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On March 23, 1971 from approximately 12:18 p.m. to approximately 1:07 p.m. the President met with Ehrlichman and Shultz in the Oval Office. At an unspecified time on March 23, 1971 the President had a telephone conversation with Colson.

30.1 John Ehrlichman log, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).

30.2 White House record of George Shultz contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).

30.3 White House record of Charles Colson contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).
On March 23, 1971 from 5:05 to 5:35 p.m., the President met in his Oval Office with Ehrlichman, Connally, Hardin, Whitaker, Shultz, Campbell and Rice. They discussed changing the milk price support level.

31.1 Tape recording of meeting among the President, John Ehrlichman, John Connally, Clifford Hardin, John Whitaker, George Shultz, Phil Campbell and Donald Rice, March 23, 1971.

31.2 White House record of John Whitaker contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).
On March 23, 1971 from 5:35 to 5:38 p.m. the President met with Connally in the Oval Office. At 5:50 p.m. Ehrlichman met with Colson and at approximately 6:00 p.m. Colson met with AMPI lawyer Chotiner. During the afternoon or evening of March 23, 1971 Under Secretary of Agriculture Campbell had a telephone conversation with Nelson. At some time on March 23, 1971 Connally had a telephone conversation with AMPI lawyer Jacobsen.

32.1 White House record of John Connally contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).

32.2 John Ehrlichman log, March 23, 1971 (received from SSC).

32.3 Murray Chotiner interviews, SSC, December 7, 1973 and December 10, 1973, with accompanying SSC affidavit.

32.4 Gary Hamman testimony, SSC Executive Session, May 21, 1974, 9-11.

32.5 Phil Campbell testimony, SSC Executive Session, May 31, 1974, 60, 61, 64-66.

32.6 John Connally log, March 23, 1971 (received from SSC).

33. During the night of March 23, 1971 AMPI officials flew to Louisville, Kentucky, the home of Dairymen, Inc. (DI), another large milk producers cooperative and met at about 4:00 a.m. on March 24, 1971 with Paul Alagia, an official of DI who had attended the March 23, 1971 morning meeting with the President. They discussed political contributions including the possibility of an immediate contribution to the Republican National Committee for a political dinner to be held that evening. They also discussed loans among their organizations for the purpose of making contributions. During the afternoon of March 24, 1971 a DI contribution of $25,000 was flown to Washington and given to the Republican National Committee dinner fund to buy tables for the dinner.

33.1 Paul Alagia testimony, SSC Executive Session, January 25, 1974, 31-34, 38-41.


33.3 David Parr testimony, SSC Executive Session, December 21, 1973, 79-81.

33.4 Gary Hanman testimony, SSC Executive Session, May 21, 1974, 8, 13-14, 20.

33.5 SPACE report to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, June 4, 1971 (received from Clerk of the House of Representatives).
34. During the night of March 24, 1971, following the Republican National Committee dinner, Chotiner, Kalmbach and AMPI General Manager Nelson met in Washington, D. C. in Kalmbach's hotel room. Kalmbach has testified that Chotiner said that Ehrlichman had asked Chotiner in view of the price support decision to be announced the next day to reaffirm to Kalmbach the milk producers' pledge of $2 million to the 1972 campaign. Chotiner has stated that as a result of a conversation with Ehrlichman he met with Nelson and Kalmbach and discussed contributions but they did not discuss price supports or a definite amount to be contributed. Nelson has testified that they met and discussed contributions. Kalmbach has testified that on March 25, 1971 he reported to Ehrlichman that Chotiner and Nelson had reaffirmed their $2 million pledge to the campaign.

34.1 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 59-62, 73-74.


34.3 Murray Chotiner interviews, SSC, December 7, 1973 and December 10, 1973, with accompanying SSC affidavit.
On March 24, 1971 Campbell sent to Rice a draft press release announcing an increase in milk price supports for use when action was completed on the subject. On March 25, 1971 the Secretary of Agriculture officially announced that the milk price support level for the 1971-72 marketing year would be $4.93 per cwt. (approximately 85% of parity). Hardin has testified in an affidavit filed in civil litigation challenging the milk price support increase that he reevaluated the evidence regarding the milk price support level and that the decision to set the price support level at $4.93 was based entirely on a reconsideration of the evidence on the basis of the statutory criteria.

35.1 United States Department of Agriculture press release, March 25, 1971 (received from White House).

35.2 Memorandum from Phil Campbell to Donald Rice, March 24, 1971, with attached proposed press release (received from White House).

36. Between March 30, 1971 and August 5, 1971 Harrison and Chotiner transmitted to AMPI the names of 100 political committees to receive contributions and over spring and summer of 1971 AMPI and the other dairy cooperatives made contributions of $2,500 each to the committees. The names and charters of the committees were prepared by Presidential campaign fundraisers Bob Bennett and Hugh Sloan with the assistance of John Dean. Haldeman received reports from Dean and Strachan regarding the collection and handling of the milk money. On September 11, 1971 Strachan sent a memorandum to Haldeman stating that fundraiser Lee Nunn reported that $232,500 of milk money had been realized. Strachan stated that this was slightly more than one-half of the amount that should have been realized on the commitment ($90,000 per month). Throughout this period dairy cooperative officials referred to the commitment to make contributions to the President's reelection campaign.

36.1 Letter from Marion Harrison to Gary Hanman, March 30, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.2 Letter from Marion Harrison to Harold Nelson, June 16, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.3 Letter from Marion Harrison to Harold Nelson, June 29, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.4 Letter from Murray Chotiner to David Parr, August 5, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.5 Letter from Hugh Sloan to John Dean, April 12, 1971 (received from SSC).
36.6 Information on campaign spending — H. R. Haldeman and John Dean, May 18, 1971, SSC Exhibit No. 34-26, 3 SSC 1226–230.

36.7 Memorandum from Gordon Strachan to H. R. Haldeman, May 21, 1971 (received from White House).


36.9 Memorandum from Gary Hanman to ADEPT Committee, September 13, 1971 (received from SSC).

37. In August 1971 Colson asked that AMPI make a contribution to People United for Good Government, a political committee, without specifying the purpose of the contribution. On September 2, 1971 AMPI contributed $5,000 to the People United for Good Government. Without the knowledge of AMPI officials, this money was later used to reimburse Joseph Baroody of Wagner & Baroody for funds he had loaned to Colson. The loan has been used to pay expenses incurred by the White House Special Investigations Unit (the "Plumbers") in connection with the break-in of the offices of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

37.1 Marion Harrison testimony, SSC Executive Session, December 4, 1973, 43-45.

37.2 Joseph Baroody affidavit, SSC, January 30, 1974.

37.3 George Webster deposition, Common Cause v. Finance Committee to Re-elect the President, December 24, 1973, 33-35.

37.4 Charles Colson testimony, People v. Ehrlichman, June 8, 1974, 652-56.

37.5 Memorandum from Gordon Strachan to H. R. Haldeman, September 16, 1971 (received from White House).

38. On September 3, 1971 the President delivered a speech to the AMPI convention in Chicago, Illinois.

38.1 President Nixon remarks, September 3, 1971, 7 Presidential Documents, 1242-45.
30. On March 23, 1971 from approximately 12:18 p.m. to approximately 1:07 p.m. the President met with Ehrlichman and Shultz in the Oval Office.

At an unspecified time on March 23, 1971 the President had a telephone conversation with Colson.

30.1 John Ehrlichman log, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).

30.2 White House record of George Shultz contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).

30.3 White House record of Charles Colson contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).
FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1971

8:00        HRH office
8:30-11:00  President
12:00       John Osborn (New Republic)
2:00        Sec. Volpe, Shultz, Magruder, MacGregor, Timmons (SST)
3:00        George Shultz
4:00        Sec. Hardin, Whitaker, Cashen, Shultz, Cook, Rice
            (Milk Price Supports)
7:00        Car at west basement
7:15        Depart for Williamsburg from Pentagon helipad
            (with Lundquists)

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1971

7:45        Car at west basement
8:00-10:15  Breakfast meeting at HUD - Romney's office (Romney, Volpe,
            Hardin, Stans, Blount, Burns, McCracken, Deming)
11:00       Reorganization briefing - Roosevelt Room
12:00       Weinberger, Morgan, Evans, Cole
2:00        Jerry Schecter (Time)
4:00        Roosevelt Room - HAK Laos briefing

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1971

8:00        Leadership - Cabinet Room
9:45        Shultz, Hodgson
11:00       Morgan, Colson, Dent, Cole
12:00       President, Shultz
3:00        President, Mayors
4:45        President, Connally, Hardin, Shultz, Whitaker, Rice
            (Milk Price Supports)
5:50        Colson
7:30        White House dinner - Etherington - Voluntary Center

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 1971

8:00        HRH office
10:45       Frank van der Linden
11:45       Barber
12:15       Depart White House
12:30       Depart Andrews enroute Boston
2:00-4:00   Christian Science Monitor editorial board
4:30        Depart Boston enroute Andrews
6:30        Dinner with White House fellows - Mess
FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1971

8:00    S&H office
8:30-11:00  President
12:00  John Osborn (New Republic)
2:00  Sec. Volpe, Shafer, Magruder, Mr. Gregory, Timmons (EST)
3:00  George Schultz
4:00  Sec. Hardin, Whitaker, Cashen, & Biz, Cook, Rice
(Milk Price Support)
7:00  Car at west basement
7:15  Depart for Williamsburg from Paxonson halipad
(with Lundquist)

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1971

7:45  Car at west basement
8:00-10:15  Breakfast meeting at HUD - Romney's office (Romney, Volpe,
Hardin, Stans, Bloom, Burns, McCracken, Doming)
11:00  Reorganization briefing - Roosevelt Room
12:00  Weinberger, Morgan, Evans, Cole
2:00  Jerry Schecter (Time)
4:00  Roosevelt Room - HAK Laos briefing

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1971

8:00  Leadership - Cabinet Room
9:45  Shultz, Hodgson
11:00  Morgan, Colson, Dent, Cole
12:00  President, Shultz
3:00  President, Mayors
4:45  President, Connolly, Hardin, Shultz, Whitaker, Rice
(Milk Price Support)
5:50  Colson
7:30  White House dinner - Etherington - Voluntary Center

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 1971

8:00  S&H office
10:45  Frank van der Linden
11:45  Jabin
12:15  Depart White House
12:30  Depart Andrews - to Boston
2:00-4:00  Christian Science Monitor editorial board
4:15  Depart Boston to Andrews
6:15  Depart Andrews to White House
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/22/71</td>
<td>Mtg Group</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>Mtg/2 staff</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>Mtg/Group</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>Mtg/Black Leaders</td>
<td>RSVPRm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>p lo nc</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>GrpMtg (QUADRIAD)</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>GrpMtg</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>GrpMtg</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>Mtg 3/6-4/1-4:30p - 6/18-7p</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>Mtg/FRS/OMB/CEA/TREAS/DEF</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHULTZ, George P. Dir., Office Mgmt Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/9/71</td>
<td>RepCongLdrshpMtg</td>
<td>CabRm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>p lo c 1/21-3/5p</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>GrpMtg</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>r ld c 3/12-5/24p</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>RepLdrshpMtg</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See reverse - 3/19/71 - Cab Rm - Cab mtg ANC*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/5/71</td>
<td>OPEN HOUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>Staff Mtg</td>
<td>Fam Thre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>ANG mtg Reps Spec Int Grps Cab Rm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>ANG mtg ABC Exec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>ANG Cab Mtg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>OPEN DOOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>plc / plc / plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td>EOB Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>OPEN DOOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>plc / r lc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>plc / plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>plc / plc / plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/71</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>plc / rd nc / rd nc / rd nc / plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20</td>
<td>plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>Mtg</td>
<td>EOB(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25</td>
<td>plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26</td>
<td>plc / plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27</td>
<td>plc / plc / plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30.3 Charles Colson contacts with the President
31. On March 23, 1971 from 5:05 to 5:35 p.m., the President met in his Oval Office with Ehrlichman, Connally, Hardin, Whitaker, Shultz, Campbell and Rice. They discussed changing the milk price support level.

31.1 Tape recording of meeting among the President, John Ehrlichman, John Connally, Clifford Hardin, John Whitaker, George Shultz, Phil Campbell and Donald Rice, March 23, 1971.

31.2 White House record of John Whitaker contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).
31.1 NOTE

See "Transcript Prepared by the Impeachment Inquiry Staff for the House Judiciary Committee of a Recording of a Meeting Among the President and John Connally, George Shultz, Clifford Hardin, John Ehrlichman, John Whitaker, Phil Campbell and Donald Rice on March 23, 1971, from 5:05 to 5:35 P.M."
### WHITAKER, John C. Deputy Asst. Secy to the Cabinet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/6/70</td>
<td>Mtg. Cncl Env. Quality</td>
<td>CabRm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6</td>
<td>Staff Mtg/Tricia Nixon</td>
<td>CabRm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>p l o c /2:32 - 12:34</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23</td>
<td>Mtg/Natl Assoc of Counties</td>
<td>CabRm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30</td>
<td>Mtg 11/06 - 11:39 W/ Haldeman</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30</td>
<td>Signing Crmny/Agric. Act of 1970</td>
<td>CabRm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17</td>
<td>White House - AgriResearchCntr, Md. hlcptr</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17</td>
<td>AgriResearchCntr, Md-White House hlcptr</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23</td>
<td>Mtg/Penna Ave Cmte</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/71</td>
<td>Staff Mtg</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>DeptmttlAgencyCongRltnsMtng</td>
<td>RsvltRm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>Mtg/Group</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**001933**
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### WHITAKER, John C. Deputy Asst. Secy to the Cabinet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/20/71</td>
<td>Mtg w/family</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>White House - AndrewsAFB</td>
<td>hlcptr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>AndrewsAFB-Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>AF-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>Mtg 3/23 - 3:30, Cabinet Mtg</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26</td>
<td>Mtg 4/26, 4:15 Oval Off, Shultz, Colson, Peter, Kaiman</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27</td>
<td>Mg 3/26, 7:00 Oval Off, Kenworthy, Leighton, Kaiman</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Swing-in Cmty James Fletcher (NASA) Oval O.</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>Mtg 5/6 oval off 10:30 - 10:45</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>Sng Telephone Bank Bill Cab Rm</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/11</td>
<td>Desalting briefing cab rm</td>
<td>Oval Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See reverse
32. On March 23, 1971 from 5:35 to 5:38 p.m. the President met with Connally in the Oval Office. At 5:50 p.m. Ehrlichman met with Colson and at approximately 6:00 p.m. Colson met with AMPI lawyer Chotiner. During the afternoon or evening of March 23, 1971 Under Secretary of Agriculture Campbell had a telephone conversation with Nelson. At some time on March 23, 1971 Connally had a telephone conversation with AMPI lawyer Jacobsen.

32.1 White House record of John Connally contacts with the President, March 23, 1971 (received from White House).

32.2 John Ehrlichman log, March 23, 1971 (received from SSC).

32.3 Murray Chotiner interviews, SSC, December 7, 1973 and December 10, 1973, with accompanying SSC affidavit.

32.4 Gary Hamman testimony, SSC Executive Session, May 21, 1974, 9-11.

32.5 Phil Campbell testimony, SSC Executive Session, May 31, 1974, 60, 61, 64-66.

32.6 John Connally log, March 23, 1971 (received from SSC).

32.1 John Connally
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FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1971

8:00  HRH office
8:30-11:00  President
12:00  John Osborn (New Republic)
2:00  Sec. Volpe, Shultz, Magruder, MacGregor, Timmons (SST)
3:00  George Shultz
4:00  Sec. Hardin, Whitaker, Cashen, Shultz, Cook, Rice
(Prices Support - Markets)
7:00  Car at west basement
7:15  Depart for Williamsburg from Pentagon helipad
(with Lundquists)

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1971

7:45  Car at west basement
8:00-10:15  Breakfast meeting at HUD - Romney's office (Romney, Volpe,
            Hardin, Stans, Blount, Burns, McCracken, Deming)
11:00  Reorganization briefing - Roosevelt Room
12:00  Weinberger, Morgan, Evans, Cole
2:00  Jerry Schecter (Time)
4:00  Roosevelt Room - HAK Laos briefing

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1971

8:00  Leadership - Cabinet Room
9:45  Shultz, Hodgson
11:00  Morgan, Colson, Dent, Cole
12:00  President, Shultz
3:00  President, Mayors
4:45  President, Connally, Hardin, Shultz, Whitaker, Rice
      (Prices Support - Markets)
5:50  Colson
7:30  White House dinner - Etherington - Voluntary Center

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 1971

8:00  HRH office
10:45  Frank van der Linden
11:45  Barber
12:15  Depart White House
12:30  Depart Andrews enroute Boston
2:00-4:00  Christian Science Monitor editorial board
4:30  Depart Boston enroute Andrews
6:30  Dinner with White House fellows - Mess
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MEMORANDUM

To: File
From: Donald G. Sanders
Date: December 7, 1973
Subj: Murray Chotiner Interview
Milk Fund

Murray Chotiner was interviewed today in his office at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C., telephone 298-9030. Attending were Donald G. Sanders, Alan Weitz, and Chotiner.

From January, 1970 to March 1971, Chotiner was Special Counsel to the President. Previously, he was General Counsel to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in the White House. In March 1971, he became of counsel for Reeves & Harrison.

