to get the client acquainted with a White House
staffer; and secondly, as indicated in the memorandum, a copy
of which I have given the Committee, to invite the President
to attend the annual convention of the client group.

Mr. Weitz. Now I would like to mark as Exhibit 2 to your
executive session, which is also Exhibit 2 to Mr. Parr's exec-
utive session, a copy of a memorandum to Mr. Dent, dated
August 19, 1969. Is this a copy of the memorandum that you
prepared and was submitted to Mr. Dent?

(Whereupon, the document referred to was marked Semer's
Exhibit 2 for identification)

Mr. Semer. Yes, that's a copy of a memorandum from
Harold Nelson, then the general manager of the client group,
and this is a memorandum that was prepared in my office in
Washington in consultation with the client.

Mr. Weitz. Do you connect the meeting with Mr. Dent and
the subsequent contacts between the dairy people and the White House people to the contribution in August of 1969?

Mr. Semer. No, I don't, Mr. Weitz.

Mr. Weitz. Now Mr. Kalmbach in his deposition on page 13 has stated, "I think that in my conversations with him," meaning you, Mr. Semer, "it became my belief that at some point after he had made a contribution, that Mr. Semer would come to see me and ask me to introduce him to people in the White House, or in the Government, simply so that as an attorney for this particular client, he could make a case for whatever matter he wished to discuss with these people."

Now do you remember either giving that impression to Mr. Kalmbach, or is it your understanding that he could have drawn that conclusion from the contacts that had been made throughout 1969?

Mr. Semer. I would be very much surprised, Mr. Weitz, that Mr. Kalmbach, a very sophisticated attorney, would draw a conclusion that the contribution of the money would tie in with the meeting with a person, such as Harry Dent, in the White House.

Mr. Weitz. Well, on page 14, in recounting what he told Mr. Dent when he called him in connection with the milk producers, he said he was asked what did you say to Mr. Dent, and his response is, "I said that this is an attorney whose clients are supportive of the President," and indicated to him that I
would appreciate it if he would meet with him."

Now, would not the fact that the contribution make the people, in fact, supporters of the President, whereas in fact, the previous year they had not been supporters of the President?

Mr. Semer. Well, I don't know the context with which Mr. Kalmbach says that. On the face of it, if that's what he says, then those are the standards by which he makes judgments in politics. I can't disagree with his point of view. I can't challenge that, if that's his point of view.

Mr. Weitz. Now I have here, I believe subsequent to your meeting on the 19th with Mr. Dent, was there a subsequent contact that you had in 1969 with either Mr. Dent or Mr. Gleason in connection with your dairy client?

Let me specifically actually direct your attention to September 16, 1969, both to a letter of that date, and also to some type of a contact or perhaps telephone call. Does your log indicate that there was, in fact, a contact with Mr. Gleason or a message from him that day?

Mr. Semer. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. And what was that message or contact?

Mr. Semer. In the message says exactly quoted from the log, 'Gleason, no M.P.I. this month. What else does M.P.I. want?'

Mr. Weitz. What does that mean to you?
Mr. Waits. Is that consistent with what he told you in 1973?

Mr. Sover. Well, if he took money out of that fungible source, it raises a tracing problem that is beyond my talents to figure out without any more information than what you've read.

Mr. Waits. And if, in another deposition, Mr. Kalmbach has testified that he used the monies in that box in California to finance the activities of Anthony Ulasewicz and also to finance the candidacy of Mr. Brewer in Alabama against Governor Wallace in 1970, is that consistent with what he told you in 1969 or 1973?

Mr. Sover. No, it is not. As a matter of fact, I just learned for the first time on the radio this morning, as to the possible use of that fund, and this is almost beyond belief.

Mr. Waits. Now I just have several more questions in connection with the aftermath of the contribution, and then we can take a recess.

Shortly after the delivery of the money to Mr. Kalmbach, did you again speak with him with respect to making contact with a particular individual or other individuals in the White House?

Mr. Sover. I received over the telephone a message, possibly from Kalmbach, more likely from Gleason, to call Harry Dant of the White House staff to make an appointment for the
client to see Dent, and that appointment was made for August 13 when Mr. Neilson and Mr. Dunn and I went to the White House and saw Mr. Dent, and possibly Gleason, who was then working for Mr. R.

Mr. Weitz. Did Mr. Rainbach tell you that he had been in contact with anyone in the White House to inform them of your interest to meet with someone there?

Mr. Senex. He never mentioned anyone specifically that he would be in touch with, but increasingly he gave me the impression that he was not only acquainted but influential with the White House people.

Mr. Weitz: Did he tell you that he called Harry Dent, or was going to call Harry Dent?

Mr. Senex. He did not say that, as I recall.

Mr. Weitz. But if he has testified that he, in fact, did, that would not be inconsistent with the circumstances?

Mr. Senex. No.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate that he had talked to anybody else in the White House about your client and their interest with meeting with people in the White House?

Mr. Senex. Not that I recall.

Mr. Weitz. Did he ever tell you that he talked to Mr. Ehrlichman about this?

Mr. Senex. No, he did not mention Mr. Ehrlichman's name, although on one occasion, I think the first occasion, in his office, it was a White House call -- I don't know whether it
was from the White House or whether it was one that was put
in by Mr. Kalbacher -- that I believe might have been Mr. Ehrl-
ichman.

Mr. Waite. Did he tell you that he reported the fact of
the contribution to Mr. Baldeman?

Mr. Sameer. No, he did not, that I recall.

Mr. Waite. What was the purpose of the meeting with Mr.
Dent?

Mr. Sameer. The purpose of the meeting with Mr. Dent was
twofold: one, to get the client acquainted with a White House
staffer; and secondly, as indicated in the memorandum, a copy
of which I have given the Committee, to invite the President
to attend the annual convention of the client group.

Mr. Waite. Now I would like to mark as Exhibit 2 to your
executive session, which is also Exhibit 2 to Mr. Farr's exec-
utive session, a copy of a memorandum to Mr. Dent, dated
August 19, 1969. Is this a copy of the memorandum that you
prepared and was submitted to Mr. Dent?

(Whereupon, the document referred to was marked Sameer's
Exhibit 2 for identification.)

Mr. Sameer. Yes, that's a copy of a memorandum from
Harold Nelson, then the general manager of the client group,
and this is a memorandum that was prepared in my office in
Washington in consultation with the client.

Mr. Waite. Do you connect the meeting with Mr. Dent and
the subsequent contacts between the dairy people and the White
House people to the contributions in August of 1969?

Mr. Sasser. No, I don't, Mr. Weitz.