Chotiner said his first contact with the milk industry was in 1970 at which time he met Parr and Nelson. He was introduced by Harrison. He learned the dairy people were going to assist the 1970 candidates. Harrison knew that Chotiner was serving as the White House liaison with the 1970 candidates. Chotiner thinks Parr and Nelson may have been on their way to see Harry Dent in an adjoining office. Chotiner didn't discuss with them any details of the contributions. Chotiner knew that Colson had responsibility for groups and organizations.

Chotiner was not a party to any meetings in late 1970 between the dairy people and Colson and associates. Harrison told Chotiner recently that Parr and Nelson met with Colson (Harrison didn't attend), at which time Parr was supposed to have said that dairy farmers were not being treated properly; that they were for the President and wanted to help him. There was also talk of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 to be contributed to the campaign. Parr told Harrison of this talk. Parr said Colson said there couldn't be any quid pro quo.

In 1971-1972, Colson showed Chotiner the Hillings letter which he had in his safe. Chotiner was probably talking to Colson about the milk industry troubles with the Department of Agriculture. One trouble was the milk products imports, and one must have been the milk price
support. This was at a time when Chotiner was back in private practice. He doesn't keep a calendar or log which would show meetings with Colson. Chotiner has only met with him a few times since leaving the White House. Most of Chotiner's clients are retainers—doesn't bill on a time basis.

Chotiner was shocked at Hillings' letter—thought it was crass. Hillings has said that he never intended for the President to see it; that he felt it was necessary as the dairy people were getting kicked in the pants.

Aside from the Parr and Hillings statements, Chotiner doesn't know of any specific amount of money to be given by the dairy industry.

Colson once told Chotiner that he wanted to disassociate himself from any further contact with the dairy industry—based on Hillings' letter. Chotiner recalled that Harrison said he had toned down the Hillings' letter. Chotiner didn't know what was meant by "special project," and when he asked Harrison what was meant by this, Harrison said he didn't recall. Chotiner didn't talk with Hillings about the letter.

Shortly after joining Reeves and Harrison in March 1971, Chotiner did tell people in the Government that the milk support level should be increased. He left the White House on March 6, 1971. After the Secretary of Agriculture decision on March 12, Chotiner talked with Ehrlichman (Gridiron Dinner), Whitaker, Colson, Cashen. Separately, but in substance, he told them the Republicans usually carry the Midwest, but they need the farm vote to do it; that they need the Midwest to carry the election. He commented that nearly every prominent Democrat had sponsored legislation to raise support. If the price is going up, he said it was stupid to let the Democrats get the credit for it.

Chotiner was not sure that he knew of trust funds at this time.

He knew the dairy folks bought one or two tables at the Republican fund-raiser on March 24, 1971.

Chotiner recalled talking with Harrison about the appearance that the milk people didn't want to buy any tickets for the dinner—he told Harrison he thought they should buy some. He didn't talk with anyone else about this.

After the dinner, Chotiner did talk with Nelson. He said if they wanted to make a contribution, Harrison would let them know to whom to give it. Kalmbach was also present; it was at the Madison Hotel.

There was some annoyance or conflict between Colson and Harrison. Therefore, Chotiner was asked to serve as liaison between the dairy people and the Government. He was asked by Ehrlichman (or someone in his behalf). Chotiner was going to California, and was asked to stay for
a meeting. After dinner, Chotiner met Nelson in the lobby, called Kalmbach's room, and met in his room (he had been in bed.) Chotiner told them he would act as dairy liaison with the Government for their problems, and Harrison would continue to serve as dairy counsel. Chotiner said nothing else of significance was discussed at this meeting.

Chotiner told Nelson that Harrison would provide names of committees for any contribution the dairy industry might make. Chotiner said Harrison would be in touch with them. Kalmbach didn't say much. There was not discussion of price support or definite amounts to be contributed.

Chotiner speculated that the only reason Harrison couldn't have met with Nelson and Kalmbach as well as Chotiner was because of the friction between Colson and Harrison. Chotiner did not know why it was so important to have the meeting that night so as to cause him to postpone a trip.

When asked how he knew that Harrison would serve to tell Nelson how the contributions were to be made, Chotiner said it was just based on the fact that Harrison was counsel for AMPI.

Chotiner saw Colson on March 23. He didn't recall if that is when he learned of Hillings' letter or the bad rapport with Harrison.

Retyped from indistinct original
MEMORANDUM

To: File

From: Donald G. Sanders

Date: December 7, 1973

Subj: Murray Chotiner Interview
       Milk Fund

Murray Chotiner was interviewed today in his office at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C., telephone 293-9030. Attending were Donald G. Sanders, Alan Weitz, and Chotiner.

From January 1970 to March 1971, Chotiner was Special Counsel to the President. Subsequently, he was General Counsel to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in the White House. In March 1971, he became of counsel for Reeves & Harrison.

Chotiner said his first contact with the milk industry was in 1970 at which time he met Farr and Nelson. He was introduced by Harrison. He learned the dairy people were going to assist the 1970 candidates.

Harrison knew that Chotiner was serving as the White House liaison with the 1970 candidates. Chotiner thinks Farr and Nelson may have been on their way to see Harry Dent in an adjoining office. Chotiner didn't discuss with them any details of the contributions. Chotiner knew that Colson had responsibility for groups and organizations.

Chotiner was not a party to any meetings in late 1970 between the dairy people and Colson and associates. Harrison told Chotiner recently that Farr and Nelson met with Colson (Harrison didn't attend), at which time Farr was supposed to have said that dairy farmers were not being treated properly; that they were for the President and wanted to help him.

There was also talk of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 to be contributed to the campaign. Farr told Harrison of this talk. Farr said Colson said there couldn't be any quit pro quo.

In 1971-1972, Colson showed Chotiner the Killings letter which he had in his safe. Chotiner was probably talking to him about the milk industry troubles with the Department of Agriculture. The trouble was the stall ordnance in the Indiana dairy which was below the milk price...
Chotiner had thought that Killings' letter—though it was caustic—was only an attempt to show the dairy industry that he never intended for the President to see it; that he felt it was necessary to the dairy people that they were getting kicked in the rear.

Calm once told Chotiner that he wanted to dissociate himself from any further contact with the dairy industry—based on Killings' letter. Chotiner recalled that Harrison said he had toned down the Killings' letter. Chotiner didn't know what was meant by "special project," and when he asked Harrison what was meant by this, Harrison said he didn't recall. Chotiner didn't talk with Killings about the letter.

Shortly after joining Reeves and Harrison in March 1971, Chotiner did tell people in the Government that the milk support level should be increased. He left the White House on March 6, 1971. After the Secretary of Agriculture decision on March 12, Chotiner talked with Fulbright (Greenbrier Dinner), Harrold, Wilson, Cashin. Separately, but in substance, he told them the Republicans usually carry the Midwest, but they need the farm vote to do it, that they need the Midwest to carry the election. He commented that nearly every prominent Democrat had sponsored legislation to raise support. If the price is going up, he said it was stupid to let the Democrats get the credit for it.

Chotiner was not sure that he knew of trust funds at this time.

He knew the dairy folks bought one or two tables at the Republican fund raiser on March 26, 1971.

Chotiner recalled talking with Harrison about the appearance that the dairy people didn't want to buy any tickets for the dinner—he told Harrison he thought they should buy some. He didn't talk with anyone else about this.
He said that he had seen Cohnin at Nelson in the lobby, called him in his office, and saw him in the hall (he had been in bed). Cohnin told him that he would not accompany Nelson to the luncheon for their problems, and Harrison would continue to serve as dairy counsel. Cohnin said nothing else of significance was discussed at this meeting.

Cohnin told Nelson that Harrison would provide the necessary contributions for the contribution they would be able to make. Cohnin said Harrison would be in Washington. Kalmbach didn't say much. There was no discussion of price support or definite amounts to be contributed.

Cohnin speculated that the only reason Harrison couldn't have met with Nelson and Kalmbach as well as Cohnin was because of the friction between Colson and Harrison. Cohnin did not know why it was so important to have the meeting that night so as to cause him to postpone the trip.

When asked how he knew that Harrison would serve to tell Nelson how the contributions were to be made, Cohnin said it was just based on the fact that Harrison was counsel for AMI.

Cohnin saw Colson on March 23. He didn't recall if that is when he learned of Killings' letter or the bad rapport with Harrison.
MEMORANDUM

TO: FILE

FROM: ALAN WEITZ

DATE: DECEMBER 10, 1973 (RETYPE FEBRUARY 13, 1974)

SUBJECT: SECOND CHOTINER INTERVIEW

Today, Dave Dorsen, Dennis Summers, Bob Silverstein and I continued our interview with Murray Chotiner.

1. March 24, 1971

Colson was "uptight" and annoyed with Marion Harrison and Pat Hillings. He had told this to Chotiner even before he left the White House, (Colson and Chotiner were 2 of 4 special counsel) and again when Chotiner saw Colson twice on the 23rd (9 or 9:30 A.M. and 6 P.M.) Colson may even have shown the Hillings letter to Chotiner on the 23rd. (Between the 6th and the 24th, Chotiner also had one meeting in San Antonio with Harrison, Hillings and the client.)

On the evening of the 24th at the Republican fund-raising dinner, Ehrlichman (or one of his staff) told Chotiner that Colson was uptight and annoyed and that he didn't want to have anything to do with dairy people if they represented them. Ehrlichman then asked Chotiner if he would take over as liaison for the dairy people on quotas, price supports and other government matters. Chotiner replied that, since he was Of Counsel and the dairy people were Harrison's clients, he couldn't take over, but he would help. Ehrlichman also asked if he could meet with the milk people, in Kalmbach's presence, to tell them so. Chotiner said he couldn't the
next day since he had plans to fly out to California. Ehrlichman then suggested that they meet that night. So, at the dinner, Chotiner told Nelson "let's get together with Kalmbach to talk about the milk decision" and then he talked briefly to Kalmbach to get his room number in the Madison Hotel. Chotiner also informed Harrison. Chotiner hasn't talked to Ehrlichman about this since then.

Chotiner explained that it would have been unseemly for a government official to have been present when Chotiner told Nelson of the change in representation, but that Kalmbach lent greater credence to it.

Chotiner said Ehrlichman did not mention the price decision or contributions. Chotiner says that he didn't learn of the Administration decision until it was publicly announced on the 25th. The dairy people were very happy after the meeting with the President.

Chotiner went to the Madison Hotel after the dinner and called Kalmbach's room but couldn't reach Kalmbach. Nelson arrived and after waiting for some time, he and Chotiner realized they had been calling the wrong number. They then reached Kalmbach and went up to his room. Since the dinner ended around 11 P.M., and they waited a half hour or so, it was 11:30 or midnight when they finally met with Kalmbach.

It appeared to Chotiner that Nelson and Kalmbach already knew each other. At the meeting, Chotiner said:

"Harold, it's no criticism of Marion or Pat; maybe they don't like the way they comb their hair, but there's bad feeling between Colson and Marion and Pat. So they want me to represent you in dairy matters unless you object."

Nelson: "O.K." (He seemed to have heard about it before; in fact he never asked about Harrison's absence from the meeting.)

Chotiner: "Herb, is that your understanding?"

Kalmbach: "Yes."
Nelson: "We had a satisfactory meeting with the President and we appreciate it. We contribute to both Democrats and Republicans. If we want to contribute to Republicans, how should we do so?"

Chotiner: "Harrison is still your attorney for such matters, and he'll give you the names of committees."

Chotiner does not recall any further discussion; he and Nelson then left Kalmbach's room. Chotiner went home and the next day (the 25th) he left for California.

Chotiner says that he assumed the contributions would be substantial, although he didn't know the specific amount. Chotiner does not believe there was any specific reference at the meeting to substantive issues.

After the meeting, he informed Harrison, but he never talked to Colson about it. After Chotiner met with Colson once or twice, Mitchell called Chotiner (in April or shortly after returning from California) to tell him that signals had been changed and Harrison was again acceptable as representative of the dairy people vis-a-vis Colson. Chotiner told Harrison, and Harrison didn't seem surprised. Nonetheless, Harrison continued to deal primarily with Cashen, and Chotiner with Colson.

Chotiner knows of no dairy contacts with Connally.

2. 1971 Contributions

Chotiner doesn't remember telling Harrison, after the March 24 meeting, about the contributions discussed by Nelson at the meeting. At some point, (Chotiner thinks more than a week after the 24th), Harrison showed Chotiner some of the "silly" names of committees. Chotiner remembers names of only some committees, of the 100, being provided at first to Harrison and the dairy people.

Chotiner wasn't directly involved in the contributions. However, in the summer of 1971, Harrison went to Europe. Before he left, he told Chotiner that the contributions were not coming in as anticipated. Chotiner confirmed this by calling FCRP, and called Dave Parr who said he wasn't sure he had all the names of the committees. So Chotiner
had Harrison's secretary send a list of the 100 committees to FARR, marked to indicate committee names already sent to the dairy people by Harrison. Chotiner had some idea that the contributions were being coordinated among the three dairy co-ops. When the checks came in to Chotiner, he merely had a secretary take them to FCRP. After August, 1971, he had no further participation in the contributions.

2. A. 1972 Solicitations

Only recently did he hear from Harrison of AMPI meetings with Kalmbach in 1972. Chotiner says he had no contemporaneous knowledge of such meetings or of any further solicitations.

3. Ellsberg Break-In

Sometime in 1971, Colson asked Chotiner if the dairy people wanted to give $5000 to another committee, for some work or project. Chotiner passed the information on to Harrison, without ever knowing any details.

Chotiner cannot explain why Harrison thinks Colson called Harrison directly. Chotiner told us that Colson may have called Chotiner who told Harrison who, in turn, called either Colson or Cashen.

Chotiner says that Harrison once told him that someone (presumably Colson) "over there" (in the White House) had suggested that AMPI hire Wagner and Baroody for public relations work. Chotiner knows nothing further except that he thinks they were retained. He thinks they needed public relations work to help their image.

4. Antitrust Suit

Harrison told Chotiner about the Justice Department antitrust suit against AMPI, after it was filed. Chotiner may have talked to Colson about it. The key objection by AMPI was that there had been no 30 or 60 day pre-filing negotiation period. Harrison and Chotiner decided to wait until the new antitrust chief was named before pursuing it. (Chotiner got the impression from Harrison that McLaren was responsible for filing the suit just prior to his leaving the Department.) But the next night, after the Harrison-Chotiner conversation,
Chotiner saw Mitchell at a party. Chotiner took the opportunity to tell Mitchell that AMPI should be treated like any other defendant in the up-coming post-filing negotiations. He says Mitchell didn't respond.

Chotiner was first shown the Harrison letters (attached) last week, and he was upset. He says that, contrary to the implication of the March 25 letter to Mehren, they did not discuss talking to Kleindienst, but only to McLaren's successor. Although Chotiner never again talked to Mitchell about the suit, he understands Harrison did later talk to Kleindienst. (Chotiner once talked to Bruce Wilson about an unrelated matter.)

In 1972, AMPI fired Reeves & Harrison because the firm was not getting a good response from the Administration.

5. FCRP

Chotiner was in charge of ballot security in the President's 1972 campaign. He was reimbursed for his expenses and for the money he paid to reporters. When he left the White House, he received money from Kalmbach for part of his secretarial and phone expense (but never his rent at Reeves & Harrison.) AMPI paid for part of his secretary's furnishings; he always paid for his rent ($625 per month) out of his monthly payment from the firm.
SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

AFFIDAVIT

District of Columbia
City of Washington

I, Alan S. Weitz, a resident of Washington, D.C., being duly sworn, hereby depose and say as follows:

1. I have been assistant counsel to the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities from September 24, 1973 to the present.

2. In the course of the Committee's investigation, Mr. Donald Sanders, Deputy Minority Counsel, and I interviewed Mr. Murray Chotiner on December 7, 1973, and Mr. David Dorsen (Assistant Chief Counsel), Mr. Dennis Summers (Assistant Counsel), Mr. Robert Silverstein (Assistant Minority Counsel) and I interviewed Mr. Chotiner, again, on December 10, 1973. On the day of the first interview, Mr. Sanders wrote a memorandum summarizing the substance of the interview. On the day of the second interview, I wrote a memorandum summarizing the substance of the interview.

3. On January 24, 1974, Mr. Dorsen advised me that he had telephoned Mr. Chotiner's office to arrange to obtain sworn testimony in executive session before the Committee on the subjects of the interviews, and was advised by Mr. Chotiner's secretary that he had been in a serious automobile accident the preceding day. Mr. Chotiner died on January 30, 1974.

4. I am executing this affidavit in order to preserve, in the most reliable form, the substance of Mr. Chotiner's account related to us of relevant events. To this end, (1) Mr. Sanders and I reviewed the December 7, 1973 memorandum; (2) I caused my December 10, 1973 memorandum to be retyped on Committee letterhead stationery to correct any typographical errors, to spell out certain names and to rewrite certain cryptically-phrased sentences in the original December 10 memorandum. I did not alter the substance of the earlier memorandum; and (3) I showed the retyped December 10 memorandum to Messrs. Dorsen, Summers and Silverstein.

5. Mr. Sanders and I agree that the December 7 Sanders memorandum is a true and accurate account of the substance of the December 7 interview with Mr. Chotiner. Messrs. Dorsen, Summers, and Silverstein and I agree that the retyped December 10 memorandum is a true and accurate account of the substance of the interview with Mr. Chotiner of that date.
6. Attached to this Affidavit are the following:

Exhibit A: copy of the December 7, 1973 memorandum from Donald G. Sanders to the File re: Murray Chotiner Interview;

Exhibit B: the retyped December 10, 1973 memorandum from Alan Weitz to the File re: Second Chotiner Interview.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of February, 1974.