Mr. Weitz. Now Mr. Kalmback in his deposition on page 1
has stated, "I think that in my conversations with him," mean-
ing you, Mr. Sasser, "I became my belief that at some point
after he had made a contribution, that Mr. Sasser would come
to see me and ask me to introduce him to people in the White
House, or in the Government, simply so that as an attorney for
this particular client, he could make a case for whatever
matter he wished to discuss with these people."

Now do you remember either giving that impression to
Mr. Kalmback, or is it your understanding that he could have
drawn that conclusion from the contacts that had been made
throughout 1969?

Mr. Sasser. I would be very much surprised, Mr. Weitz,
that Mr. Kalmback, a very sophisticated attorney, would draw a
conclusion that the contribution of the money would tie in with
the meeting with a person, such as Harry Dent, in the White
House.

Mr. Weitz. Well, on page 14, in recounting what he told
Mr. Dent when he called him in connection with the milk pro-
ducers, he said he was asked what did you say to Mr. Dent, and
his response is, "I said that this is an attorney whose clients
are supportive of the President," and indicated to him that I
would appreciate it if he would meet with him.

Now, would not the fact that the contribution made by the people, in fact, supporters of the President, whereas in the previous year they had not been supporters of the President?

Mr. Senator. Well, I don't know the context with which Mr. Kaimo back says that. On the face of it, if that's what he says then those are the standards by which he makes judgments in politics. I can't disagree with his point of view. I can't challenge that. if that's his point of view.

Mr. Weitz. Now I have here, I believe subsequent to your meeting on the 19th with Mr. Dent, was there a subsequent contact that you had in 1969 with either Mr. Dent or Mr. Gleason in connection with your dairy client?

Let me specifically actually direct your attention to September 16, 1969, both to a letter of that date, and also to some type of a contact or perhaps telephone call. Does your log indicate that there was, in fact, a contact with Mr. Gleason or a message from him that day?

Mr. Senator. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. And what was that message or contact?

Mr. Senator. In the message says exactly quoted from the log, 'Gleason, no M.P.I. this month. What else does M.P.I. want?'

Mr. Weitz. What does that mean to you?
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Senator Weicker. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, 
the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Nelson. I do.

(Whereupon, at 10:25 o'clock a.m., the hearing in the 
above-entitled matter recessed to reconvene at 10:40 o'clock 
a.m., at 129 C Street, N. E., the same day.)
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at the time they told me his name. They may have. But anyway, I understood that it had been delivered.

Mr. Weitz. Now, following delivery of that money did you become aware of any contacts or any greater access to anyone in the Administration?

Mr. Nelson. That's what I started to say earlier when I misunderstood your question.

It seemed to us then that nothing was happening as a result of that. But since then, just by reading published why, in retrospect I would tie the fact that we did see Mr. Dent.

Mr. Weitz. That was sometime shortly after the delivery of the money?

Mr. Nelson. I can't tell you just how -- not a whole lot of time elapsed.

Mr. Weitz. Did you see him with Mr. Semer?

Mr. Nelson. I believe Mr. Semer and Mr. Parr.

Mr. Weitz. And yourself met Harry Dent in the White House in his White House office.

Mr. Nelson. Yes, in his office.

Mr. Weitz. The Executive Office Building?

Mr. Nelson. No, as I recall his office -- I may be wrong about this -- but as I recall, his office was in the East Wing of the White House when we saw him. It wasn't in the Executive Office Buildings.

Mr. Weitz. Now, if Mr. Semer's records indicate that he
met with Mr. Dent on August 19th, 1969, which would have been approximately two and a half weeks after the delivery of the money to Mr. Kalmbach, does that refresh your recollection as to the time you met with Mr. Dent and Mr. Parr?

Mr. Nelson. I'm sure that's when I was there.

Mr. Weitz. What was discussed at the meeting with Mr. Dent?

Mr. Nelson. I believe that we discussed some problems that we had. I can't recall what specific problem we were talking about then. It probably had to do with import regulations or tariffs, or something like that.

Mr. Weitz. Did anyone at that meeting --

Mr. Nelson. It would have been on dairy problems.

Mr. Weitz. Was it your understanding, then, that Mr. Dent was going to be your contact or the person that you could reach in the White House with respect to dairy problems?

Mr. Nelson. No. It would just, it was just kind of hoped that maybe he would.

Mr. Weitz. Did Mr. Semer or Mr. Dent or anyone else indicate at the meeting that you were supporters of the President?

Mr. Nelson. I believe that at the meeting it was indicated that we wanted to support the President. You see, we were always very candid about it, that we were Democrats who had a track record that, you know, couldn't be denied. That was, depending upon your political persuasion, that is a cross that you had to
bear. And so we made no bones about the fact. But we also
told him that we wanted to support the President and that we
would support the President.

Mr. Weitz. But there was no indication to your recollec-
tion that you were supporters of the President?

Mr. Nelson. That we were at that time? No, I wouldn't
say so.

Mr. Weitz. What about the $100,000 contribution?

Mr. Nelson. That was a payment. As far as I recall, that
$100,000 was never mentioned by anybody.

Mr. Weitz. No, not specifically. But didn't that make you
supporters of the President?

Mr. Nelson. Oh, you mean -- yes, it did. It did in our
view. But I don't think that -- I am quite sure that at that
point they didn't consider us to be supporters.

Mr. Weitz. Did you ever meet with Mr. Gleason?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Weitz. In 1969?

Mr. Nelson. Well, I can't tell you the date. But I tell
you, I believe we met with Mr. Gleason more than once. And as
I recall, it was either very shortly after or maybe a little be-
fore meeting with Mr. Dent.

Mr. Weitz. Now, let me show you a letter, and if you can
identify it, so be it. It is a letter which I will mark as Exhi-
bbit No. 1 at this session, from Jack Gleason to Milt Semer, dated
at the time they came - but this - only my have. But anyway,
I understand this to be the case.
Mr. Nelson. Yes, Mr. ... I don't know but you
became aware of Mr. ... to say it is correct to expect in
the Administration?
Mr. Nelson. That's what I wanted to say earlier when I
misunderstood your question.
It seemed to me that there was nothing else happening as a re-
sult of that. But since then, just by reading published accounts
why, in retrospect I would tie the fact that we did see Mr. Barr
Mr. Waitz. What was surprising shortly after the delivery
of the money?
Mr. Nelson. I can't call you just now - not a whole lot
of time elapsed.
Mr. Waitz. Did you see him with Mr. Barr?
Mr. Nelson. I believe Mr. Adams and Mr. Barr.
Mr. Waitz. And you did not see Mr. Menden in the White House
in his White House office?
Mr. Nelson. Yes, in his office.
Mr. Waitz. The Executive Office Building?
Mr. Nelson. No, as I recall his office -- I may be wrong
about this -- but as I recall, his office was in the East Wing
of the White House when we saw him. He wasn't in the Executive
Office Buildings.
Mr. Waitz. Yes, those - those documents indicates that he
met with Mr. Dent on August 10th, 1969, which would have been
approximately 40 or 50 years prior to delivery of the
money to Mr. Babcock. We are to get your money in at
the time you put with Mr. Dent or I...Aunt?

Mr. Nelsen. I'm sure that's when I was there.

Mr. Wells. What was discussed at the meeting with Mr.
Dent?

Mr. Nelsen. I believe that we discussed some problems that
we had. I can't recall the specific problems we were talking
about then. It probably had to do with import regulations or
tariffs, or something like that.

Mr. Wells. Did anyone at that meeting —

Mr. Nelsen. It would have been on dairy problems.

Mr. Wells. Was it your understanding, then, that Mr. Dent
was going to be your contact on the person that you could contact
in the White House with respect to dairy problems?

Mr. Nelsen. No. It would just, it was just kind of hoped
that maybe he would.

Mr. Wells. Did Mr. Seamer or Mr. Dent or anyone else indi-
cate at that meeting that you were supporters of the President?

Mr. Nelsen. I believe that at that meeting it was indicated
that we wanted to support the President. For see, we were always
very careful about it, that we came through there had a clean
record that you haven't had any. That was, I was talking
upon your personal judgment. Mr. Wells, that you had to
I'm not sure how it all fits in, but it seems to me that the banks would support the idea.

Mr. Nelson: Is there any other evidence of the fact that you can show, other than the prewriting?

Mr. Waite: I think we need it. We did, in our opinion. But I don't think that -- I'm quite sure that at that point they didn't consider it to be a supporter.

Mr. Waite: Did you ever work with Mr. Allison?

Mr. Nelson: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nelson: In 1956?

Mr. Waite: Can't tell you the exact date. But I will recall, I believe we met with Mr. Allison more than once. And as I recall, it was either very shortly after or maybe a little before meeting with Mr. Drum.

Mr. Waite: Now, let me give you a letter, and if you can identify it, so be it. It is a prewriting that I will show you in two days, but no, 16. 16/10/55.
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Harry S. Dent

FROM: Harold Nelson, General Manager,
Associated Dairymen, Inc.

SUBJECT: Invitation to the President to Address the Annual Meeting of
Associated Dairymen, Inc.

In accordance with your suggestion made in your office this morning, here are the details of our invitation to the President to address the Annual Meeting of Associated Dairymen, Inc.

Associated Dairymen, Inc. is a dairy cooperative representing both manufacturing and Grade A fluid milk producers whose farms are in the area roughly defined by the Appalachian Mountains on the east, the Rocky Mountains on the west, the Canadian border on the north, and the Gulf of Mexico on the south. These farms are in the 18 states of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Texas, and New Mexico.

Our member farmers produce approximately 16 percent of the national milk supply, which represents approximately $1 billion per year in sales.

This will be a banquet meeting at which we will have approximately 6,000 in attendance, including dairy farmers from every state in the United States.

Our first choice for a place of meeting is Kansas City, Missouri; but, if you deem it advisable, we suggest as possible alternatives Des Moines, Iowa; St. Louis, Missouri; or Chicago, Illinois. We have some latitude as to the date of the meeting, but, if at all possible, we would prefer a date in September or October.

Of course, I am sure that I need not assure you that the President would be among friends, as the area from which these farmers come are those in which he demonstrated his strength and popularity during the recent election.

Harold S. Nelson, 1011 N.W. Military Highway, San Antonio, Texas. (512) DI-4-138
David Parr, 6423 Forbing Road, Little Rock, Arkansas. (501) 562-1900
September 16, 1969

Dear Milt:

Are there any people in the Associated Dairymen's group whom we ought to give priority consideration for a position on some of the Department of Agriculture Advisory Boards or Commissions? We can play this pageantry pretty far if you've got any suggestions for people in that group whom we ought to push for that kind of appointment.

I will need their names and some kind of biography on them, but I think we can pretty well get this in hand over at Agriculture.

Regards.

Sincerely,

Jack A. Gleason

Mr. Milton P. Semer
Attorney
1156 15th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.
4. By memorandum dated June 24, 1970 White House aide Jack Gleason turned over most of the responsibilities with regard to the milk producers to Special Counsel to the President Charles Colson. Gleason stated that Colson would handle outstanding items including the possibility of the President speaking in September at the AMPI annual meeting in Chicago and the possibility of the President making an emergency reduction of import quotas on dairy products. Attached to the memorandum was a draft letter prepared by Parr that could be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend that the President take immediate action imposing limitations on imports of certain cheeses and other dairy products.

4.1 Memorandum from Jack Gleason to Charles Colson, June 24, 1970 and attached draft letter (received from White House).

Late '69 Colson came to WH & took over resp dealing with special ute like milk & Labor.
MEMORANDUM FOR CHARLES W. COLSON

From: Jack A. Gleason
Re: Milk Producers

Chuck,

As we discussed yesterday, it seems logical to me to turn over to you most of the responsibilities for handling the Milk Producers, as they would normally belong in your area anyway. The mechanics on their support to us this year have been straightened out so that Dave Parr will coordinate directly with me on collection and distribution of support.

In the meantime, there are a few outstanding items that need to go into your pending problem category:

(A) First, Milk Producers for some time have been seeking to have the boss appear at one of their national meetings. This has been discussed and has gone around and around in the White House for some time without result as yet. However, you should know that they have now scheduled their next annual meeting for early September to be held in Chicago. As I understand it from Dave Parr, this meeting would include at least 15,000 of their members.

(B) The next question is that of the possibility of having the President request that the Tariff Commission take emergency action on dairy imports in a similar fashion to that which Johnson did in July of '67 following the March 30, 1967, request for a Tariff Commission investigation. I am attaching to this memo a copy of a letter Parr prepared which spells out in some detail exactly what they are looking for. The problem evidently is that since we

Retyped from indistinct original.
recommended the Tariff Commission begin an investigation of dairy imports again, the European importers have begun to dump increased quantities of their product on our market. Parr is cognizant of the line of the President's last address on the state of the economy regarding the possible need for increasing all imports to offset inflationary pressures, but that, of course, in no way lessens his interest in achieving the above. I mentioned this to John Whitaker yesterday, but he is not familiar with the problem and I therefore assume that at this stage of the game neither Agriculture nor Whitaker is seriously contemplating the request for emergency action.

In any event, I would believe it advisable for you and I and Dave Parr to get together at some point in the near future to go over these and a few other smaller items.