Marie Lecoeau
Notary Public

My Commission Expires 10/31/78
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Mr. Hanman. I do not know for sure.

Mr. Weitz. Did he tell you or did anyone else tell you who called Parr?

Mr. Hoecker. Did Parr tell him that?

Mr. Weitz. Did Parr tell you that or did you know that it was a fact?

Mr. Hanman. I do not know who called him. But it is my recollection that's why we went.

Mr. Weitz. Did someone tell you or do you recall from whatever source who you were told had called Parr?

Mr. Hanman. My recollection was it was a call from Phil Campbell.

Mr. Weitz. He was Undersecretary of Agriculture?

Mr. Hanman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Were you told or do you have any recollection of what was supposed to have transpired in that telephone conversation?

Mr. Hanman. No. My recollection was that the call in effect said we should go to the dinner, we should not boycott the dinner, we should go ahead with the plans as previously made.

Mr. Weitz. Had you ever talked to Phil Campbell about contributions activity, as opposed to the merits of the price support decision?

Mr. Hanman. No.
Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether anyone connected with any of the three principal dairy coops had spoken to Campbell about contributions activities or possible contributions?

Mr. Hanman. Not that I could testify to, no.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know how Campbell knew about the plans to go to the dinner, the possible boycott of the dinner?

Mr. Hanman. No, I do not.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether there was any reference by Campbell to the price support matter, either any meetings that were going on within the Administration or a review of the price support, the first decision and so forth?

Mr. Hanman. No, I do not.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether Campbell indicated to Parr any reason that you should not boycott the dinner?

Mr. Hanman. No. As I recall, the general statement was, progress is being made. We should go ahead and go to the dinner.  Mr. Weitz. Progress is being made with regard to what?

Mr. Hanman. To this price support activity, working on this legislation.

Mr. Weitz. Campbell was in the Administration. He would not have to call you to tell you progress was being made with legislation, would he?

Mr. Hanman. Normally not. I would think that would be true.

Mr. Weitz. In fact, was he not referring to the fact that
the progress that was being made in the Administration was regarding administrative increase?

Mr. Hanman. I do not know.

Mr. Weitz. Is that not what you understood?

Mr. Hanman. I understood that progress was being made in our objective, to get price support increases, legislative or administratively.

Mr. Weitz. What was Campbell referring to?

Mr. Hanman. I do not know.

Mr. Weitz. What was your understanding talking about it with Parr and others?

Mr. Hanman. I do not know. I do not recollect whether it was legislative or administrative. I think it could have been legislative. I think there would have been some calls to him from Republican Congressmen or Senators with respect to this.

One of the things that we asked them to do was to call the Administration people, the people in the Administration.

Mr. Weitz. They had been doing that for a number of weeks had they not?

Mr. Hanman. That's right.

Mr. Weitz. The effort had been going on with the dairy people in Congress and elsewhere for a number of weeks or months.

Mr. Hanman. Intensively since that March decision, yes.

Mr. Weitz. Did you have any knowledge or were you told of
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time which would be five fifty Eastern Standard Time which
would be the time in Washington on March 23 of 71, there is a
record of a phone call from Mr. Phil Campbell to Mr. Nelson
with the message to return the call to your home. Is your
number Area Code 703-360-5789?

Mr. Campbell. Yes. So --

Mr. Weitz. That would indicate then that at 5:30 in the
afternoon which would have been shortly after the 4:45 meeting
you placed a call that did not reach Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Campbell. Maybe I didn't. All I know is I placed the
call and talked to him. I can't give you the details. I mean
you have the records and I will have to accept when it was on
there.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall him returning the call at your
home that evening?

Mr. Campbell. I recall I talked to him. I don't recall
under what circumstances.

Mr. Weitz. Did you talk to him after dinner?

Mr. Campbell. I thought I talked to him at the office.

My memory may be wrong on that.

Mr. Weitz. You see the records show he was still in Wash-
ington that day.

Mr. Campbell. I see. I don't know where I talked to him
but I placed the call and talked to him but I can't tell you
exactly when.
Mr. Weitz. Did you have your secretary place the call?

Mr. Campbell. I don't remember how it was done.

Mr. Weitz. But it is likely that the only number you would have had in your records would have been his office in San Antonio?

Mr. Campbell. That is correct. Yes. Possibly his home. I don't know.

Mr. Weitz. But not his hotel room in Washington?

Mr. Campbell. No, I recall I had the call placed, I did talk to him but I don't know how or when the call was completed.

Mr. Weitz. Could you tell us what you told him on the telephone?

Mr. Campbell. Yes. I asked him to -- well I said, now Harold if we do change our mind and do raise the price, will you and the other dairymen stop asking us for prices increases -- well, not price increases but price support increases -- because I don't think it is good for the dairymen. Will you get off our backs? And he agreed and said he would.

Mr. Weitz. You recall using that language, "get off our backs?"

Mr. Campbell. Yes, I asked him to get off our backs and he agreed that if we did raise the price support that he would.

Mr. Weitz. Did you indicate that you had met with the President?

Mr. Campbell. No.
him that it had been made.

Mr. Weitz. Did you discuss anything else in the conversation

Mr. Campbell. No, that was a very short conversation.

Mr. Weitz. Did you ask him not to boycott the Republican

fund raising dinner the next night?

Mr. Campbell. No, sir, I don't recall even talking to

him about that. I don't recall any conversations with him in

regard to that fund raising.

Mr. Weitz. Did you attend that dinner?

Mr. Campbell. No, sir.

Mr. Weitz. Were you aware on the 23rd the dinner was

going to be held the next evening?

Mr. Campbell. I was aware because I got a letter soliciting

me to buy a $1,000 ticket, which I was not financially able to

do. I get these letters each year and I have never bought a

ticket because I am not financially able to.

Mr. Weitz. Were you aware that the dairy co-ops were

planning to attend the dinner representatives of the co-op were

planning to attend the dinner?

Mr. Campbell. I don't know when I knew. I heard after-

wards that they were there and I don't know how many tickets

they bought or anything about it, but I had nothing to do with

then purchasing the tickets.

Mr. Weitz. Were you aware that after the March 12 decision

they had started to change their minds about attending the
dinner and in fact some of them wanted to boycott the dinner?

Mr. Campbell. I don't recall that, no. I do not recall that because I was not involved in initiating or instigating the purchase of any tickets to that dinner.

Mr. Weitz. Well, whether or not you were involved in initiating or instigating the purchase of the tickets, were you aware or were there people telling you or inferring the fact that there was a change of sentiment on the part of the dairy people?

Mr. Campbell. I don't recall it. I don't recall when I knew they were even thinking of buying tickets. I do remember hearing as I remember that they had two or three tables. I don't know how many people that would be but I assume that is ten people to a table. I don't recall the time sequence of when I heard this because frankly I was not involved in the dinner, I was not involved in trying to sell tickets and did not attend the dinner and as a result it wasn't of prime importance to me in my mind and I don't remember when I heard anything of that type but I do remember hearing afterwards they did have two or three tables.

Mr. Weitz. Before the dinner you didn't discuss with any one the likelihood of the dairy people either attending or not attending the dinner?

Mr. Campbell. I don't remember any such discussions, although I may have heard that just like I heard this other
thing of donating $2million to the President's campaign. I could have heard that but I don't recall it.

Mr. Weitz. Did you know of any plans by the dairy people to contribute as much as $60 thousand, $80 thousand, or $100 thousand to the dinner or to the dinner committees?

Mr. Campbell. I had no personal knowledge of this. I don't recall anyone telling me and saying "we are going to do these things" although I did hear afterwards that they had. I could have very easily been told by somebody well "they are going to buy tickets to the dinner" but that wasn't important to me. I wasn't involved. And I don't recall it. It could have been told to me but I just don't recall it.

Mr. Weitz. Is there any way that you can pinpoint the time when you talked to Nelson on the 23rd other than the fact it apparently was after 5:50 p.m.?

Mr. Campbell. No, there is not. I remember placing the call and then, until you corrected me I thought I got the call through but I evidently did not and I just don't know when I talked to him but I thought it was that same day. It might not have been, it could have been the next day but I did talk to him. And I thought it was the same day that it may not have been.

Mr. Weitz. Assuming it was the same day though you don't recall talking to him at home versus at your office?

Mr. Campbell. No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Callers</th>
<th>Phone Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Dr. McCaslin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Mr. W. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Wilbeed Finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:55</td>
<td>Bruce F. Kenney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>Mr. Tidman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25</td>
<td>Art S. Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Wayne Wedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>Paul S. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calls**

- 6:30 July 4th 6th (Art) McGraw
- 4:30 July 4th 6th (Art) McGraw

**Time Record**

- Tuesday, March 23.
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MR. GOLDBLOOM: Do you have other questions?

MR. DOBROVIR: No. After this I'm finished.

(Secretary returns original exhibit to Counsel.

MR. DOBROVIR: I am now showing the original back page of Exhibit 75 to Mr. Nelson who will read, as best he can decipher his own handwriting, what it says.

A "Schultz: Every dime must be cut 'down." Squiggle.

"Schultz has got to be instructed." Then an illegible word, then "talked to Schultz and Pres thirty minutes. Told Pres we were most aggressive political organization in America." Then another line and uncompleted sentence, "Didn't give."

Q Would you like to amend the word "America"? You just said "most aggressive political organization in America."

A "In agriculture." Yes, I certainly would because that's not a strong statement because agricultural organizations are notoriously politically impotent.

MR. DOBROVIR: Off the record.

(An off-the-record discussion was had.

MR. DOBROVIR: I have no more questions.
best of his ability what it says.

MR. GOLDEN: Do you have other questions?

MR. DOBROW: No. After this I'm finished.

The Secretary returns original

(exhibit to Counsel).

MR. DOBROW: I am now showing the original
back part of Exhibit 75 to Mr. Nelson who will read, as
best he can decipher his own handwriting, what it says.

"Schultz: Every dime must be cut, down." Squiggle.

"Schultz has got to be instructed." Then an illegible
word, then "talked to Schultz and Pres thirty minutes.

Told Pres we were most aggressive political organization
in America." Then another line and uncompleted sentence,

"Don't give."

Would you like to read the word "America"? You just said
"most aggressive political organization in America."

"In agriculture." Yes, I certainly would because that's
not a strong statement because agricultural organizations
are notoriously politically impotent.

MR. DOBROW: Off the record.

(An off-the-record discussion was

had.)

MR. DOBROW: I have no more questions.
32.7 Exhibit attached to Harold Nelson deposition
33. During the night of March 23, 1971 AMPI officials flew to Louisville, Kentucky, the home of Dairymen, Inc. (DI), another large milk producers cooperative and met at about 4:00 a.m. on March 24, 1971 with Paul Alagia, an official of DI who had attended the March 23, 1971 morning meeting with the President. They discussed political contributions including the possibility of an immediate contribution to the Republican National Committee for a political dinner to be held that evening. They also discussed loans among their organizations for the purpose of making contributions. During the afternoon of March 24, 1971 a DI contribution of $25,000 was flown to Washington and given to the Republican National Committee dinner fund to buy tables for the dinner.

33.1 Paul Alagia testimony, SSC Executive Session, January 25, 1974, 31-34, 38-41.


33.3 David Parr testimony, SSC Executive Session, December 21, 1973, 79-81.

33.4 Gary Hanman testimony, SSC Executive Session, May 21, 1974, 8, 13-14, 20.

33.5 SPACE report to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, June 4, 1971 (received from Clerk of the House of Representatives).
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she gave me a number to call and then I was informed that they wanted to meet me. But I can't remember -- I know I didn't talk with Nelson, Parr, Lilley, or Hanman. I mean I don't recall them talking to me.

Mr. Weitz. While you were in Chicago?

Mr. Alagia. Right.

Mr. Weitz: But were you informed that those were the people who were trying to look for you?

Mr. Alagia. Oh, no. No, I didn't know who was going to be at the airport when I got off until I got off the airplane.

Mr. Weitz. Did you know someone would be trying to meet you or wait for you?

Mr. Alagia. I was told that. Whether or not they would be there, I was going home.

Mr. Weitz. But your wife told you they would try to meet you at the airport?

Mr. Alagia. When I got home, yes.

Mr. Weitz. What is your best recollection of the time you arrived in the airport in Louisville that morning?

Mr. Alagia. Three or four o'clock.

Mr. Weitz. Who did you find at the airport waiting for you?

Mr. Alagia. I found Harold Nelson, Dave Parr, Garry Hanman, and Bob Lilley. If they had anybody else there, I don't remember.
Mr. Weitz. And Mr. Lilley, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Parr were employed by AMPI and Mr. Hanman was employed by Mid-America dairy.

Mr. Alagia. Yes sir.

Mr. Weitz. Who spoke to you when you came off the plane?

Mr. Alagia. I don't know which one of them spoke to me, but I know my -- you know --

Mr. Weitz. Who did most of the talking to you?

Mr. Alagia. Mr. Parr.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall anything in particular -- could you tell us essentially what he told you?

Mr. Alagia. When I got off the plane -- you know, I can tell you the thrust of the meeting. I can't remember it word for word, but I can tell you what the thrust was as far as these four fellows descending on me at that time. That was, you know, I could not imagine why they were down there to meet me at that time. But in the past, I mean, they were night people from the word go as far as meetings and things like that were concerned.

In any event, I asked them to -- you know, what on earth did they want?

They said, well, they indicated to me they wanted two or three hundred thousand dollars from us.

I said, well, you, or words to this effect, you have got to be kidding. I mean we would not have that kind of money.
Mr. Alagia. Yes sir.

Mr. Weitz. Who did most of the talking to you?

Mr. Alagia. Mr. Parr.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall anything in particular -- could you tell us essentially what he told you?

Mr. Alagia. When I got off the plane -- you know, I can tell you the thrust of the meeting. I can't remember it word for word, but I can tell you what the thrust was as far as these four fellows descending on me at that time. That was, you know, I could not imagine why they were down there to meet me at that time. But in the past, I mean, they were night people from the word go as far as meetings and things like that were concerned.

In any event, I asked them to -- you know, what on earth did they want?

They said, well, they indicated to me they wanted two or three hundred thousand dollars from us.

I said, well you, or words to this effect, you have got to be kidding. I mean we would not have that kind of money.
What are you guys talking about? You have to be kidding.

So they got off that.

Mr. Weitz. Before we leave that. They got off that.

When they first made the -- would it be Nelson or Parr
essentially who made that request or statement?

Mr. Alagia. Yes, but I don't recall which one.

Mr. Weitz. Did they in any way indicate, either by the
context of the discussion or anything else you can piece
together from your understanding at the time, did they
indicate what they wanted the money for or for whom?

Mr. Alagia. Well, it was -- let me put it this way.
In the context of the meeting -- and you know, incidentally,
I didn't know whether this meeting was this day or later on
at some other time until we got really checking these
records. But obviously, in the meeting we had had with the
President and it was in the context of, you know, that meeting.
That is about the best I can put it.

Then they got on to wanting SPACE to lend ADEPT $100,000.

Mr. Weitz. Now, ADEPT, you indicated, had been formed
more than a year after SPACE had been formed. Was it your
understanding that they had even a smaller amount of funds
available than did SPACE?

Mr. Alagia. Frankly, I didn't know what ADEPT had in
their coffers, you know, nor did I know what TAPE had. I just
didn't keep count of that, you know.
Mr. Weitz. But it was clear in your mind that they wanted the money in order to enable ADEPT to make a contribution with that amount?

Mr. Alagia. What other conclusion could I reach?

Mr. Weitz. And they said they wanted how much, $100,000?

Mr. Alagia. $100,000.

Mr. Weitz. Did they tell you by what time or timetable they wanted it?

Mr. Alagia. I asked them in effect, what was the timetable. They said the first of the week.

I said, well, listen, I am a lame duck, by gosh, and I am sure not going to make any decision like that.

Mr. Weitz. Did you also raise a question as to the legality of that loan?

Mr. Alagia. Yes, I did. I said that I didn't think that Corrupt Practices law would permit the transfer or loans like that. And I had made up my mind I was not going to have any part of that.

Mr. Weitz. I am sorry if you had stated it before. Did he indicate he wanted the loan by the first of the week? Did you -- did he indicate that to you?

Mr. Alagia. They indicated -- I am just telling you how I remember it. The thrust of it was that by the first of the week, the loan from SPACE that they wanted for ADEPT --

Mr. Weitz. Right. Now, if the record, which would, of
meaning you -- "interested in helping you but just wanted to
check how much they had and would do everything they could?"
Mr. Nelson's response was: "In my recollection, he was very
interested. There was no problem from that standpoint at all
And that is inconsistent with your recollection of the
meeting?

Mr. Alagia. Why, yes, I didn't agree to that at all.

Mr. Weitz. How did you leave it? Did you just go to
bed and leave it that you would not be contributing any
amount or no amount?

Mr. Alagia. I told them that I was going to leave any
decision on contributions to Ben Morgan and I didn't think it
was legal what they were trying to do. I don't know what he
says about that, but I sure didn't think it was legal.

Mr. Weitz. When you say what they were trying to do, are
you talking in terms of the loan from one trust to another?

Mr. Alagia. Why, sure. Why should we lend ADEPT or
anybody else the money? If they don't have the money, they
should not be making any contributions.