Over to you.

cc: Harry S. Dent
Dear Mr. President:

On May 13, 1970, in accordance with my advice and recommendations, you directed the United States Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 624) to determine whether certain dairy articles (ice cream chocolate crumb with a fat content of 5.5 percent or less, animal feeds containing milk or milk derivatives, and certain cheese containing less than 0.5 percent by weight of butterfat) are being, or are practically certain to be, imported under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the price support programs now conducted by the Department of Agriculture for milk and butterfat, or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic milk and butterfat. You have directed the Tariff Commission to report its findings and recommendations to you at the earliest practical date.

Pursuant to Section 22, I hereby advise that I now have reason to believe that certain additional articles are being imported, and are practically certain to be imported, under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the price support programs now conducted by the Department of Agriculture for milk and butterfat, and to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States for domestic milk and butterfat.

Specifically, reference is made to the following articles:

1) Swiss or Emmenthaler cheese with eye formation; Gruyere-process cheese; and cheese and substitutes for cheese containing, or processed from, such cheeses; all the foregoing, if shipped otherwise than in pursuance to a purchase, or if having a purchase price of 47 cents per pound or more.

2) Cheese and substitutes for cheese provided for in items 117.75 and 117.85, part 4C, schedule 1 (except cheese not containing cow's milk; cheese, except cottage cheese, containing no butterfat or not over 0.5 percent by weight of butterfat, and articles within the scope of other import quotas provided for in this part); all the foregoing.

3) Lactose, a dairy product manufactured from whey.

Retyped from indistinct original.
The imports of these articles have been increasing rapidly during 1970 and will apparently continue to do so if no action is taken to restrain such imports. It is, in my judgment, most desirable that the Tariff Commission make recommendations to you as to the effect on price support programs of imports of quota-type cheeses selling at a price at or over 47 cents per pound and imports of quota-type "other cheese" under existing quota levels, including the 7.5 million pound allocation in this category to New Zealand. I have also concluded that there should be an investigation of the effect of the growing imports of the product known as lactose. The growth of imports of these articles has become of increasing concern to me since my previous recommendation to you and since your letter to the Tariff Commission of May 13, 1970.

In view of the foregoing, I recommend that you cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission as to such articles and that you direct the Tariff Commission to include said articles within the scope of the investigation directed by your letter of May 13, 1970.

Furthermore, I determine and hereby report to you that, with respect to the articles which were the subject of your letter to the Tariff Commission of May 13, 1970, and the additional articles described in this letter, a condition exists requiring emergency treatment of all such articles. I therefore recommend that you take immediate action, pursuant to Section 22 (b), to impose limitations on the quantities of such articles which may be imported in a quota year without awaiting the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission with respect to such articles.

Sincerely,

Secretary of Agriculture
CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR CHARLES W. COLSON

From: Jack A. Gleason

Re: Milk Producers

June 24, 1970

Chuck,

As we discussed yesterday, it seems logical to me to turn over to you most of the responsibilities for handling the Milk Producers, as they would normally belong in your area anyway. The mechanics on their support to us this year have been straightened out so that Dave Parr will coordinate directly with me on collection and distribution of support.

In the meantime, there are a few outstanding items that need to go into your pending problem category;

(A) First, Milk Producers for some time have been seeking to have the boss appear at one of their national meetings. This has been discussed and has gone around and around in the White House for some time without result as yet. However, you should know that they have now scheduled their next annual meeting for early September to be held in Chicago. As I understand it from Dave Parr, this meeting would include at least 15,000 of their members.

(B) The next question is that of the possibility of having the President request that the Tariff Commission take emergency action on dairy imports in a similar fashion to that which Johnson did in July of '67 following the March 30, 1967, request for a Tariff Commission investigation. I am attaching to this memo a copy of a letter Parr prepared which spells out in some detail exactly what they are looking for. The problem evidently is that since we
recommended the Tariff Commission begin an investigation of dairy imports again, the European importers have begun to dump increased quantities of their product on our market. Parr is cognizant of the line of the President's last address on the state of the economy regarding the possible need for increasing all imports to offset inflationary pressures, but that, of course, in no way lessens his interest in achieving the above. I mentioned this to John Whitaker yesterday, but he is not familiar with the problem and I therefore assume that at this stage of the game neither Agriculture nor Whitaker is seriously contemplating the request for emergency action.

In any event, I would believe it advisable for you and I and Dave Parr to get together at some point in the near future to go over these and a few other smaller items.

Over to you.

cc: Harry S. Dent
Dear Mr. President:

On May 13, 1970, in accordance with my advice and recommendations, you directed the United States Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 624) to determine whether certain dairy articles (ice cream, chocolate crumb with a fat content of 5.5 percent or less, animal feeds containing milk or milk derivatives, and certain cheese containing 0.5 percent or less by weight of butterfat) are being, or are practically certain to be, imported under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the price support programs now conducted by the Department of Agriculture for milk and butterfat, or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic milk and butterfat. You have directed the Tariff Commission to report its findings and recommendations to you at the earliest practical date.

Pursuant to Section 22, I hereby advise that I now have reason to believe that certain additional articles are being imported, and are practically certain to be imported, under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the price support programs now conducted by the Department of Agriculture for milk and butterfat, and to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States for domestic milk and butterfat.

Specifically, reference is made to the following articles:

1) Swiss or Emmenthaler cheese with eye formation; Gruyere-process cheese; and cheese and substitutes for cheese containing, or processed from, such cheeses; all the foregoing, if shipped otherwise than in pursuance to a purchase, or if having a purchase price of 47 cents per pound or more.

2) Cheese and substitutes for cheese provided for in items 117.75 and 117.85, part 4C, schedule 1 (except cheese not containing cow's milk; cheese, except cottage cheese, containing no butterfat or not over 0.5 percent by weight of butterfat, and articles within the scope of other import quotas provided for in this part); all the foregoing.

3) Lactose, a dairy product manufactured from whey.
The imports of these articles have been increasing rapidly during 1970 and will apparently continue to do so if no action is taken to restrain such imports. It is, in my judgment, most desirable that the Tariff Commission make recommendations to you as to the effect on price support programs of imports of quota-type cheeses selling at a price at or over 47 cents per pound as imports of quota-type "other cheese" under existing quota levels, including the 7.5 million pound allocation in this category to New Zealand. I have also concluded that there should be an investigation of the effect of the growing imports of the product known as lychee. The growth of imports of these articles has become of increasing concern to me since my previous recommendation to you and since your letter to the Tariff Commission of May 13, 1970.

In view of the foregoing, I recommend that you cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission as to such articles and that you direct the Tariff Commission to include said articles within the scope of the investigation directed by your letter of May 13, 1970.

Furthermore, I determine and hereby report to you that, with respect to the articles which were the subject of your letter to the Tariff Commission of May 13, 1970, and the additional articles described in this letter, a condition exists requiring emergency treatment of all such articles. I therefore recommend that you take immediate action, pursuant to Section 22 (b), to impose limitations on the quantities of such articles which may be imported in a quota year without awaiting the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission with respect to such articles.

Sincerely,

001318

Secretary of Agriculture
5. In the June 24, 1970 memorandum from Gleason to Colson referred to in the preceding paragraph, Gleason stated that AMPI special counsel Parr would coordinate directly with Gleason on collection and distribution of support. During 1970, AMPI and other dairy organizations pledged or contributed approximately $135,000 to a special White House project administered by Gleason and Kalmbach that designated certain congressional candidates to receive contributions and distributed the contributions.

5.1 Memorandum from Jack Gleason to Charles Colson, June 24, 1970 (received from White House).

5.2 Memorandum from Herbert Kalmbach to file, April 22, 1970 (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.3 Herbert Kalmbach notes on 1970 congressional campaign fundraising (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.4 Letter from Herbert Kalmbach to H. R. Haldeman, November 6, 1970 (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.5 Letter from Jack Gleason to Mrs. Joan Payson, July 20, 1970 (received from Special Prosecutor).

5.6 Letter from Patrick J. Hillings to the President, December 16, 1970 (received from SSC).

5.7 Memorandum from Jack Gleason to Harry Dent, June 18, 1970 (received from SSC).
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
June 24, 1970

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR CHARLES W. COLSON

From: Jack A. Gleason /s/ JAG
Re: Milk Producers

Chuck,

As we discussed yesterday, it seems logical for me to turn over to you most of the responsibilities for handling the Milk Producers, as they would normally belong in your area anyway. The mechanics on their support to us this year have been straightened out so that Dave Parr will coordinate directly with me on collection and distribution of support.

In the meantime, there are a few outstanding items that need to go into your pending problem category;

(A) First, Milk Producers for some time have been seeking to have the boss appear at one of their national meetings. This has been discussed and has gone around and around in the White House for some time without result as yet. However, you should know that they have now scheduled their next annual meeting for early September to be held in Chicago. As I understand it from Dave Parr, this meeting would include at least 15,000 of their members.

(B) The next question is that of the possibility of having the President request that the Tariff Commission take emergency action on dairy imports in a similar fashion to that which Johnson did in July of '67 following the March 30, 1967, request for a Tariff Commission investigation. I am attaching to this memo a copy of a letter Parr prepared which spells out in some detail exactly what they are looking for. The problem evidently is that since we
recommended the Tariff Commission begin an investigation of dairy imports again, the European importers have begun to dump increased quantities of their product on our market. Parr is cognizant of the line of the President's last address on the state of the economy regarding the possible need for increasing all imports to offset inflationary pressures, but that, of course, in no way lessens his interest in achieving the above. I mentioned this to John Whitaker yesterday, but he is not familiar with the problem and I therefore assume that at this stage of the game neither Agriculture nor Whitaker is seriously contemplating the request for emergency action.

In any event, I would believe it advisable for you and I and Dave Parr to get together at some point in the near future to go over these and a few other smaller items.

Over to you.

cc: Harry S. Dent
Confidential

Memorandum for Charles W. Colson

From: Jack A. Gleason

Re: Milk Producers

June 24, 1979

Chuck,

As we discussed yesterday, it seems logical to me to turn over to you most of the responsibilities for handling the Milk Producers, as they would normally belong in your area anyway. The mechanics on their support to us this year have been straightened out so that Dave Parr will coordinate directly with me on collection and distribution of support.

In the meantime, there are a few outstanding items that need to go into your pending problem category:

(A) First, Milk Producers for some time have been seeking to have the boss appear at one of their national meetings. This has been discussed and has gone around and around in the White House for some time without result as yet. However, you should know that they have now scheduled their next annual meeting for early September to be held in Chicago. As I understand it from Dave Parr, this meeting would include at least 15,000 of their members.

(B) The next question is that of the possibility of having the President request that the Tariff Commission take emergency action on dairy imports in a similar fashion to that which Johnson did in July of '67 following the March 30, 1967, request for a Tariff Commission investigation. I am attaching to this memo a copy of a letter Parr prepared which spells out in some detail exactly what they are looking for. The problem evidently is that since we
recommended the Tariff Commission begin an investigation of dairy imports again, the European importers have begun to dump increased quantities of their product on our market. Parr is cognizant of the line of the President's last address on the state of the economy regarding the possible need for increasing all imports to offset inflationary pressures, but that, of course, in no way lessens his interest in achieving the above. I mentioned this to John Whitaker yesterday, but he is not familiar with the problem and I therefore assume that at this stage of the game neither Agriculture nor Whitaker is seriously contemplating the request for emergency action.

In any event, I would believe it advisable for you and I and Dave Parr to get together at some point in the near future to go over these and a few other smaller items.

Over to you.

cc: Harry S. Dent
This afternoon I received a call from Jack Gleason who said that Harry Dent has reported to him that he (Dent) had just met with John Ehrlichman and Ehrlichman had confirmed that all of these contribution solicitation assignments had been officially assigned to me for handling.

I told Jack that I would be back to him within a day or so to discuss these various prospects with him and to work out the procedures involved.

HWK/ss
MEMORANDUM

1970 Contributions File
Jack Gleason Telex

Date: April 22, 1970
To: Memorandum to File
From: Herbert W. Kalmbach

This afternoon I received a call from Jack Gleason who said that Harry Dent has reported to him that he (Dent) had just met with John Ehrlichman and Ehrlichman had confirmed that all of these contribution solicitation assignments had been officially assigned to me for handling.

I told Jack that I would be back to him within a day or so to discuss these various prospects with him and to work out the procedures involved.