Mr. Weitz. Now, the very next morning, the morning of the
24th, that same day, did you relate this conversation to
Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Alagia. That next morning, I talked with Ben Morgan
and I talked about the Presidential meeting. I talked about
the meeting with, you know, Mr. Moser.
Mr. Weitz. The discussion?

Mr. Alagia. The discussion about the contribution.

We talked about the fact that we ought to concentrate our efforts on the Hill, and we -- I am sure we discussed the dinner dates, and as far as the meeting at the airport, I told Ben Morgan if he got a call from anybody over there, lending money from SPACE to ADEPT or any of that, I am sure not going to authorize it from a legal point of view.

Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you one question. I think we may have overlooked this from my understanding of the meeting at the airport. Was there any reference to Mr. Connally by the AMPI officials?

Mr. Alagia. Yes sir.

Mr. Weitz. This was at the meeting at the airport?

Mr. Alagia. Yes. They told me, you know, they had either been to see Connally or they were on their way to see Secretary Connally.

Mr. Weitz. Who told you that, do you recall?

Mr. Alagia. Harold Nelson. I feel it could have been Dave Parr, but I think it was Harold Nelson.

Mr. Weitz. Did Mr. Lilley or Mr. Parr say anything about Mr. Connally that you can recall?

Mr. Alagia. Mr. Lilley -- they were trying to tell me what kind of a forceful fellow Mr. Connally was.

Mr. Weitz. There again, was it your understanding that
they were referring to the price support matter then possible before the Administration?

Mr. Alagia. Well, it was in the context of this meeting

Mr. Weitz. Was anything else said that you can recall at this meeting at the airport at 4:00 o'clock in the morning

Mr. Alagia. No, I was ready to leave, you know, and would have done anything within limits to politely excuse myself and get out of there. I didn't appreciate them descending on me, you know.

Mr. Weitz. Let me ask you one more question. Had you been aware before their comment to you about Mr. Connally that they had been in contact with Mr. Connally or were trying to get in contact with Mr. Connally?

Mr. Alagia. Had I been aware?

Mr. Weitz. Yes, before they told you.

Mr. Alagia. I mean if they did tell me, it didn't make much of an impression, because they were always talking about big names. And I say big names; you know, they had either been down to see President Johnson at his ranch or some other place.

Mr. Weitz. But this was the only "big name" that they mentioned to you at the airport meeting?

Mr. Alagia. Yes sir, as far as I can recall.

Mr. Weitz. Now, on the 24th, after you had talked to Mr. Morgan, do you in fact know what steps were taken to make

Retyped from indistinct original
a contribution that day to the dinner, to the fund-raising
dinner on the 24th?

Mr. Alagia. Yes. When I could not find Joe Westwater
and my wife reminded me that she tried to get Lou Westwater
his wife, to call me during the course of the morning if sh
ran him down, I sent John Mays to Washington to get the din
tickets from Harrison's office to take them to the Quality
Court --

Mr. Weitz. In Washington?

Mr. Alagia. Where our Dairymen were so our Dairymen,
the President and these other farmers, would not be flounder
around, wondering where the dinner was, or anything like tha

Mr. Weitz. I think the record shows that five checks,
each for $5,000, to various Republican committees, totaling
$25,000 were drawn for SPACE on the 24th of March. Can you
tell us who authorized those contributions?

Mr. Alagia. After talking with Mr. Morgan, he called me
back, talking about how much was in our kitty, and 20 or 25
thousand dollars is what he authorized Jim Mueller to write.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether that contribution on the
24th, totaling $25,000, was the largest amount to any one
function or fund-raising event that SPACE had made up to that
time?

Mr. Alagia. It could have been; it could have been.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether any representatives of
he was a number of days, and I was informed that I
would not meet you. But if you would call me,
I could call with Mieles, Port, Minn., or anyone. I
will recall that talking to me.

Mr. Waits. While you were in Chicago?

Mr. Alagia. Right.

Mr. Waits. But were you informed that those were the
people who were trying to look for you?

Mr. Alagia. Oh, no. No, I didn't know who was going to
be at the airport when I got off until I got off the airplane.

Mr. Waits. Did you know someone would be trying to meet
you or wait for you?

Mr. Alagia. I was told that. Whether or not they would
be there, I was going home.

Mr. Waits. But your wife told you they would try to meet
you at the airport?

Mr. Alagia. When I got home, yes.

Mr. Waits. What is your best recollection of the time
you arrived in the airport in Louisville that morning?

Mr. Alagia. Three or four o'clock.

Mr. Waits. Who did you find at the airport waiting for
you?
Mr. Waite. And Mr. Hill, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Parr were employed by kind and Mr. Waite was employed by the
American daily.

Mr. Alagia. Yes sir.

Mr. Waite. Who spoke to you when you came off the plane?

Mr. Alagia. I don't know which one of them spoke to
me, but I know my — you know —

Mr. Waite. Who did most of the talking to you?

Mr. Alagia. Mr. Parr.

Mr. Waite. Do you recall anything in particular —
could you tell us essentially what he told you?

Mr. Alagia. When I got off the plane — you know, I can
tell you the thrust of the meeting. I can't remember it
word for word, but I can tell you what the thrust was as far
as these four fellows descending on me at that time. That
was, you know, I could not imagine why they were down there
to meet me at that time. But in the past, I mean, they were
night people from the word go as far as meetings and things
like that were concerned.

In any event, I asked them to — you know, what on earth
did they want?

They said, well, they indicated to me they wanted
two or three hundred thousand dollars from me.

But I said, well, I don't have that kind of money.
Mr. Alagia: What are you guys talking about? You have to be kidding.

Mr. Wertz: They got off some.

Mr. Wertz: Before we leave that. They got off that. When they first made the request or statement?

Mr. Alagia: Yes, but I don't recall which one.

Mr. Wertz: Did they in any way indicate, either by the content of the discussion or anything else you can piece together from your understanding at the time, did they indicate what they wanted the money for or for whom?

Mr. Alagia: Well, it was — let me put it this way. In the context of the meeting — and you know, incidentally, I didn't know whether this meeting was this day or later or at some other time until we got really checking these records. But obviously, in the meeting we had had with the President and it was in the context of, you know, that meeting. That is about the best I can put it.

Then they got on to wanting SPACE to lend ADRE $100,000.

Mr. Wertz: Now, ADRE, you indicated, had been formed more than a year after SPACE had been formed. Was it your understanding that they had even a smaller amount of funds available than the SPACE?

Mr. Alagia: Well, I think we had never been in a position, and you were, you know, the same situation that we had. It didn't keep count of these, you know.
Mr. Waits. Did it ever occur to your mind that they
wanted the money in order to enable AIFST to make a con-
with that amount?

Mr. Alagia. What other conclusion could I reach?

Mr. Waits. And they said they wanted how much, $100,
Mr. Alagia. $100,000.

Mr. Waits. Did they tell you by what time or timetab-
they wanted it?

Mr. Alagia. I asked them in effect, what was the tim-
table. They said the first of the week.

I said, well, listen, I am a lame duck, by gosh, and I
am sure not going to make any decision like that.

Mr. Waits. Did you also raise a question as to the
legality of that loan?

Mr. Alagia. Yes, I did. I said that I didn't think t
Corrupt Practices law would permit the transfer or loans li
that. And I had made up my mind I was not going to have an
part of that.

Mr. Waits. I am sorry if you had stated it before. Do
he indicate he wanted the loan by the first of the week? Do
you -- did he indicate that to you?

Mr. Alagia. Very indirect. -- I am just telling you he
indicated to me that he hoped it would be in his hands by the first of
week. The Loan from AIFST was made pending for issuance.

Mr. Waits. May I now, if the record, which Mind, of
meaning you — "Interested in helping you but just wanted to
check how much they had and could do everything they could?"
Mr. Nelson's response was: "In my recollection, he was ver
interested. There was no problem from that standpoint at a
And that is inconsistent with your recollection of the
meeting?
Mr. Alagia. Why, yes, I didn't agree to that at all.
Mr. Wetz. How did you leave it? Did you just go to
bed and leave it that you would not be contributing any
amount or no amount?
Mr. Alagia. I told them that I was going to leave any
decision on contributions to Ben Morgan and I didn't think
was legal what they were trying to do. I don't know what he
says about that, but I sure didn't think it was legal.
Mr. Wetz. When you say what they were trying to do,
you talking in terms of the loan from one trust to another?
Mr. Alagia. Why, sure. Why should we lend ADEPT or
anybody else the money? If they don't have the money, they
should not be making any contributions,
Mr. Wetz. Now, the very next morning, the morning of
14th, that same day, did you recall this conversation to
Mr. Morgan?
Mr. Alagia. The next morning, I talked with Bob and
and I talked about the presidential meeting. I talked about
the meeting with, you know, Mr. Ross.
Mr. Waitz. The discussion?

Mr. Alagia. The discussion about the contribution.

We talked about the fact that we ought to concentrate
our efforts on the Hill, and as I am sure we discussed
the dinner dates, and as far as the meeting at the airport.
I told Ben Morgan if he got a call from anybody over there,
landing money from SPACE to ADMET or any of that, I am sure
not going to authorize it from a legal point of view.

Mr. Waitz. Let me ask you one question. I think we may
have overlooked this from my understanding of the meeting at
the airport. Was there any reference to Mr. Connally by the
AMPF officials?

Mr. Alagia. Yes sir.

Mr. Waitz. This was at the meeting at the airport?

Mr. Alagia. Yes. They told me, you know, they had
either been to see Connally or they were on their way to see
Secretary Connally.

Mr. Waitz. Who told you that, do you recall?

Mr. Alagia. Harold Nelson. I feel it could have been
Dave Parr, but I think it was Harold Nelson.

Mr. Waitz. Did Mr. Lillay or Mr. Farr say anything about
Mr. Connally that you can recall?

Mr. Alagia. Mr. Lillay — they were trying to talk on
what kind of a formal letter Mr. Connally was.

Mr. Waitz. That again, was it your understanding that
they were referring to the price support matter then possi-
before the Administration?

Mr. Alagia. Well, it was in the context of this meet-

Mr. Weiss. Was anything else said that you can recall
at this meeting at the airport at 4:00 o'clock in the mor-

Mr. Alagia. No, I was ready to leave, you know, and
would have done anything within limits to politely excuse
myself and get out of there. I didn't appreciate them
descending on me, you know.

Mr. Weiss. Let me ask you one more question. Had you
been aware before their comment to you about Mr. Connally
that they had been in contact with Mr. Connally or were try
to get in contact with Mr. Connally?

Mr. Alagia. Had I been aware?

Mr. Weiss. Yes, before they told you.

Mr. Alagia. I mean if they did tell me, it didn't mak
much of an impression, because they were always talking abo
big names. And I say big names; you know, they had either
been down to see President Johnson at his ranch or some oth
place.

Mr. Weiss. But this was the only "big name" that they
mentioned to you at the airport meeting?

Mr. Alagia. For mine, to you as I can recall.

Mr. Weiss. Now, on the 29th, when you had talked to
Mr. Ryan, do you in fact know that those were to be the

a contribution that day to the dinner, to the fund-raise
dinner on the 24th?

Mr. Alagia. Yes. When I could not find Joe Westwell
and my wife reminded me that she tried to get Joe Westwell
his wife, to call me during the course of the morning if
ran him down, I sent John Hayes to Washington to get the 4
tickets from Harrison's office to take them to the Qualit
Court --

Mr. Weitz. In Washington?

Mr. Alagia. Where our Dairyman were so our Dairyman,
the President and these other farmers, would not be flound
around, wondering where the dinner was, or anything like a

Mr. Weitz. I think the record shows that five checks
each for $5,000, to various Republican committees, totaling
$25,000 were drawn for SPACE on the 24th of March. Can you
tell us who authorized these contributions?

Mr. Alagia. After talking with Mr. Morgan, he called
back, talking about how much was in our kitty, and 20 or 25
thousand dollars is what he authorized Jim Mueller to write

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether that contribution on the
24th, totaling $25,000, was the largest amount to any one
function or fund-raising event that SPACE had made up to the
time?

Mr. Alagia. No, I would have been if it would have been.

Mr. Weitz. Do we know whether any representatives of
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Mr. Weitz. Why were you seeking a commitment on the morning of the 24th of Mr. Alagia if he had already expressed his interest in contributing?

Mr. Nelson. We did not have a -- actually, I personally at the time -- just trying to recall -- I figured we were more certain to get the money from Mr. Alagia than we were from Mr. Hanman, and we got Mr. Hanman in the posture of going down there to get Alagia, and incidentally we were getting Mr. Hanman.

Mr. Weitz. So you wanted to line up everybody?

Mr. Nelson. That is right.

Mr. Weitz. How much money did you want to tell Mr. Kalmback the next day that you wanted to contribute?

Mr. Nelson. We had already told him long before this.

Mr. Weitz. How much?

Mr. Nelson. As I have told you repeatedly --

Mr. Weitz. There's the two million dollar figure that Mr. Hillings stated.

Would that be consistent your previous conversation?

Mr. Nelson. Oh, it would have been -- that was not too much.

Mr. Weitz. More than two million dollars?

Mr. Nelson. We would have if they would have given us the committees.

Mr. Weitz. Well, you could make that representation, and you had already made that representation according to your testimony.
without talking to Mr. Alagia.

What was the purpose of getting --

Mr. Nelson. We wanted to --

Mr. Weitz. Wait a minute.

-- getting a commitment from him on some specific amount in the morning of the 24th?

Mr. Nelson. Just because we wanted to -- if we got the committees we wanted to be in a position to have them start contributing.

Mr. Weitz. But you did not have the committees. You had not had them for three or four months, at least, since the last time that you had met with Mr. Kalmbach and Mr. Evans.

Did you not, in fact, want to get specific amounts from him so you knew you could tell Mr. Kalmbach or someone of the Republican fund-raisers on the 24th that within one week or two weeks time you could contribute x amount of dollars if the committees were provided?

Mr. Nelson. I don't think we were getting enough money from them to make a whole lot of difference.

Mr. Weitz. How much did you ask them for?

Mr. Nelson. I do not recall.

Mr. Weitz. Did you ask them for $300,000?

Mr. Nelson. They did not have $300,000, as I recall.

Mr. Weitz. SPACE?

Mr. Nelson. I don't believe so.
Mr. Weitz. Did you ask them for $300,000?

Mr. Nelson. No, I don't recall. Mr. Alagia might remember, but I do not remember how much we might have asked him for.

Mr. Weitz. How much did you ask him for?

Mr. Nelson. As I say, I do not recall.

Mr. Weitz. Did you mention a figure?

Mr. Nelson. I am sure we talked about a figure.

Mr. Weitz. You asked for some specific amount which you cannot recall at this particular time?

Mr. Nelson. That's right, we asked him for a figure.

Mr. Weitz. Did he agree to make that contribution that you asked for?

Mr. Nelson. He agreed to see what he could do. I do not think he made any firm --

Mr. Weitz. Did you ask him to make a loan to ADEPT, to have his organizations make a loan to ADEPT?

Mr. Nelson. We asked him or it was discussed. I don't remember whether we asked him. It was discussed that one or the other of us would make a loan to ADEPT, and I believe it wound up with TARE asking a loan to ADEPT.

Mr. Weitz. That's the way it wound-up.

Did you ask Mr. Alagia to have SPACE make a loan to ADEPT?

Mr. Nelson. We talked to him, whether it would be them or us.

Mr. Weitz. Did you ask him whether they would be interested
Mr. Holst. — Do you have to -- actually, I generally
at the time -- but trying to think -- I figured we were more
escutive to get the case from Mr. Alvey than we were from Mr.
Holston, and so the best decision was the putting of going down that
we got Alvey, and consequently we were getting Mr. Holston.

Mr. Holst. Do you want to line up everybody?

Mr. Holston. We reach some also? you want to call Mr. Holst-
now the case how long are you willing to participate?

Mr. Holston. We already told him long before this.

Mr. Holston. Well, well.

Mr. Holston. And you have not agreed.

Mr. Holston. And the million dollar figure that Mr.
Holston wanted.

Would that be consistent with your previous conversation?

Mr. Holston. Oh, there would have been -- that was not the

Mr. Holston. How long have you been on this?

Mr. Holston. We have to give us the

Mr. Holston. Then you have given us the

Mr. Holston. So you have given us the

Mr. Holston. Therefore, you can put this representation, and

Dr.
Mr. Brochu, it is very hard in one case to make a perfect statement when you are in a situation where you are not fully informed. In the case of thePagination of the Document: Page 3
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Mr. Chairman, I understand for some time.

Mr. Smith, if I may refer to your remarks.

Mr. Jackson, if I may ask him that.

Mr. Johnson, if I may bring it to a figure.

Mr. Johnson. You were saying about a figure.

Mr. Smith. I'm not sure how specific enough which you

search should be for determining what?

Mr. Jackson. One of each, we asked him for a figure.

Mr. Smith. Did he agree to make that contribution than

we asked for?

Mr. Johnson. Are you sure that we could do. I do not

know that we could do that.

We would like to make a form to that, so

we will make a form to that?
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period where he was waiting for the meeting, and subsequently went through with the meeting, it took perhaps one hour, perhaps one and one-half hours.

Mr. Parr. That was the night of the 24th?

Mr. Weitz. The night of the 24th, and immediately after the fund-raising dinner, and that he immediately returned to his room to go to sleep in the Madison Hotel.

Now, given that information, does that refresh your recollection as to whether that was the time period in which you were waiting for him, and then the discussion you had with him ensued?