HWK/38
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Donations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abplanalp, Robert H.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abplanalp, Robert H.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annenberg, Walter H.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry, Loren M.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobst, Elmer H.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Edgar W., Jr.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey, William J.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby, James H.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Shelby</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Walter</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Roulet, Vincent</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Guilford, Jr.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Max M.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford, Henry II</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franzheim, Kenneth</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frick, Helen Clay</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerritty, Ned</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getty, J. Paul</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Albert H.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould, Kingdon, Jr.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwall, Frank K.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Robert C.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch, Clement L.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Wayne M.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humes, John P.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin, John N., II</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Willard W.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall, Donald M.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, John H.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasdon, William S.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Lawrence, Jr.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liedtke, William C., Jr.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckman, Charles</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch, Robert</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaw, Foster G.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKnight, William L.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middendorf, J. William, II</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, Jack (II)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Charles</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, John D. J.</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount pledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrison, Thomas J.</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nielsen, Arthur C.</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olin, John M.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappas, Thomas A.</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson, Mrs. Charles</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perot, H. Ross (12)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pew, J. Howard</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickett, Roscoe</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistell, Richard (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell, Willard F.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollins, John W., Sr. (14)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush, Kenneth</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Fred J. (15)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvatori, Henry</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaver, Mrs. Blanche</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaife, Richard</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaheen, John M.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Gerard</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith,Kent H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, W. Clement</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim, Dudley</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symington, J. Fife, Jr. (16)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talenti, Pier</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, DeWitt</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, Arthur K.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyerhaeuser, F. K.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilde, Claude</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, David K. (17)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyly, Sam</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount pledged as of 11/3/70</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,809,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original goal amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,050,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of goal amount pledged</strong></td>
<td><strong>137.04%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes

1. Called after earlier pledge to say that he had other campaign commitments that we were aware of and asked to be released from this program.

2. Misunderstanding here inasmuch as the followup on Berry was conducted on the basis of a $20,000 commitment when in fact he and I had agreed at the time of my solicitation that he would pledge $50,000 to the program.

3. While pledge was for $50,000, only $25,000 was realized.

4. Total amount received outside of program; he has also pledged an additional $50,000 in 1972.

5. Pledge amount "on the way".

6. While pledge amount is yet to be received, I am reasonably certain that such will be forthcoming.

7. Total amount received and routed to Delaware committees.

8. $2550 realized outside of program; balance not realized.

9. Hirsch also pledged an additional $25,000 in 1972.

10. Pledged amount will not be forthcoming due to King's personal financial difficulties.

11. Pledge from tobacco group not yet realized.

12. Pledge amount will not be realized for reasons already expressed.

13. Pledged amount will not be forthcoming due to Pistell's personal financial difficulties.

14. While pledge amount not received directly into this program, am advised by Rollins (confirmed by Harry Dent) that his total contributions to various campaigns this year will exceed $500,000.

15. Total amount received outside of program.

16. Symington also pledged an additional $50,000 in 1972.

17. Wilson asked to be excused from participating in this program because of his involvement in Tennessee as Bill Brock's finance chairman.
Footnotes

1. Called after earlier pledge to say that he had other campaign commitments that we were aware of and asked to be released from this program.

2. Misunderstanding here inasmuch as the followup on Berry was conducted on the basis of a $20,000 commitment when in fact he and I had agreed at the time of my solicitation that he would pledge $50,000 to the program.

3. While pledge was for $50,000, only $25,000 was realized.

4. Total amount received outside of program; he has also pledged an additional $50,000 in 1972.

5. Pledge amount "on the way".

6. While pledge amount is yet to be received, I am reasonably certain that such will be forthcoming.

7. Total amount received and routed to Delaware committees.

8. $2550 realized outside of program; balance not realized.

9. Hirsch also pledged an additional $25,000 in 1972.

10. Pledged amount will not be forthcoming due to King's personal financial difficulties.

11. Pledge from tobacco group not yet realized.

12. Pledge amount will not be realized for reasons already expressed.

13. Pledged amount will not be forthcoming due to Pistell's personal financial difficulties.

14. While pledge amount not received directly into this program, am advised by Rollins (confirmed by Harry Dent) that his total contributions to various campaigns this year will exceed $500,000.

15. Total amount received outside of program.

16. Sprungten also pledged an additional $50,000 in 1972.

17. Wilson asked to be excused from participating in this program because of his involvement in Tennessee as Bill Brock's Finance Chairman.
NOTE 5.3

In an interview with the House Judiciary Committee Impeachment Inquiry staff on May 7, 1974, Herbert Kalmbach identified the following documents as his notes showing pledges to the "Town House project." The figure to the left of the arrow indicates the amount sought, an upward arrow indicates that a pledge was made, and the figure to the right of the arrow indicates the amount pledged.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W. Clement Stone</td>
<td>250↑250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John King</td>
<td>250↑250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Rollins</td>
<td>250↑250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sam Wyly and Charles Wyly</td>
<td>250↑0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H. R. Perot</td>
<td>250↑250 [1000]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Walter Annenberg</td>
<td>100↑50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Richard Scaife</td>
<td>100↑100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>David Parr</td>
<td>100↑110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>William Liedtke</td>
<td>100↓On 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Henry Ford</td>
<td>250↑100 [260]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vincent de Roulet</td>
<td>50↑50 + 50 in '72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mrs. Blanche Seaver</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Henry Salvatori</td>
<td>50↑50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retyped from indistinct original
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W. Clement Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Rollins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sam Wray and Charles Wly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H. R. Payot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Walter Annenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Richard Scheff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>David Farr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>William Diederke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Henry Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vincent de Poulet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mrs. Blanche Seaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Henry Salvatori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fred Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shelby Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arthur K. Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kenneth Branzeim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>P. J. Howard Pew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Max Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kent H. Smith VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Robert K. Abplanado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Walter Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Howard Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kingdom Gould</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>James Crosby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Thomas J. Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>John P. Humes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Guilford Dudley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>J. William Middenkorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Robert Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mrs. Helen Clay Prick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Willard E. Keith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Richard Pestell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Robert C. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Willard Pk Rockwell, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dudley Swinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Edger W. Brown, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Thomas Fairman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lorentz Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Clement Meach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 12, 1970
Page 1 of 2
Nessel - 25

Pepper - Sweet or Brown

Pars - Bred for 100

Singe 10 to 16th 10 in

Gloves (Green)

Wearers 15 in
Daily Entry:

In April Project I have transferred 400 pan into drums on the following dates:

4-1 100 @ Sherry 11:45 H.K.
5-15 10 @ BZC 11:45 H.K.
5-22 20 @ Sherry 11:45 H.K.

The 4-1 came out of Charm Box. The 5-15 came 45 from Sel Pic. Box + 55 insecticide (5-1)
+ the 200 from the Charm. 

[6027]
November 6, 1970

Mr. H. R. Haldeman
Assistant to the President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Bob:

Attached is a listing of everyone contacted on my recent assignment with the results indicated. The footnotes are used to help explain the circumstances in those instances where Jack Gleason did not actually receive and/or route the amounts earlier pledged.

Directly or indirectly and with very few exceptions, those who pledged their participation in the program for the amounts indicated honored their pledges. As you know and as indicated in the footnotes, certain contributions were received in a different manner.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way in which I can be of further assistance.