Mr. Parr. I thought it was the 24th. I have testified that way before. But when you mentioned Louisville -- I had forgotten about Louisville. I always thought it was the 24th.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall, for example, whether Mr. Nelson came in dressed in some kind of a formal clothing?

Mr. Parr. I do not know what kind of clothes he had on.

Mr. Weitz. So, based on what I have told you, you believe it was the night of the 24th that this conversation with Nelson took place?

Mr. Parr. Yes, sir.

Mr. Weitz. Going back to the night of the 23rd, when, as I say, we have independent evidence that you with Mr. Nelson and Mr. Hanman went to Louisville, can you enlighten us with anything that you recall that took place before and that led to that
trip?

Mr. Parr. I know this is very important to me personally and very important to the investigation. I just know that there was some reason in the discussion that we should consult with Mr. Alagia.

Mr. Weitz. You said before that you thought that there were some discussions connected with some substantial contributions, for example, to the dinner?

Mr. Parr. That was -- I believe that was what was discussed with Mr. Alagia on the 23rd.

Mr. Weitz. In Louisville?

Mr. Parr. In Louisville.

And that I got the impression that not only would we go to the dinner on the 24th, but we would make additional contributions.

Mr. Weitz. Above and beyond the tickets for the dinner?

Mr. Parr. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Substantial contributions?

Mr. Parr. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. For what purpose?

Mr. Parr. I guess in relationship to the matter of the price supports.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall when you -- did you meet with Mr. Alagia in Louisville?

Mr. Parr. Yes, sir.
Mr. Weitz. Was he alone?

Mr. Parr. Well, I did not even remember Mr. Hanman going, so I do not recall whether Mr. Alagia was by himself or was not.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall what time at night or in the morning you met with them?

Mr. Parr. It seemed like to me it was around -- I just know it was at night, late in the night.

Mr. Weitz. Hardly anyone there at the airport?

Mr. Parr. I do not recall. I just know -- I believe it was around 12:00 o'clock.

Mr. Weitz. Do you remember what was discussed?

Mr. Parr. I know it was discussed, the idea of going to the dinner, and I believe what we discussed was making additional contributions.

Mr. Weitz. Do you remember whether any cussed?

Mr. Parr. It seems to me that there were amounts, but I do not recall what they were and how they were --

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall someone asking Mr. Alagia whether SPACE would contribute $300,000 or some amount in excess of $100,000?

Mr. Parr. I just do not remember, Mr. Weitz.

Mr. Weitz. You indicated before that your understanding was that ADEPT did not have sufficient funds at that point to make substantial contributions. They were short on funds.
period where he was waiting for the meeting, and subsequently
went through with the meeting, it took perhaps one hour, perhaps
one and one-half hours.

Mr. Parr. That was the night of the 26th?

Mr. Wertz. The night of the 26th, and immediately after
the fund-raising dinner, and that he immediately returned to
his room to go to sleep in the Madison Hotel.

Now, given that information, does that refresh your recol-
lection as to whether that was the time period in which you
were waiting for him, and then the discussion you had with him
ensued?

Mr. Parr. I thought it was the 26th. I have testified
that was before. But when you mentioned Louisville -- I had for
gotten about Louisville. I always thought it was the 26th,

Mr. Wertz. Do you recall, for example, whether Mr. Nelson
came dressed in some kind of a formal clothing?

Mr. Parr. I do not know what kind of clothes he had on,

Mr. Wertz. So, based on what I have told you, you believe
it was the night of the 26th that this conversation with Nelson
took place?

Mr. Parr. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wertz. Going back to the night of the 23rd, when, as
I have, so far, indicated, and talked to you with Mr. Nelson if
Mr. Nelson went to Louisville, can you enlighten us with any
what you recall that your phone records and then led to the
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Mr. Farra. I have felt it very important to me personally and very important to the investigation. I just knew that there was some refrain in the discussion that we should consult with Mr. Alagia.

Mr. Weitz. You said before that you thought that there were some discussions connected with some substantial contributions, for example, to the dinner?

Mr. Farr. That was -- I believe that was what was discussed with Mr. Alagia on the 23rd.

Mr. Weitz. In Louisville?

Mr. Farr. In Louisville.

And that I got the impression that not only would we go to the dinner on the 31st, but we would make additional contributions.

Mr. Weitz. Above and beyond the tickets for the dinner?

Mr. Farr. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Substantial contributions?

Mr. Farr. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. For what purpose?

Mr. Farr. I guess in relationship to the matter of the...
Mr. Waitz. Did we plan?

Mr. Parr. Well, I did not even remember Mr. Reiman going, so I do not recall whether Mr. Alpin was by himself or was not.

Mr. Waitz. Do you recall what time at night or in the morning you met with them?

Mr. Parr. It seemed like to me it was around -- I just know it was at night, late in the night.

Mr. Waitz. Hardly anyone there at the airport?

Mr. Parr. I do not recall. I just know -- I believe it was around 12:00 o'clock.

Mr. Waitz. Do you remember what was discussed?

Mr. Parr. I know it was discussed, the idea of going to the dinner, and I believe what we discussed was making additional contributions.

Mr. Waitz. Do you remember whether any accused?

Mr. Parr. It seems to me that there were amounts, but I do not recall what they were and how they were

Mr. Waitz. Do you recall someone asking Mr. Alpin whether DSHF would contribute $399,960 or some amount in excess of $100,000?

Mr. Parr. I do not recall anything. Mr. Waitz.

We did have discussions on that topic to

and we ended up making a contribution of
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Mr. Hanman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. I believe you said Harold Nelson had also attended the meeting at Louisville.

He also attended that morning, did he not?

Mr. Hanman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Paul Alagia was also at the meeting with the President, was he not?

Mr. Hanman. I believe that is correct.

Mr. Weitz. Can you tell us what was the reason that you flew out from Washington to Louisville for this meeting, rather than having discussed the matter that morning either before or after the meeting with the President?

Mr. Hanman. My recollection of it was, the first thought that the dairy farmers would attend this Republican dinner in substantial amounts. Then after the March 12th decision, the thought was that we would not -- maybe even boycott it, not go at all.

Some time between, I believe between the meeting with the President and the dinner, which was to be the next night, I believe Dave got a call from somebody -- I do not know from whom who indicated that we should not boycott the meeting, that we should go ahead and go to this dinner as previously planned.

And as I recall, the flight to Louisville was to talk to Alagia about what he thought about that.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know who called Parr?
that we attend this dinner and I think in that vein would be why we would be going to the dinner, yes.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall what time you left Washington for the meeting in Louisville?

Mr. Hanman. No, I do not. It was late, I know that.

Mr. Weitz. You were already in bed, close to midnight, before you left Washington?

Mr. Hanman. I do not know. I suppose.

Mr. Weitz. You flew to Louisville by AMPI jet?

Mr. Hanman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. This was a special trip; the plane was not going anywhere else on the way?

Mr. Hanman. That is my recollection. That is right.

Mr. Weitz. Were you told of any arrangements to try to meet Alagia there, contact Alagia or his wife or so forth, to make sure he would be there?

Mr. Hanman. It was my understanding when we took off that was who we were going to talk with.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know where he was at the time?

Mr. Hanman. No, I did not at the time.

Mr. Weitz. Was he there when you arrived in Louisville?

Mr. Hanman. I do not believe he was.

Mr. Weitz. How long did you wait before he came?

Mr. Hanman. I do not know. I don't think very long, becau I do not believe we were in the airport very long.
Mr. Weitz. Was he arriving by plane from somewhere else?
Mr. Hanman. Yes, that is my recollection.
Mr. Weitz. When he came what happened?
Mr. Hanman. When he came we sat down in the lobby right out in the foyer of the little airport, the benches out there, and talked to him about the Republican dinner that was coming up and the fact that we wanted to attend it, we thought it would look better if all three political action trusts bought tickets, and if ADEPT were going to buy a significant amount of tickets we would have to negotiate a loan. Generally, that was the just of the discussion.
Mr. Weitz. Negotiate a loan from SPACE or TAPE or both?
Mr. Hanman. Either one.
Mr. Weitz. How much was needed?
Mr. Hanman. As I recall, we were talking in the neighbor-
hood of $40,000 or $50,000.
Mr. Weitz. From ADEPT?
Mr. Hanman. Yes.
Mr. Hoecker. For ADEPT.
Mr. Weitz. So ADEPT could take the money and contribute it?
Mr. Hanman. Yes.
Mr. Weitz. How much was contemplated that would be contri-
buted from the other two coops?
Mr. Hanman. I really do not know. I do not recall.
making a specific indication that he would make a contribution from SPACE.

My impression of the discussion is that he was favorably inclined to the proposition.

Mr. Weitz. Of making some contribution?

Mr. Hanman. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate that he had already decided or that Morgan and he or John Moser, to make some contribution for the dinner?

Mr. Hanman. I do not believe he did, no.

Mr. Weitz. Did he indicate how much he would be willing to recommend that SPACE contribute to the dinner?

Mr. Hanman. Not that I recall.

Mr. Weitz. Did anyone indicate to him at the meeting the timing or the urgency of the request -- that is, of the contributions themselves?

Any deadlines that had to be met or any timetable to be followed?

Mr. Hanman. My recollection is, we were talking to him about going to the dinner and the dinner was the next day or the next night. The idea was that we would go and we would have dairy farmers attend from the three groups.

Mr. Weitz. ADEPT committee members did attend the dinner did they not?

Mr. Hanman. Yes.
June 7, 1971

Mr. J. E. Mueller, Treasurer
Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Ed.
500 Portland Federal Building
200 N. Broadway
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Dear Sir:

This will acknowledge receipt of your statement of receipts and expenditures, as Treasurer of the above Committee, for the period ended May 31, 1971, filed in this office pursuant to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

Very truly yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
The Honorable W. Pat Jennings
Clerk, United States House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed please find a statement of receipts and disbursements by the Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education for the period beginning March 1, 1971 and ending May 31, 1971. The statement is submitted pursuant to Section 305 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, as amended.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. Mueller
Treasurer and Trustee
Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education

JEH/nc
Enclosure
STATEMENT FOR THE
TRUST FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL
AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION
FOR THE PERIOD MARCH 1, 1971 TO MAY 31, 1971

1. The name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for the Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education between March 1, 1971 and May 31, 1971 in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution.

NONE

2. The total sum of other contributions made to or for the Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education for the period March 1, 1971 to May 31, 1971.

$39,324.39

3. The total sum of all contributions.

$59,759.55

4. The name and address of each person to whom an expenditure between March 1, 1971 and May 31, 1971, in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value of $10 or more has been made by or on behalf of the Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure.

SEE SEPARATE SCHEDULE ATTACHED HERETO
5. The total sum of other expenditures made by or on behalf of the Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education between March 1, 1971 and May 31, 1971.

$5,583.37

6. The total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of the Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education.

$42,583.37

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4th day of June, 1971.

Notary Public
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME AND ADDRESS</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>Republican National Finance Operations Committee</td>
<td>Campaign Contribution</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310 First Street, S.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>Republican National Candidates Conference</td>
<td>Campaign Contribution</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 0-145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Hilton Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>Republican National Committee</td>
<td>Campaign Contribution</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310 First Street, S.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>Republican National Finance Committee</td>
<td>Campaign Contribution</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310 First Street, S.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>Republican National Association Congressional Hotel</td>
<td>Campaign Contribution</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 New Jersey Avenue, S.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tickets to Banquet Dinner</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL |                        |                        |        |
34. During the night of March 24, 1971, following the Republican National Committee dinner, Chotiner, Kalmbach and AMPI General Manager Nelson met in Washington, D. C. in Kalmbach's hotel room. Kalmbach has testified that Chotiner said that Ehrlichman had asked Chotiner in view of the price support decision to be announced the next day to reaffirm to Kalmbach the milk producers' pledge of $2 million to the 1972 campaign. Chotiner has stated that as a result of a conversation with Ehrlichman he met with Nelson and Kalmbach and discussed contributions but they did not discuss price supports or a definite amount to be contributed. Nelson has testified that they met and discussed contributions. Kalmbach has testified that on March 25, 1971 he reported to Ehrlichman that Chotiner and Nelson had reaffirmed their $2 million pledge to the campaign.

34.1 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, SSC Executive Session, March 22, 1974, 59-62, 73-74.


34.3 Murray Chotiner interviews, SSC, December 7, 1973 and December 10, 1973, with accompanying SSC affidavit.
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talking with the Administration about this parity situation.

But I don't have an independent recollection of him doing --
recollection of him doing so.

However, I do have a recollection that following my
meeting with Mr. Chotiner and Mr. Nelson on the 25th --

Mr. Weitz. The meeting was on the 24th, and then follow-
ing that, you're saying on the 25th?

Mr. Kalmbach. Didn't I meet with Mr. Ehrlichman on the
day following that?

Mr. Weitz. Right.

Mr. Kalmbach. I think that at that meeting -- I think it
was on the 25th that I told Mr. Ehrlichman that Mr. Chotiner
and Mr. Nelson had reaffirmed their $2 million pledge to the
campaign.

Mr. Weitz. Let's go, then, back to the night of the 24th.

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Could you tell us, after the dinner, what
happened?

Where did you go and how you happened to meet with them?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I remember I met them in the lobby
of the Madison Hotel around 10:00 or 10:30, and we then went
up to my room and after some preliminary conversation I was
informed, I think it was by Mr. Chotiner, that he had been
talking to Mr. Ehrlichman and that -- it's my best memory that
I was informed that there was going to be an announcement on the
price support the following day. And in view of that, that Mr. Ehrlichman had asked Mr. Chotiner to talk to me and re-affirm to me that the milk people would reaffirm their pledge of $2 million to the 1972 campaign.

Mr. Weitz. You mentioned preliminary conversations. Was there anything substantive, or was it just pleasantries?

Mr. Kalmbach. Just pleasantries.

Mr. Weitz. You also already -- you already knew Mr. Chotiner and already met with Mr. Nelson, prior to that time?

Mr. Kalmbach. Right.

Mr. Weitz. Was there any reference by anyone at that meeting to Mr. Harrison -- Marion Harrison?

Mr. Kalmbach. I don't recall that there was.

Mr. Weitz. What about Pat Hillings?

Mr. Kalmbach. I don't recall. There could well have been, but I don't have the recollection of it.

Mr. Weitz. Was there any reference to any bad feelings or any disruption in communications between the Harrison law firm, of which Chotiner was of counsel at that point, and the White House or Mr. Colson?

Mr. Kalmbach. I think there was, as I think about it.

I think there was probably a statement of some displeasure at the breakdown in mechanics in setting up committees and the whole organizational approach.

And now, I'm not certain as to this point, but for some
reason I have that feeling.

Mr. Weitz. Did anything go more to the substance of relations between -- as a personal matter, for example -- between the Harrison law firm and/or Mr. Harrison, personally, and Mr. Colson?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, I don't recall that it did, Mr. Weitz.

And I say I'm doing my very best to remember what, in fact, did happen. But to me the main, and almost sole, purpose of that meeting was the reaffirmation of the $2 million pledge and the fact that they told me that the price support decision was to be announced the next day and that in view of that fact and in view of the fact that Mr. Ehrlichman had asked Mr. Chotiner to make sure that I was informed of this reaffirmation, that they were in fact reaffirming the $2 million pledge to the campaign.

Mr. Weitz. At that time was there -- or shortly thereafter -- was there any discussion of any further details with respect to the $2 million pledge?

That is, any breakdown as to timetable of amounts?

Mr. Kalmbach. On that point I think --

(Pause)

Mr. Weitz. I'm sorry, I believe you were going to answer my question with respect to any details or timetable as to --

Mr. Kalmbach. I have a recollection that at some point I was informed that there was a kind of a monthly goal figure
of $90,000.00 a month to be received by the campaign.

Now, when that actually was made known to me, I don't know, and I've done my darndest to try to recall it but I can't place it in the time frame.

Mr. Weitz. Do you place it, for example, or, although you can't place it specifically, do you think that it related to a time period following your meeting on the night of the 24th?

Mr. Kalmbach. I just cannot place it.

Mr. Weitz. But you have no recollection that at the meeting on the 24th, or during the period of March, 1971, for example, the dairy people were in any way delinquent on a monthly commitment if such a commitment was made?

For example, in your discussions with either Mr. Chotiner or Mr. Ehrlichman?

Mr. Kalmbach. Very possibly, and what would cause me to think that might well be the case is that I think if you divide $90,000.00 into $2 million, you can find the number of months that are involved. And it could well have been that. And I remember it so well now, that the -- Gordon Strachan talking to me about the fact that Marion Harrison and the others were oftentimes, I think -- had checks in hand, but there were no committees established to which these checks could be routed.

And it very possibly could be, Mr. Weitz, that this
have a number of questions on that meeting and subsequent
meetings -- Mr. Sanders, do you have questions as to 1971?

Mr. Sanders. Yes.

This pertains to your March 24th meeting with Nelson and
Chotiner. Today, in telling us of this, you made mention of
some remark at that meeting about a price announcement to be
made the next day.

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Sanders. Can you explain that for me?

Mr. Kalmbach. I think as I remember it, that Mr. Chotiner,
in telling me of the fact that Mr. Ehrlichman had asked him to
advise me or relay to me the fact that they were reaffirming
their pledge of $2 million in contributions to the 1972
campaign, that this was that Mr. Chotiner also indicated,
along with Mr. Nelson, an announcement as to the price support
or parity problem.

There was to be an announcement the next day and this was,
in fact, linked to this reaffirmation of the $2 million pledge,
or that is the way that I so understood it from that conversa-
tion.

Mr. Sanders. Did it appear to you that Nelson knew before
the meeting with you that there was to be a public announce-
ment the next day, of the price support?

Mr. Kalmbach. My memory would be that I did understand
that.
Mr. Sanders. Did they give you any perception of how they knew there was to be an announcement?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, I just, I'm not certain of that. I know that Mr. Chotiner had said that he had talked to Mr. Ehrlichman, and that Mr. Ehrlichman had asked him to advise me what evidently he had advised Mr. Ehrlichman, that the $2 million pledge was being reaffirmed.

Mr. Sanders. You've just now said that the reaffirmation of the $2 million pledge was linked to this price announcement.

Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.

Mr. Sanders. Would you be able to elaborate on the phraseology of Chotiner or Nelson as to how they were linked?

Mr. Kalmbach. No. I think the words were to the effect that Murray Chotiner had indicated that John Ehrlichman had asked him to see me and reaffirm this $2 million pledge, and I think, as I remember it, he was saying that this was in view of the fact that the announcement was to be made the following day that he was reaffirming the pledge, and that's the linkage that I recall on it.

Mr. Sanders. That's all I have.

Mr. Weitz. Returning to 1972, you've described just a moment ago a meeting that you had with Mr. Jacobsen, you believe in the middle or first part of January 1972?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Was Mr. Nelson in attendance at that meeting?
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Mr. Weitz. How did you come to be sitting with Mr. Chotiner in the lobby of the Madison Hotel?

Mr. Nelson. He called, and I cannot tell you when; either he -- I do not want to say he called. It might have been Mr. Harrison. It was either Mr. Harrison or Mr. Chotiner called me, and asked me to meet them there, because Mr. Kalmbach was going to be there.

Mr. Weitz. You say he called you. Did you attend the dinner that evening?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Weitz. And did Mr. Chotiner attend that dinner?

Mr. Nelson. I have been told that Mr. Chotiner did attend the dinner. I do not remember him being at the dinner.

Mr. Weitz. Did Mr. Harrison attend the dinner?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, as I recall, he did.

Mr. Weitz. And how soon after the dinner did you meet with Mr. Chotiner in the lobby of the Madison Hotel?

Mr. Nelson. Well, I would say right after the dinner.

Mr. Weitz. So did he call you, or did he in fact not tell you at the end of the dinner to meet him in the lobby of the Madison Hotel?

Mr. Nelson. I think it was before. I think it was even before we ever went to the dinner, that he either called me or Mr. Harrison told me. I do not really remember what time. I do not remember talking to him at all at the dinner.
the time Mr. Chotiner left the White House that you talked to
Mr. Chotiner about the milk question without Mr. Harrison being
present?

Mr. Nelson. I do not believe so. I do not believe -- I
do not believe we did.

Mr. Weitz. Now, did either Mr. Harrison [sic] or Mr. Chotiner,
whoever told you to meet Mr. Chotiner in the lobby, tell you
why you were to meet with him, and ultimately Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Nelson. It seems, and I could be wrong about this.
It seems to me we were going to meet with Mr. Kalmbach to get --
that Mr. Chotiner was going to get Mr. Kalmbach to produce the
committees.

Mr. Weitz. These are the same committees you had asked
for the year before?

Mr. Nelson. It is a continuing thing.

Mr. Weitz. Why was Mr. Chotiner going to intervene at
this point?

Mr. Nelson. Well, I guess because he thought he could get
the job done, and no one else had succeeded up to that point in
really getting it done.

Mr. Weitz. And he was to meet with you and Mr. Kalmbach
to make sure that Mr. Kalmbach obtained the committees, produced
the committee for you?

Mr. Nelson. That is my recollection of it.

Mr. Weitz. Was Mr. Colson in any way mentioned with respect
room all of the time.

Mr. Weitz. Why then did — did you wake him, and did you meet with him ultimately?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, we went upstairs.

Mr. Weitz. Why did you decide to? Why did you and Mr. Chotiner decide to meet with him if he already was in bed and asleep and so forth, and it was way past 12:00 o'clock?

Mr. Nelson. You know, I do not really recall why. If I could talk to Mr. Chotiner and find out, I would be glad to tell you. I just do not recall right at the moment why that was, but he was in his pajamas.

Mr. Weitz. Did Mr. Kalmbach, from the conversation on the phone and then ultimately in the meeting in his room, indicate that he understood or knew ahead of time that you and Mr. Chotiner had come to meet with him?

Mr. Nelson. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Was he expecting your visit?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, he was apologetic over the mix-up.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall what the purpose of the meeting was?

Mr. Nelson. No, it seemed to me that it was to get the committees, that he was going to see that we got committees.

Mr. Weitz. Did you have any contributions to make that evening, or any checks to deliver?

Mr. Nelson. I am not certain about that. I do not want
to say that I did, because I want to check and see. I do not really recall that I did. I would have to check and see whether or not I did do that, because I do not know.

I do not want to say that I did unless I check on it and find out that I actually had some checks, but Kalmbach was expecting us. That was obvious. There was not any question.

Mr. Weitz. What happened when you arrived in his room?

Mr. Nelson. I would say we were not in there ten minutes.

Mr. Weitz. And what was said, if you can follow along as closely as you recall?

Mr. Nelson. You see, I had forgotten all about this thing until they started pressing me about what did you -- actually, they were asking me, did I leave there and go to a meeting and so forth. I said, no, I did not leave and go to any meeting and so forth.

Then I ran it through and I said, what I did was met Murray Chotiner down stairs in the hotel lobby. So I cannot tell you exactly what went on in that room when we got up there. It was -- my recollection of it is that he put it on him about getting names of the committees, and he said he would.

Mr. Weitz. Mr. Chotiner to Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Nelson. Yes.

Mr. Weitz. Was Mr. Harrison mentioned at all or Mr. Hillings?

Mr. Nelson. In that, no, not that I recall. They were
Mr. Weitz. And there was no reference to them?

Mr. Nelson. Not that I recall, no.

Mr. Weitz. What did Mr. Kalmbach say?

Mr. Nelson. Well, Mr. Kalmbach had just been awakened, and he is not a very verbose guy to start with, and he did not have a whole lot to say.

Mr. Weitz. Well, you had made this request before to him a number of times?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, sir. I sure had.

Mr. Weitz. Did he appear irritated, or did he wonder at why he had to be awakened at after 12:00 o'clock that night to be told of a request that had been made to him once before?

Mr. Nelson. He had already been told on the phone when Chotiner got him downstairs, you know, he was exorcised about the fact that we had been waiting. Well Kalmbach obviously had been there all the time, so he was not remiss in any way.

Mr. Weitz. Why were you present? Why did you have to be present for this if Mr. Chotiner was brought in to see what he could do about obtaining committees?

Mr. Nelson. Well, I do not know why.

Mr. Weitz. Did you say anything during the meeting?

Mr. Nelson. Oh, I am sure I did.

Mr. Weitz. Do you recall what you said, or the substance
of what you said?

Mr. Nelson. Well, I am sure the substance of what I said was to agree to whatever arrangement they made between themselves as to how we would make payments.

Mr. Weitz. Was there any reference to governmental policies or representation of AMPF in governmental action?

Mr. Nelson. You mean by Kalmbach?

Mr. Weitz. By Chotiner, Kalmbach or anyone else.

Mr. Nelson. Well, I am not following your question.

Mr. Weitz. Well, all right. Let me go at it this way. Is there anything else that was said with respect to contributions or committees?

Mr. Nelson. Not that I recall.

Mr. Weitz. Was anything else said at the meeting?

Mr. Nelson. That was all that was discussed, as far as I remember, was about contributions.

Mr. Weitz. And then you left Mr. Kalmbach's room?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, sir, but then I cannot remember a specific time, but it seems to me it was about 2:30 or 3:00 o'clock; by then, it was very late, I will tell you... I will put it that way.

Mr. Weitz. Where did Mr. Chotiner go after the meeting?

Mr. Nelson. Where did he go? I do not know.

Mr. Weitz. He left the hotel? He left your presence?

Mr. Nelson. We went -- yes. As I recall, we went back
Mr. N: Yes, I may he called you. Did you attend the...

Mr. N: Yes, I may he called you. Did you attend the...

Mr. W: And did Mr. Chetiner attend that dinner?

Mr. N: No. I have a memo that Mr. Chetiner did attend the...

Mr. W: And how soon after the dinner did you meet...

Mr. W: And how soon after the dinner did you meet...

Mr. W: Do you remember in the lobby of the Madison Hotel?

Mr. W: Do you remember in the lobby of the Madison Hotel?

Mr. W: Did he call me, or did he in fact not call...

Mr. W: Did he call me, or did he in fact not call...

Mr. W: Do you remember me meeting him in the lobby of the...

Mr. W: Do you remember me meeting him in the lobby of the...

Mr. W: Do you remember me meeting him in the lobby of the...

Mr. W: Do you remember me meeting him in the lobby of the...
Mr. Whit. Why did Oliver Harbinson or Mr. Chetiner,
answer to you to have Mr. Chetiner in the lobby, until you
why you were to meet with him and ultimately Mr. Rainbach?
Mr. Rainbach. He hinted, and I could be wrong about this.
Mr. Rainbach was going to get Mr. Rainbach to take
then Mr. Chetiner was going to get Mr. Rainbach to produce the
confirmation.
Mr. Whit. There are the more conditions you had asked
for at your before.
Mr. Whit. He is a mysterious thing.
Mr. Rainbach. Why was Mr. Chetiner going to intervaise at
this point?
Mr. Rainbach. Well, I guess because he thought he could go
the job there, and we are also not committed up to that point in
which we have a lot of work.
Mr. White. And I may not wish you and Mr. Rainbach
not to make sure that we should not discuss the conditions, produce
this meeting on.
Mr. White. To my own members of the
this.
Mr. Nelson. Well, I am not sure, I did not wake him, but did you wake him? Did you wake him immediately?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, he was awake.

Mr. Wals. Why did you decide to? Why did you and Mr. Nelson decide to wake him if he already was in bed and asleep and in fact, and it was not past 12:00 o'clock?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, may. I do not really recall why. If I could talk to Mr. Gholster and find cut, I would be glad to tell you. I just do not recall right at the moment why that was, but he was in his pajamas.

Mr. Wals. Did Mr. Kamphouse, from the conversation on the phone and then ultimately in the meeting in his home, indicate that he understood or knew ahead of time that you and Mr. Gholster did not try to make with him?

Mr. Nelson. Yes.

Mr. Wals. Was he expecting your visit?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, he was apologetic over the mix-up.

Mr. Wals. Do you recall what the purpose of the meeting was?

Mr. Nelson. No, it seemed to me that it was to get the committee, can he get going to see that we get committee.

Mr. Wals. Did you have any contributions to make the meeting, or do you want to add?

Mr. Nelson. I am not certain about that. I do not want
I'm not sure to say that I did unless I check on it and find out that I actually had some checks, but Kelmach was agreeing on. That was obvious. There was not any question.

Mr. Halsma. What happened when you arrived in his room?

Mr. Halsma. I would say we were not in there ten minutes.

Mr. Wals. And that was said, if you can follow along as closely as you would?

Mr. Halsma. You see, I had forgotten all about this thing until they started pressing us about what did you—actually, they were asking me, did I leave there and go to a meeting and so forth. I said no. I did not leave and go to any meeting and so forth.

When I ran it through and I said, what I did was not

Harry Chetinak don't claim in the trial lobby. So I cannot hold you exactly what went on in that room when we got up there.

It was—my recollection of it is that he put it on him about some sort of the criminal, and he said he wouldn't.

Mr. Wals. Mr. Chetinak to Mr. Kelmach?

Mr. Wals. That.

Mr. Wals. Was Mr. Halsma mentioned at all or Mr.
Mr. Wals. But there was no reference to him?
Mr. Nelson. Not that I recall, no.
Mr. Wals. That did Mr. Hahn say?
Mr. Nelson. Well, Mr. Hahn had just been awakened, and he is not a very verbose guy to start with, and he did not have a whole lot to say.
Mr. Wals. Well, you had made this request before to a number of others.
Mr. Nelson. Yes, sir. I sure had.
Mr. Wals. Did he appear war-torn, or did he wonder at why he had to be awakened at after 11:00 o'clock that night to be told of a request that had been made to him once before?
Mr. Nelson. No, I don't think he had already been told on the phone what conditions on him themselves, you know, he was exercised about the fact that we had been meeting. Well Hahn obviously had been from all the time, so he did not mind in any way.
Mr. Wals. Why were you present? Why did you have to be present for this? Mr. Blank had brought in to see what he could be about obtaining supplies?
Mr. Wals. Why didn't you just call Mr. Hahn from here?
Mr. Nelson. Well, I do not know why.
Mr. Wals. Did you say anything during the meeting?
Mr. Nelson. No, I do not think I did.
Mr. Wals. Do you recall what you said, or the substance
Mr. Nelson. Well, I am sure the substance of what I said was to agree to whatever arrangement they made between themselves as to how we would make payments.

Mr. Waitz. Was there any reference to governmental policies or representation of AMV in governmental action?

Mr. Nelson. You mean by Felsch?

Mr. Waitz. By Crothers, Felsch or anyone else.

Mr. Nelson. Well, I am not following your question.

Mr. Waitz. Well, all right. Let me go at it this way.

Is there anything else that was said with respect to contributions or conditions?

Mr. Nelson. Not that I recall.

Mr. Waitz. Was anything else said at the meeting?

Mr. Nelson. That was all that was discussed, as far as I remember, was about contributions.

Mr. Waitz. And then you left Mr. Felsch's room?

Mr. Nelson. Yes, sir, but then I cannot remember a specific time, but it seems to me it was about 2:30 or 3:00 o'clock.

By then, it was very late, I will tell you. I will put it that

Mr. Nelson. Where did Mr. Crothers go after the meeting?

Mr. Nelson. Where did he go? I do not know.

Mr. Waitz. He went to the airport? He left your presence?

Mr. Nelson. We went -- you. As I recall, we went back
MEMORANDUM

To: File
From: Donald G. Sanders
Date: December 7, 1973
Subj: Murray Chotiner Interview

Murray Chotiner was interviewed today in his office at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C., telephone 298-9030. Attending were Donald G. Sanders, Alan Weitz, and Chotiner.

From January 1970 to March 1971, Chotiner was Special Counsel to the President. Previously, he was General Counsel to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in the White House. In March 1971, he became of counsel for Reeves & Harrison.

Chotiner said his first contact with the milk industry was in 1970 at which time he met Parr and Nelson. He was introduced by Harrison. He learned the dairy people were going to assist the 1970 candidates. Harrison knew that Chotiner was serving as the White House liaison with the 1970 candidates. Chotiner thinks Parr and Nelson may have been on their way to see Harry Dent in an adjoining office. Chotiner didn't discuss with them any details of the contributions. Chotiner knew that Colson had responsibility for groups and organizations.

Chotiner was not a party to any meetings in late 1970 between the dairy people and Colson and associates. Harrison told Chotiner recently that Parr and Nelson met with Colson (Harrison didn't attend), at which time Parr was supposed to have said that dairy farmers were not being treated properly; that they were for the President and wanted to help him. There was also talk of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 to be contributed to the campaign. Parr told Harrison of this talk. Parr said Colson said there couldn't be any quid pro quo.

In 1971-1972, Colson showed Chotiner the Hillings letter which he had in his safe. Chotiner was probably talking to Colson about the milk industry troubles with the Department of Agriculture. One trouble was the milk products imports, and one must have been the milk price.
support. This was at a time when Chotiner was back in private practice. He doesn't keep a calendar or log which would show meetings with Colson. Chotiner has only met with him a few times since leaving the White House. Most of Chotiner's clients are retainers--doesn't bill on a time basis.

Chotiner was shocked at Hillings' letter--thought it was crass. Hillings has said that he never intended for the President to see it; that he felt it was necessary as the dairy people were getting kicked in the pants.

Aside from the Parr and Hillings statements, Chotiner doesn't know of any specific amount of money to be given by the dairy industry.

Colson once told Chotiner that he wanted to disassociate himself from any further contact with the dairy industry--based on Hillings' letter. Chotiner recalled that Harrison said he had toned down the Hillings' letter. Chotiner didn't know what was meant by "special project," and when he asked Harrison what was meant by this, Harrison said he didn't recall. Chotiner didn't talk with Hillings about the letter.

Shortly after joining Reeves and Harrison in March 1971, Chotiner did tell people in the Government that the milk support level should be increased. He left the White House on March 6, 1971. After the Secretary of Agriculture decision on March 12, Chotiner talked with Ehrlichman (Gridiron Dinner), Whitaker, Colson, Cashen. Separately, but in substance, he told them the Republicans usually carry the Midwest, but they need the farm vote to do it, that they need the Midwest to carry the election. He commented that nearly every prominent Democrat had sponsored legislation to raise support. If the price is going up, he said it was stupid to let the Democrats get the credit for it.

Chotiner was not sure that he knew of trust funds at this time. He knew the dairy folks bought one or two tables at the Republican fundraiser on March 24, 1971.

Chotiner recalled talking with Harrison about the appearance that the milk people didn't want to buy any tickets for the dinner--he told Harrison he thought they should buy some. He didn't talk with anyone else about this.