Best regards,

Herbert W. Kalmbach

HWW:mrp
Attachment
Jack Gleason letter,
July 20, 1970

CONFIDENTIAL

Mrs. Joan Payson
Shelter Rock Road
Manhasset, New York 11030

Dear Mrs. Payson:

This is to confirm my instructions following Mr. Herbert W. Kalmbach's recent visit with you that I am to contact you regarding certain political campaign contributions for 1970. Pursuant to your discussion with Mr. Kalmbach, I would now like to propose that you forward to my office checks in the amounts indicated on the attached schedule. I understand that by so doing you will have fully completed your commitment made with Mr. Kalmbach.

If you have any questions concerning the above please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jack A. Gleason

jack gleason

cc: Mr. Herbert W. Kalmbach

RECEIVED
July 22 1970
Kalmbach, DeMarco, Knapp & Chillingworth
Law Offices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF CHECK</th>
<th>COMMITTEE TO WHICH CHECK SHOULD BE PAYABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Brock for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Brock Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Burton for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Burton Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Wold for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Wold Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Carter for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Carter Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Stevens for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Stevens Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retyped from indistinct original.
July 20, 1970

CONFIDENTIAL

Mrs. Joan Payson
Shelter Rock Road
Manhasset, New York 11030

Dear Mrs. Payson:

This is to confirm my instructions following Mr. Herbert W. Kalmbach's recent visit with you that I am to contact you regarding certain political campaign contributions for 1970. Pursuant to your discussion with Mr. Kalmbach, I would now like to propose that you forward to my office checks in the amounts indicated on the attached schedule. I understand that by so doing you will have fully completed your commitment made with Mr. Kalmbach.

If you have any questions concerning the above please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jack A. Gleason

[cc: Mr. Herbert W. Kalmbach]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF CHECK</th>
<th>COMMITTEE TO WHICH CHECK SHOULD BE PAYABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Brock for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Brock Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Burton for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Burton Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Hold for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Hold Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Carter for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Carter Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Stevens for Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Stevens Campaign Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 16, 1970

The Honorable Richard Nixon
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Re: §22 Tariff Commission (Milk) Recommendations
Presidential Proclamation

Dear Mr. President:

This letter discusses a matter of some delicacy and of significant political impact.

Since January 1 my Washington partner Marion Harrison (one of your 1968 Virginia Co-Chairmen) and I have represented Associated Milk Producers, Inc. ("AMPI"). At the White House in September you privately met AMPI's two key leaders, Harold Nelson and Dave Parr. You spoke by telephone from the beach at San Clemente to Secretary Hardin and to Harold Nelson during AMPI's annual convention in Chicago Labor Day weekend. You told Harold of your intent personally to address AMPI's next annual convention (a gathering of almost 30,000 dairy farmers and their families).

AMPI has followed our advice explicitly and will do so in the future. AMPI contributed about $135,000.00 to Republican candidates in the 1970 election. We are now working with Tom Evans and Herb Kalmbach in setting up appropriate channels for AMPI to contribute $2 million for your re-election. AMPI also is funding a special project.

On September 21 the Tariff Commission recommended to you, after it did a study you requested in May, four specific quotas for four specific dairy products. These recommendations are well documented and by now are well known in the dairy and related industries. No Presidential Proclamation has been issued.

The problem is this. The dairy industry cannot understand why these recommendations were not implemented
very quickly. The longest the Democrats ever took to implement a Tariff Commission dairy recommendation was 16 days. On one occasion, President Johnson even imposed quotas before he received the Tariff Commission's recommendations!

The overall parity ratio is at its lowest since December 1933. Farmers generally are unhappy with the economy. You know our farmbelt losses in the election.

The Government saves money (by saving price support payments) and the farmer makes money when the recommended quotas are imposed. The products are all "evasion" products - that is, products which historically were not imported but which started to be imported only after quotas were imposed on other products.

The dairy and related industries have great faith in your personal leadership. At the same time, they are shaken by the economy. The right kind of Proclamation issued quickly would dramatize your personal interest in a large segment of agriculture.

This problem is bogged down within the White House. It is a victim of the bureaucracy - the Trade Bill people, the National Security Council people, the domestic people. It has been studied and restudied. It is not moving.

We write you both as advocates and as supporters. The time is ripe politically and economically to impose the recommended quotas. Secretary Hardin, the Tariff Commission and the dairy industry all support this. All that is necessary is a simple Proclamation implementing the four specific Tariff Commission recommendations.

(We attach a more detailed Memorandum. The subject is quite interesting if you have time for it.)

Respectfully,

/s/ Pat

PATRICK J. HILLINGS

PJH:ek

Enclosure
December 16, 1970

The Honorable Richard Nixon
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Re: §22 Tariff Commission (Milk) Recommendations
Presidential Proclamation

Dear Mr. President:

This letter discusses a matter of some delicacy and of significant political impact.

Since January 1 my Washington partner Marion Harrison (one of your 1968 Virginia Co-Chairmen) and I have represented Associated Milk Producers, Inc. ("AMPI"). At the White House in September you privately met AMPI's two key leaders, Harold Nelson and Dave Parr. You spoke by telephone from the beach at San Clemente to Secretary Hardin and to Harold Nelson during AMPI's annual convention in Chicago Labor Day weekend. You told Harold of your intent personally to address AMPI's next annual convention (a gathering of almost 30,000 dairy farmers and their families).

AMPI has followed our advice explicitly and will do so in the future. AMPI contributed about $135,000.00 to Republican candidates in the 1970 election. We are now working with Tom Evans and Herb Kalmbach in setting up appropriate channels for AMPI to contribute $2 million for your re-election. AMPI also is funding a special project.

On September 21 the Tariff Commission recommended to you, after it did a study you requested in May, four specific quotas for four specific dairy products. These recommendations are well documented and by now are well known in the dairy and related industries. No Presidential Proclamation has been issued.

The problem is this. The dairy industry cannot understand why these recommendations were not implemented
very quickly. The longest the Democrats ever took to implement a Tariff Commission dairy recommendation was 16 days. On one occasion, President Johnson even imposed quotas before he received the Tariff Commission's recommendations!

The overall parity ratio is at its lowest since December 1933. Farmers generally are unhappy with the economy. You know our farmland losses in the election.

The Government saves money (by saving price support payments) and the farmer makes money when the recommended quotas are imposed. The products are all "evasion" products - that is, products which historically were not imported but which started to be imported only after quotas were imposed on other products.

The dairy and related industries have great faith in your personal leadership. At the same time, they are shaken by the economy. The right kind of Proclamation issued quickly would dramatize your personal interest in a large segment of agriculture.

This problem is bogged down within the White House. It is a victim of the bureaucracy - the Trade Bill people, the National Security Council people, the domestic people. It has been studied and restudied. It is not moving.

We write you both as advocates and as supporters. The time is ripe politically and economically to impose the recommended quotas. Secretary Hardin, the Tariff Commission and the dairy industry all support this. All that is necessary is a simple Proclamation implementing the four specific Tariff Commission recommendations.