After the dinner, Chotiner did talk with Nelson. He said if they wanted to make a contribution, Harrison would let them know to whom to give it. Kalmbach was also present; it was at the Madison Hotel.

There was some annoyance or conflict between Colson and Harrison. Therefore, Chotiner was asked to serve as liaison between the dairy people and the Government. He was asked by Ehrlichman (or someone in his behalf). Chotiner was going to California, and was asked to stay for
a meeting. After dinner, Chotiner met Nelson in the lobby, called Kalmbach's room, and met in his room (he had been in bed.) Chotiner told them he would act as dairy liaison with the Government for their problems, and Harrison would continue to serve as dairy counsel. Chotiner said nothing else of significance was discussed at this meeting.

Chotiner told Nelson that Harrison would provide names of committees for any contribution the dairy industry might make. Chotiner said Harrison would be in touch with them. Kalmbach didn't say much. There was not discussion of price support or definite amounts to be contributed.

Chotiner speculated that the only reason Harrison couldn't have met with Nelson and Kalmbach as well as Chotiner was because of the friction between Colson and Harrison. Chotiner did not know why it was so important to have the meeting that night so as to cause him to postpone a trip.

When asked how he knew that Harrison would serve to tell Nelson how the contributions were to be made, Chotiner said it was just based on the fact that Harrison was counsel for AMPI.

Chotiner saw Colson on March 23. He didn't recall if that is when he learned of Hillings' letter or the bad rapport with Harrison.

Retyped from indistinct original
MEMORANDUM

In: File

From: Donald G. Sanders

Date: December 7, 1973

Subj: Murray Chotiner Interview

Milk Fund

Murray Chotiner was interviewed today in his office at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C., telephone 293-9030. Attending were Donald G. Sanders, Alan Weitz, and Chotiner.

From January 1970 to March 1971, Chotiner was Special Counsel to the President. Previously, he was General Counsel to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in the White House. In March 1971, he became of counsel for Reeves & Harrison.

Chotiner said his first contact with the milk industry was in 1970 at which time he met Farr and Nelson. He was introduced by Harrison. He learned the dairy people were going to assist the 1970 candidates. Harrison knew that Chotiner was serving as the White House liaison with the 1970 candidates. Chotiner thinks Farr and Nelson may have been on their way to see Harry Dent in an adjoining office. Chotiner didn't discuss with them any details of the contributions. Chotiner knew that Colson had responsibility for groups and organizations.

Chotiner was not a party to any meetings in late 1970 between the dairy people and Colson and associates. Harrison told Chotiner recently that Farr and Nelson met with Colson (Harrison didn't attend), at which time Farr was supposed to have said that dairy farmers were not being treated properly; that they were for the President and wanted to help him. There was also talk of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 to be contributed to the campaign. Farr told Harrison of this talk. Farr said Colson said there couldn't be any quid pro quo.

In 1971-1972, Colson showed Chotiner the Willings letter which he had sent to some of the dairy industry leaders in the nation. This letter was about the milk industry working with the Department of Agriculture. Colson talked about the milk products imports, and one must have been the milk price.
support. This was at a time when Chotiner was back in private practice. He doesn’t keep a calendar or log which would show meetings with Colson. Chotiner has only met with him a few times since leaving the White House. Most of Chotiner’s clients are retainers—doesn’t bill on a time basis.

Chotiner was shocked at Hillings’ letter—thought it was crude. Hillings had said that he never intended for the President to see it; that he felt it was necessary as the dairy people were getting kicked in the pants.

Aside from the Farr and Hillings statements, Chotiner doesn’t know of any specific amount of money to be given by the dairy industry.

Colson once told Chotiner that he wanted to disassociate himself from any further contact with the dairy industry—based on Hillings’ letter. Chotiner recalled that Harrison said he had toned down the Hillings’ letter. Chotiner didn’t know what was meant by “special project,” and when he asked Harrison what was meant by this, Harrison said he didn’t recall. Chotiner didn’t talk with Hillings about the letter.

Shortly after joining Reeves and Harrison in March 1971, Chotiner did tell people in the government that the milk support level should be increased. He left the White House on March 6, 1971. After the Secretary of Agriculture decision on March 12, Chotiner talked with Ehrlichman (Griffin Dinner), Whitaker, Colson, Cashen. Separately, but in substance, he told that the Republicans usually carry the Midwest, but they need the farm vote to do it, that they need the Midwest to carry the election. He commented that nearly every prominent Democrat had sponsored legislation to raise support. If the price is going up, he said it was stupid to let the Democrats get the credit for it.

Chotiner was not sure that he knew of trust funds at this time.

He knew the dairy folks bought one or two tables at the Republican fundraiser on March 24, 1971.

Chotiner recalled talking with Harrison about the appearance that the milk people didn’t want to buy any tickets for the dinner—he told Harrison he thought they should buy some. He didn’t talk with anyone else about this.

After the dinner, Chotiner did talk with Colson. He said if they wanted to go to the White House, Colson would tell the people to go.

I have no evidence of any conflict between Colson and Harrison.
a meeting. After dinner, Chotiner met Nelson in the lobby, called Kalmbach's room, and met in his room (he had been in bed). Chotiner told them he would act as dairy liaison with the Government for their problems, and Harrison would continue to serve as dairy counsel. Chotiner said nothing else of significance was discussed at this meeting.

Chotiner told Nelson that Harrison would provide names of committees for any contribution the dairy industry might make. Chotiner said Harrison would be in touch with them. Kalmbach didn't say much. There was no discussion of price support or definite amounts to be contributed.

Chotiner speculated that the only reason Harrison couldn't have met with Nelson and Kalmbach as well as Chotiner was because of the friction between Colson and Harrison. Chotiner did not know why it was so important to have the meeting that night so as to cause him to postpone a trip.

When asked how he knew that Harrison would serve to tell Nelson how the contributions were to be made, Chotiner said it was just based on the fact that Harrison was counsel for AMPI.

Chotiner saw Colson on March 23. He didn't recall if that is when he learned of Killings' letter or the bad rapport with Harrison.
MEMORANDUM

TO: FILE

FROM: ALAN WEITZ

DATE: DECEMBER 10, 1973 (RETYPEd FEBRUARY 13, 1974)

SUBJECT: SECOND CHOTINER INTERVIEW

Today, Dave Dorsen, Dennis Summers, Bob Silverstein and I continued our interview with Murray Chotiner.

1. March 24, 1971

Colson was "uptight" and annoyed with Marion Harrison and Pat Hillings. He had told this to Chotiner even before he left the White House, (Colson and Chotiner were 2 of 4 special counsel) and again when Chotiner saw Colson twice on the 23rd (9 or 9:30 A.M. and 6 P.M.) Colson may even have shown the Hillings letter to Chotiner on the 23rd. (Between the 6th and the 24th, Chotiner also had one meeting in San Antonio with Harrison, Hillings and the client.)

On the evening of the 24th at the Republican fund-raising dinner, Ehrlichman (or one of his staff) told Chotiner that Colson was uptight and annoyed and that he didn't want to have anything to do with dairy people if they represented them. Ehrlichman then asked Chotiner if he would take over as liaison for the dairy people on quotas, price supports and other government matters. Chotiner replied that, since he was Of Counsel and the dairy people were Harrison's clients, he couldn't take over, but he would help. Ehrlichman also asked if he could meet with the milk people, in Kalmbach's presence, to tell them so. Chotiner said he couldn't the
next day since he had plans to fly out to California. Ehrlichman then suggested that they meet that night. So, at the dinner, Chotiner told Nelson "let's get together with Kalmbach to talk about the milk decision" and then he talked briefly to Kalmbach to get his room number in the Madison Hotel. Chotiner also informed Harrison. Chotiner hasn't talked to Ehrlichman about this since then.

Chotiner explained that it would have been unseemly for a government official to have been present when Chotiner told Nelson of the change in representation, but that Kalmbach lent greater credence to it.

Chotiner said Ehrlichman did not mention the price decision or contributions. Chotiner says that he didn't learn of the Administration decision until it was publicly announced on the 25th. The dairy people were very happy after the meeting with the President.

Chotiner went to the Madison Hotel after the dinner and called Kalmbach's room but couldn't reach Kalmbach. Nelson arrived and after waiting for some time, he and Chotiner realized they had been calling the wrong number. They then reached Kalmbach and went up to his room. Since the dinner ended around 11 P.M., and they waited a half hour or so, it was 11:30 or midnight when they finally met with Kalmbach.

It appeared to Chotiner that Nelson and Kalmbach already knew each other. At the meeting, Chotiner said:

"Harold, it's no criticism of Marion or Pat; maybe they don't like the way they comb their hair, but there's bad feeling between Colson and Marion and Pat. So they want me to represent you in dairy matters unless you object."

Nelson: "O.K." (He seemed to have heard about it before; in fact he never asked about Harrison's absence from the meeting.)

Chotiner: "Herb, is that your understanding?"

Kalmbach: "Yes."
Nelson: "We had a satisfactory meeting with the President and we appreciate it. We contribute to both Democrats and Republicans. If we want to contribute to Republicans, how should we do so?"

Chotiner: "Harrison is still your attorney for such matters, and he'll give you the names of committees."

Chotiner does not recall any further discussion; he and Nelson then left Kalmbach's room. Chotiner went home and the next day (the 25th) he left for California.

Chotiner says that he assumed the contributions would be substantial, although he didn't know the specific amount. Chotiner does not believe there was any specific reference at the meeting to substantive issues.

After the meeting, he informed Harrison, but he never talked to Colson about it. After Chotiner met with Colson once or twice, Mitchell called Chotiner (in April or shortly after returning from California) to tell him that signals had been changed and Harrison was again acceptable as representative of the dairy people vis-a-vis Colson. Chotiner told Harrison, and Harrison didn't seem surprised. Nonetheless, Harrison continued to deal primarily with Cashen, and Chotiner with Colson.

Chotiner knows of no dairy contacts with Connally.

2. 1971 Contributions

Chotiner doesn't remember telling Harrison, after the March 24 meeting, about the contributions discussed by Nelson at the meeting. At some point, (Chotiner thinks more than a week after the 24th), Harrison showed Chotiner some of the "silly" names of committees. Chotiner remembers names of only some committees, of the 100, being provided at first to Harrison and the dairy people.

Chotiner wasn't directly involved in the contributions. However, in the summer of 1971, Harrison went to Europe. Before he left, he told Chotiner that the contributions were not coming in as anticipated. Chotiner confirmed this by calling FCP, and called Dave Parr who said he wasn't sure he had all the names of the committees. So Chotiner
had Harrison's secretary send a list of the 100 committees to Parr, marked to indicate committee names already sent to the dairy people by Harrison. Chotiner had some idea that the contributions were being coordinated among the three dairy co-ops. When the checks came in to Chotiner, he merely had a secretary take them to FCP. After August, 1971, he had no further participation in the contributions.

2. A. 1972 Solicitations

Only recently did he hear from Harrison of AMPI meetings with Kalmbach in 1972. Chotiner says he had no contemporaneous knowledge of such meetings or of any further solicitations.

3. Ellsberg Break-In

Sometime in 1971, Colson asked Chotiner if the dairy people wanted to give $5000 to another committee, for some work or project. Chotiner passed the information on to Harrison, without ever knowing any details.

Chotiner cannot explain why Harrison thinks Colson called Harrison directly. Chotiner told us that Colson may have called Chotiner who told Harrison who, in turn, called either Colson or Cashen.

Chotiner says that Harrison once told him that someone (presumably Colson) "over there" (in the White House) had suggested that AMPI hire Wagner and Baroody for public relations work. Chotiner knows nothing further except that he thinks they were retained. He thinks they needed public relations work to help their image.

4. Antitrust Suit

Harrison told Chotiner about the Justice Department antitrust suit against AMPI, after it was filed. Chotiner may have talked to Colson about it. The key objection by AMPI was that there had been no 30 or 60 day pre-filing negotiation period. Harrison and Chotiner decided to wait until the new antitrust chief was named before pursuing it. (Chotiner got the impression from Harrison that McLaren was responsible for filing the suit just prior to his leaving the Department.) But the next night, after the Harrison-Chotiner conversation,
Chotiner saw Mitchell at a party. Chotiner took the opportunity to tell Mitchell that AMPI should be treated like any other defendant in the up-coming post-filing negotiations. He says Mitchell didn't respond.

Chotiner was first shown the Harrison letters (attached) last week, and he was upset. He says that, contrary to the implication of the March 25 letter to Mehren, they did not discuss talking to Kleindienst, but only to McLaren's successor. Although Chotiner never again talked to Mitchell about the suit, he understands Harrison did later talk to Kleindienst. (Chotiner once talked to Bruce Wilson about an unrelated matter.)

In 1972, AMPI fired Reeves & Harrison because the firm was not getting a good response from the Administration.

5. FCRP

Chotiner was in charge of ballot security in the President's 1972 campaign. He was reimbursed for his expenses and for the money he paid to reporters. When he left the White House, he received money from Kalmbach for part of his secretarial and phone expense (but never his rent at Reeves & Harrison.) AMPI paid for part of his secretary's furnishings; he always paid for his rent ($625 per month) out of his monthly payment from the firm.
SENIATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

AFFIDAVIT

District of Columbia
City of Washington

I, Alan S. Weitz, a resident of Washington, D.C., being duly sworn, hereby depose and say as follows:

1. I have been assistant counsel to the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities from September 24, 1973 to the present.

2. In the course of the Committee's investigation, Mr. Donald Sanders, Deputy Minority Counsel, and I interviewed Mr. Murray Chotiner on December 7, 1973, and Mr. David Dorsen (Assistant Chief Counsel), Mr. Dennis Summers (Assistant Counsel), Mr. Robert Silverstein (Assistant Minority Counsel) and I interviewed Mr. Chotiner, again, on December 10, 1973. On the day of the first interview, Mr. Sanders wrote a memorandum summarizing the substance of the interview. On the day of the second interview, I wrote a memorandum summarizing the substance of the interview.

3. On January 24, 1974, Mr. Dorsen advised me that he had telephoned Mr. Chotiner's office to arrange to obtain sworn testimony in executive session before the Committee on the subjects of the interviews, and was advised by Mr. Chotiner's secretary that he had been in a serious automobile accident the preceding day. Mr. Chotiner died on January 30, 1974.

4. I am executing this affidavit in order to preserve, in the most reliable form, the substance of Mr. Chotiner's account related to us of relevant events. To this end, (1) Mr. Sanders and I reviewed the December 7, 1973 memorandum; (2) I caused my December 10, 1973 memorandum to be retyped on Committee letterhead stationary to correct any typographical errors, to spell out certain names and to rewrite certain cryptically-phrased sentences in the original December 10 memorandum. I did not alter the substance of the earlier memorandum; and (3) I showed the retyped December 10 memorandum to Messrs. Dorsen, Summers and Silverstein.

5. Mr. Sanders and I agree that the December 7 Sanders memorandum is a true and accurate account of the substance of the December 7 interview with Mr. Chotiner. Messrs. Dorsen, Summers, and Silverstein and I agree that the retyped December 10 memorandum is a true and accurate account of the substance of the interview with Mr. Chotiner of that date.
Affidavit
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6. Attached to this Affidavit are the following:

Exhibit A: copy of the December 7, 1973 memorandum from
Donald G. Sanders to the File re: Murray Chotiner Interview;

Exhibit B: the retyped December 10, 1973 memorandum
from Alan Weitz to the File re: Second Chotiner Interview.

[Signature]
Alan S. Weitz

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 27th day of February, 1974.

[Signature]
Notary Public

My Commission Expires 10/31/78
35. On March 24, 1971 Campbell sent to Rice a draft press release announcing an increase in milk price supports for use when action was completed on the subject. On March 25, 1971 the Secretary of Agriculture officially announced that the milk price support level for the 1971-72 marketing year would be $4.93 per cwt. (approximately 85% of parity). Hardin has testified in an affidavit filed in civil litigation challenging the milk price support increase that he reevaluated the evidence regarding the milk price support level and that the decision to set the price support level at $4.93 was based entirely on a reconsideration of the evidence on the basis of the statutory criteria.

35.1 United States Department of Agriculture press release, March 25, 1971 (received from White House).

35.2 Memorandum from Phil Campbell to Donald Rice, March 24, 1971, with attached proposed press release (received from White House).

Support Price for Manufacturing Milk Increased

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin today announced an upward adjustment of support price for manufacturing milk to $4.93 from the $4.66 support price announced by him on March 12 which was a continuance at that time of support at the same level as for 1970.

In announcing the new higher support level, Secretary Hardin stated such announcements are minimums which cannot be lowered during that marketing season after once being announced, but which can be raised. Support levels can be lowered only at the beginning of the milk marketing year each April 1st.

Secretary Hardin stated that there is a constant analysis of the milk production situation, and that farmer costs have escalated sharply particularly in concentrate feed which has gone up $10 to $20 per ton. Farmers have no way to cut other costs to compensate for those which have risen.
Support Price for Manufacturing Milk Increased

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin today announced an upward adjustment of support price for manufacturing milk to $4.93 from the $4.66 support price announced by him on March 12 which was a continuance at that time of support at the same level as for 1970.

In announcing the new higher support level, Secretary Hardin stated there will be adjustments to the minimum prices which cannot be lowered during the marketing season after price being announced, but which can be raised. Support levels can be lowered only at the beginning of the milk marketing year each April 1st.