(We attach a more detailed Memorandum. The subject is quite interesting if you have time for it.)

Respectfully,

[Signature]

[Name]

PJH:ck

Enclosure
Jack Gleason memorandum to
Harry S. Dent, June 18, 1970.

Retyped from indistinct original.

THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington

June 18, 1970

CONFIDENTIAL
MEMORANDUM FOR HARRY S. DENT

From: Jack A. Gleason
Re: Operating Expenses, Special Project, July through November.

Harry,

Attached are summary figures indicating the difficulties in getting office space for our project. The essential problems are:

(A) No one will agree to short-term leases without charging substantial premiums over and above the figures indicated below.

(B) Unfurnished office space at an attractive price (De Salle Building) also happens to be very shabby in appearance and wide open to security problems.

(C) Private office space through "friends," either corporate or personal, presents additional security problems and opens the possibility for potential embarrassment. (Gadsby - Hannah space is no longer available as they are taking on an additional member in the firm.) The Senate Campaign Committee is no longer housed at the Washington-Hilton, Lee lives there which may have confused you, and even if he could get us lower cost than they have quoted to me, it still would be far more expensive -- after office supply costs are added -- than the Courtesy Associates proposal.

I strongly urge that we accept the Courtesy Associates proposal as it is not only the lowest cost, but is also the most efficient for us in terms of controlling administrative management problems. In addition, it is without a doubt the most secure operation that I have seen. In any event, the whole operational budget will run out a cost figure of less than one half of one percent of anticipated gross income which is pretty good. Your quick approval is desired asCourtesy Associates needs about one week to install phones and prepare the office.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 18, 1970

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR HARRY S. DENT

From: Jack A. Gleason

Re: Operating Expenses, Special Project, July through November.

Harry,

Attached are summary figures indicating the difficulties in getting office space for our project. The essential problems are:

(A) No one will agree to short-term leases without charging substantial premiums over and above the figures indicated below.

(B) Unfurnished office space at an attractive price (De Salle Building) also happens to be very shabby in appearance and wide open to security problems.

(C) Private office space through "friends," either corporate or personal, presents additional security problems and opens the possibility for potential embarrassment. (Gadsby - Hannah space is no longer available as they are taking on an additional member in the firm.) The Senate Campaign Committee is no longer housed at the Washington-Hilton, Lee lives there which may have confused you, and even if he could get us lower cost than they have quoted to me, it still would be far more expensive -- after office supply costs are added -- than the Courtesy Associates proposal.

I strongly urge that we accept the Courtesy Associates proposal as it is not only the lowest cost, but is also the most efficient for us in terms of controlling administrative management problems. In addition, it is without a doubt the most secure operation that I have seen. In any event, the whole operational budget will run out a cost figure of less than one half of one percent of anticipated gross income which is pretty good. Your quick approval is desired as Courtesy Associates needs about one week to install phones and prepare the office.
I.

A. Comparative Costs -- Furnished Space

(1) Washington-Hilton Hotel -- Two rooms, minimum $1,000 - $1,200 per month; still requires office equipment and supplies, and parking.

(2) Watergate Hotel -- Two rooms, minimum $35 per day; roughly $1,100 per month; would require same additional office equipment as in #1 above.

(3) Sheraton-Carlton Hotel -- Two rooms, $55 - $75 per day, $1,500 - $2,000 per month; would require additional office equipment as in #1 above.

Unfurnished Space

(1) Madison Hotel -- $350 per month. (minimum one year lease.)

(2) De Salle Building -- $200 per month. (one year lease, not ready for occupancy before September.)

(3) 1707 L Street, N. W. -- Minimum space available is 600 square feet at $6.00 per square foot; $360 per month.
B. Costs for Furnishing Office

(1) Xerox (smallest unit) $60.00 per month plus supplies and excess copy charges.

(2) Electric typewriter -- $25.00 per month. Dictating equipment -- $35.00 per month. (quotes supplied by Metropolitan Office Machines.)

(3) Furniture for two offices -- minimum of $100 - $125 per month. (quotes supplied by Budget Furniture, Inc. and Lease-a-Desk, Inc.)

(4) Office maintenance -- approximately $50 per month.

(5) Telephone installation -- $22.00 (one time charge).

(6) Parking space (2) -- approximately $75 - $100 per month.

(7) Utilities (other than telephone) -- approximately $25 per month.

Indicated furnishing costs: Low -- $390; High -- $440

II.

Recommended Procedure

Lease private office and secretarial space through Courtesy Associates. Space available July 1st through November. Total cost of $625 per month includes following: secretarial supplies, electric typewriter, dictating equipment, use of Xerox machine, all furniture, office maintenance, parking, back-up telephone answering service, good security measures, conference room, all basic office supplies. Location at either 1730 Rhode Island Avenue or 1629 K Street.

Retyped from indistinct original.
B. Costs for Furnishing Office

(1) Xerox (smallest unit) $60.00 per month plus supplies and excess copy charges.

(2) Electric typewriter -- $25.00 per month. Dictating equipment -- $35.00 per month. (quotes supplied by Metropolitan Office Machines.)

(3) Furniture for two offices -- minimum of $100 - $125 per month. (quotes supplied by Budget Furniture, Inc. and Lease-a-Desk, Inc.)

(4) Office maintenance -- approximately $50 per month.

(5) Telephone installation -- $22.00 (one time charge).

(6) Parking space (2) -- approximately $75 - $100 per month.

(7) Utilities (other than telephone) -- approximately $25 per month.

**Indicated furnishing costs:** Low -- $390; High -- $440

II.

**Recommended Procedure**

Lease private office and secretarial space through Courtesy Associates. Space available July 1st through November. Total cost of $625 per month includes following: secretarial supplies, electric typewriter, dictating equipment, use of Xerox machine, all furniture, office maintenance, parking, back-up telephone answering service, good security measures, conference room, all basic office supplies. Location at either 1730 Rhode Island Avenue or 1629 K Street.
Estimated Budget -- Special Project

(1) Per Month (5 months)  
Rent -- $625  
Secretary -- $850  
Postage and Telephone -- $75 (estimate)  

TOTAL Operational Expenses  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Per Month</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$3,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Telephone</td>
<td>$75 (estimate)</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$7,825

(2) One-time Charges  
Moving from E.O.B. to Office  
Security checks of Office  
Any travel or entertainment

(3) JAG salary (present rate) $2,161 per month, already covered.

All above indicated expenses (Items #1 and #3) would suggest running costs of less than one half of one percent of anticipated gross income.

cc: Herbert W. Kalmbach
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