Secretary Hardin stated that there is a constant analysis of the milk production situation, and that farmer costs have escalated sharply particularly in concentrate feed which has gone up $10 to $20 per ton. Farmers have no way to cut other costs to compensate for those which have risen.
March 24, 1971

To: Donald B. Rice
   Assistant Director
   Office of Management and Budget

Attached is a proposed press release when action is completed on this subject.

/s/
J. PHIL CAMPBELL
Under Secretary

Attachment
Secretary Hardin today announced an upward adjustment of support price for manufacturing milk to $4.92 from the $4.66 support price announced by him on March 12 which was a continuance at that time of support at the same level as for 1970.

In announcing the new higher support level, Secretary Hardin stated such announcements are minimums which cannot be lowered during that marketing season after once being announced, but which can be raised. Support levels can be lowered only at the beginning of the milk marketing year each April 1st.

Secretary Hardin stated that there is a constant analysis of the milk production situation, and that farmer costs have escalated sharply particularly in concentrate feed which has gone up $10 to $20 per ton. Farmers have no way to cut other costs to compensate for those which have risen.
March 24, 1971

To:

Donald B. Rice
Assistant Director
Office of Management and Budget

Attached is a proposed press release when action is completed on this subject.

J. PHIL CAMPBELL
Under Secretary

Attachment
Secretary Hardin today announced an upward adjustment of support price for manufacturing milk to $4.92 from the $4.66 support price announced by him on March 12 which was a continuance at that time of support at the same level as for 1970.

In announcing the new higher support level, Secretary Hardin stated such announcements are minimums which cannot be lowered during that marketing season after once being announced, but which can be raised. Support levels can be lowered only at the beginning of the milk marketing year each April 1st.

Secretary Hardin stated that there is a constant analysis of the milk production situation, and that farmer costs have escalated sharply particularly in concentrate feed which has gone up $10 to $20 per ton. Farmers have no way to cut other costs to compensate for those which have risen.
I, Clifford M. Hardin, being duly sworn, hereby depose and say as follows:

1. I am a Vice-Chairman of the Board ofRalston Purina Company, St. Louis, Missouri. From January 21, 1969 until November 17, 1971, I was the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. As such, I had ultimate responsibility for the determination of dairy price support levels for the marketing year 1971-1972 under the applicable statutes.

2. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1446), authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make available price support to producers of milk "at such level not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply." Section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, requires the Secretary "insofar as practicable" to announce the level of support for milk "in advance of the marketing year or season" (7 U.S.C. 1426). The level of support so announced may not be reduced.

In addition, the purposes of Section 201(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 include, among other things, to assure adequate supplies of milk and dairy products; encourage development of efficient production units
as well as "stabilize the economy of dairy farmers at a level which will provide a fair return for their labor and investment when compared with the cost of things that farmers buy." (7U.S.C. 1446b).

3. On March 12, 1971, an announcement was issued at my direction advising the public of my determination to support the price of milk at $4.66 per cwt. for the year April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972. This was the same level as was in effect for the previous year. The complex economic factors which enter into a decision such as this are, of course, not subject to any one interpretation. Indeed, based on the information and advice that I was receiving, a number of determinations, including one to raise the support level to $4.93 per cwt., would have been justified at this time. The initial determination of the level of price support for milk as announced on March 12, 1971 was the subject of major controversy even before it was made. Nevertheless, on balance I determined for the reasons stated in C.C.C. Docket MCP 98a to set the support level at $4.66 per cwt.

4. At the time of the March 12, 1971 announcement of the price support level, I was aware of substantial Congressional sentiment in favor of a higher figure. Subsequent to the announcement of the $4.66 per cwt. price support on March 12, 1971, such sentiment increased notably. A number of bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House which would have increased the support level on a mandatory basis to as much as $5.00 per cwt. In addition, certain representatives of the dairy industry strongly urged that the price support determination be revised, pointing to increase in dairy production costs during the preceding 12 months. For example, at a meeting with the President on March 23, 1971, various representatives of the industry urged an increase in the price support level citing again the factor of increased costs to farmers.

5. The existence of such sentiment on the part of many members of Congress and wide segments of the dairy industry led me to inquire as to
whether sufficient weight had been given to those factors which we had
been aware of at the time of the March 12, 1971 announcement and which
would have supported a decision to establish the price support at a
higher level.

6. The meeting between representatives of the dairy industry and
the President, referred to in paragraph 4 above, resulted from an
invitation extended by the President in September, 1970, at a time when
I addressed a meeting of some 25,000 members of a milk producers
organization in Chicago. The arrangements which I made for key leaders
of the dairy industry to meet with the President were made in January,
1971, and the March 23, 1971 date was fixed by the White House on
February 25, 1971. At the meeting, to the best of my recollection,
the President made certain brief remarks to the group and a spokesman
for the group made a presentation urging an increase in the price support
level.

7. In light of the considerations noted in paragraphs 4 and 5 above.
I reevaluated the price support level announced on March 12, 1971 on the
basis of the requirements of 7 U.S.C. 1146, with an increased focus on
the factors described in C.C.C. Docket MCP 98a, Amendment 1. Among other
things, feed costs had shown a noticeable rise throughout the year.
In addition, there was some indication that the producers were considering
action, based on recent legislation, which would have had the effect of
reducing the overall supply of milk. One other factor to which our
attention was directed was the fact that an increased supply of cheese
was needed to meet obligations under other programs and a higher
support price would tend to insure an adequate supply for these purposes.
Such a reevaluation was not novel. Price support determinations for
particular marketing years had been increased in the past.

8. During the course of reevaluating the evidence, I had discussions
and advise from members of my staff, including Under Secretary Campbell, Assistant Secretary Lyng, and Assistant Secretary Palmby.

9. On March 25, 1971, this reevaluation of evidence pertinent to the dairy situation, on the basis of the criteria in 7 U.S.C. 1446, culminated in an announcement, issued at my direction, that the price support level for the marketing year 1971-1972 would be established at $4.93 per cwt.

10. The decision to set the price support level at $4.93 per cwt. was based entirely on a reconsideration of the evidence on the basis of the statutory criteria.

11. Neither the decision to reevaluate the $4.66 per cwt. support price level nor the ultimate decision to establish the price support level at $4.93 per cwt. was based on any consideration other than those outlined in this affidavit. Specifically, at no time did any person or organization promise or lead me to believe that funds of any kind or anything of value would be paid to me or any other person or organization in return for a reevaluation of, or increase in, the price support level.

12. Being cognizant of the views of Congress, as well as the views of the dairy industry and other industries affected by our programs, with respect to the administration of statutes relating to Agriculture, is, of course, a fundamental part of the Secretary's role.

/s/ Clifford M. Hardin
Clifford M. Hardin

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of March, 1972

/s/ Notary Public

State of Missouri

City of St. Louis Act performed in the City of St. Louis, which adjoins the County of St. Louis,
I, Clifford M. Hardin, being duly sworn, hereby depose and say as follows:

1. I am a Vice-Chairman of the Board of Ralston Purina Company, St. Louis, Missouri. From January 21, 1963 until November 17, 1971, I was the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. As such, I had ultimate responsibility for the determination of dairy price support levels for the marketing year 1971-1972 under the applicable statutes.

2. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1446), authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make available price support to producers of milk "at such level not in excess of 30 per centum nor less than 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply." Section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, requires the Secretary "insofar as practicable" to announce the level of support for milk "in advance of the marketing year or season" (7 U.S.C. 1476). The level of support so announced may not be reduced. In addition, the purposes of Section 204(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 include, among other things, to assure adequate supplies of milk and dairy products; encourage development of efficient production units...
as well as "stabilize the economy of dairy farmers at a level which will
provide a fair return for their labor and investment when compared with
the cost of things that farmers buy." (7U.S.C. 1146b).

3. On March 12, 1971, an announcement was issued at my direction
advising the public of my determination to support the price of milk at
$4.66 per cwt. for the year April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972. This was
the same level as was in effect for the previous year. The complex
economic factors which enter into a decision such as this are, of course,
not subject to any one interpretation. Indeed, based on the information
and advice that I was receiving, a number of determinations, including
one to raise the support level to $4.93 per cwt., would have been
justified at this time. The initial determination of the level of price
support for milk as announced on March 12, 1971 was the subject of
major controversy even before it was made. Nevertheless, on balance I
determined for the reasons stated in C.C.C. Docket MCP 98a to set the
support level at $4.66 per cwt.

4. At the time of the March 12, 1971 announcement of the price
support level, I was aware of substantial Congressional sentiment in
favor of a higher figure. Subsequent to the announcement of the $4.66
per cwt. price support on March 12, 1971, such sentiment increased notably.
A number of bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House which
would have increased the support level on a mandatory basis to as much
as $5.00 per cwt. In addition, certain representatives of the dairy
industry strongly urged that the price support determination be revised,
pointing to increase in dairy production costs during the preceding 12
months. For example, at a meeting with the President on March 23, 1971,
various representatives of the industry urged an increase in the price
support level citing again the factor of increased costs to farmers.

5. The existence of such sentiment on the part of many members of
Congress and wide segments of the dairy industry led me to inquire as to
The reevaluation was given to three factors which we had not considered at the time of the March 10, 1971 announcement and which would have supported a decision to establish the price support at a higher level.

6. The meeting between representatives of the dairy industry and the President, referred to in paragraph 4 above, resulted from an invitation extended by the President in September, 1971, at a time when I addressed a meeting of some 15,000 members of a milk producers organization in Chicago. The arrangements which I made for key leaders of the dairy industry to meet with the President were made in January, 1971, and the March 22, 1971 date was fixed by the White House on February 25, 1971. At the meeting, to the best of my recollection, the President made certain brief remarks to the group and a spokesman for the group made a presentation urging an increase in the price support level.

7. In light of the considerations noted in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, I reevaluated the price support level announced on March 10, 1971 on the basis of the requirements of 7 U.S.C. 1446, with an increased focus on the factors described in C.C.C. Docket MCP 98a, Amendment 1. Among other things, feed costs had shown a noticeable rise throughout the year. In addition, there was some indication that the producers were considering action, based on recent legislation, which would have had the effect of reducing the overall supply of milk. One other factor to which our attention was directed was the fact that an increased supply of cheese was needed to meet obligations under other programs and a higher support price would tend to insure an adequate supply for those purposes. Such a reevaluation was not novel. Price support determinations for particular marketing years had been increased in the past.

8. During the course of reevaluating the evidence, I had discussions
9. On March 25, 1971, this reevaluation of evidence pertinent to the dairy situation, on the basis of the criteria in 7 U.S.C. 1446, culminated in an announcement, issued at my direction, that the price support level for the marketing year 1971-1972 would be established at $4.93 per cwt.

10. The decision to set the price support level at $4.93 per cwt. was based entirely on a reconsideration of the evidence on the basis of the statutory criteria.

11. Neither the decision to reevaluate the $4.66 per cwt. support price level nor the ultimate decision to establish the price support level at $4.93 per cwt. was based on any consideration other than those outlined in this affidavit. Specifically, at no time did any person or organization promise or lead me to believe that funds of any kind or anything of value would be paid to me or any other person or organization in return for a reevaluation of, or increase in, the price support level.

12. Being cognizant of the views of Congress, as well as the views of the dairy industry and other industries affected by our programs, with respect to the administration of statutes relating to Agriculture, is, of course, a fundamental part of the Secretary's role.

Clifford W. Hamlin

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of March, 1972

[Signature]

Notary Public

State of Missouri

City of St. Louis

My commission expires: _____________________________
36. Between March 30, 1971 and August 5, 1971 Harrison and Chotiner transmitted to AMPI the names of 100 political committees to receive contributions and over spring and summer of 1971 AMPI and the other dairy cooperatives made contributions of $2,500 each to the committees. The names and charters of the committees were prepared by Presidential campaign fundraisers Bob Bennett and Hugh Sloan with the assistance of John Dean. Haldeman received reports from Dean and Strachan regarding the collection and handling of the milk money. On September 11, 1971 Strachan sent a memorandum to Haldeman stating that fundraiser Lee Nunn reported that $232,500 of milk money had been realized. Strachan stated that this was slightly more than one-half of the amount that should have been realized on the commitment ($90,000 per month). Throughout this period dairy cooperative officials referred to the commitment to make contributions to the President's reelection campaign.

36.1 Letter from Marion Harrison to Gary Hanman, March 30, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.2 Letter from Marion Harrison to Harold Nelson, June 16, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.3 Letter from Marion Harrison to Harold Nelson, June 29, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.4 Letter from Murray Chotiner to David Parr, August 5, 1971 (received from SSC).

36.5 Letter from Hugh Sloan to John Dean, April 12, 1971 (received from SSC).
36.6 Information on campaign spending -- H. R. Haldeman and John Dean, May 18, 1971, SSC Exhibit No. 34-26, 3 SSC 1226-230.

36.7 Memorandum from Gordon Strachan to H. R. Haldeman, May 21, 1971 (received from White House).


36.9 Memorandum from Gary Hanman to ADEPT Committee, September 13, 1971 (received from SSC).

March 30, 1971

Mr. Gary Hanman
Executive Vice-President of Marketing
Mid-America Dairymen, Inc.
P. O. Box 1837 S.S.S.
Springfield, Missouri 65805

Dear Gary:

We send you herewith the names and addresses of nine committees. We will get the tenth one later. Please don't hold up waiting for it because we need a few days.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marion Edwin Harrison

Enclosure

Contact Bob Selmon.
Kick Off '72 Republican Dinner
Eisenhower Center
310 - 1st Street, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Republican National Committee
Eisenhower Center
310 - 1st Street, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Republican National Finance Committee
Eisenhower Center
310 - 1st Street, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Republican National Finance Operations Committee
Eisenhower Center
310 - 1st Street, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Republican National Associates
Eisenhower Center
310 - 1st Street, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Republican Victory Committee
Eisenhower Center
310 - 1st Street, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Republican Campaign Committee
Eisenhower Center
310 - 1st Street, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Committee for a Republican Congress
Congressional Hotel
300 New Jersey Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Republican Congressional Candidates Conference
Congressional Hotel
300 New Jersey Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D. C.
June 16, 1971

Harold S. Nelson, Esq.
General Manager
Associated Milk Producers, Inc.
GPM Building, Fourth Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78216

Re: Contributions

Dear Harold:

We enclose a list showing 25 committees, each with a chairman and a treasurer. As to each, the address of the committee is the address of the chairman.

Twenty-three of the 25 committees are from the list I already gave you. In sequence, beginning with unnumbered page one, the committees as they correspond to that list are #15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, the Citizens for More Effective Community Involvement (not on the list), Americans Dedicated to Support Democracy (also not on the list), 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 16.

Let's not wait for the other 75 names. If Bob Isham or somebody would bring me these checks, each payable to the named committee in the sum of $2,500.00 showing for your records the address (but not the name) of the chairman as the address for the committee, and showing nothing about the treasurer or the bank, I would deliver them and we would be started on our project.

The fact all this took so long and is yet incomplete frustrates me, believe me, even more than it frustrates you. Sometimes it is difficult to honor a commitment!

Sincerely,

/s/

MARION EDWYN HARRISON

Received June 21, 1971
June 16, 1971

Harold S. Nelson, Esq.
General Manager
Associated Milk Producers, Inc.
GPM Building, Fourth Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78210

Re: Contributions

Dear Harold:

We enclose a list showing 25 committees, each with a chairman and a treasurer. As to each, the address of the committee is the address of the chairman.

Twenty-three of the 25 committees are from the list I already gave you. In sequence, beginning with unnumbered page one, the committees as they correspond to that list are #15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, the Citizens for More Effective Community Involvement (not on the list), Americans Dedicated to Support Democracy (also not on the list), 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 16.

Let's not wait for the other 75 names. If Bob Isham or somebody would bring me those checks, each payable to the named committee in the sum of $2,500.00 showing for your records the address (but not the name) of the chairman as the address for the committee, and showing nothing about the treasurer or the bank, I would deliver them and we would be started on our project.

The fact all this took so long and is yet incomplete frustrates me, believe me, even more than it frustrates you. Sometimes it is difficult to honor a commitment!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Handwritten note: Millie ok]
Americans Dedicated to Better Public Administration:
Chairman: Robert J. Kuo
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Vera Iden
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Association of Americans for Good Government:
Chairman: Leonard J. Bonner
1420 New York Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20005

Treasurer: Rosemary Hutchinson
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

League for Concerted Action:
Chairman: Maurice S. Williams
2104 Orchard Place
Landover, Maryland 20795

Treasurer: J. D. Bowersock
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

League of Dedicated Voters:
Chairman: Mrs. Inga Tarz
2148 Georgian Woods Place
Silver Spring, Maryland

Treasurer: Kenneth A. Williams
Union Trust Building
Washington, D.C.

Association of Political Volunteers:
Chairman: Harold Smith
1420 New York Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20005

Treasurer: August Zinsser
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.
Organization of Community Volunteers:
Chairman: Mrs. Freddie Tower
6033 Herb Farm Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20030

Treasurer: Paul M. Carden
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Americans Dedicated to Greater Public Awareness:
Chairman: John H. Quick
10134 Little Pond Drive
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

Treasurer: Wilbur Biggs
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Americans United for Better Federal Administration:
Chairman: Mrs. John H. Quick
10134 Little Pond Drive
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

Treasurer: Richard Barrett
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Association for Sensible Disarmament:
Chairman: Katheryn Beck
6609 Hillendale Road
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015

Treasurer: James Shank
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Organization of Moderate Americans:
Chairman: Mr. John Packard
1840 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Stephen D. Kozma
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.
Americans Organized for Political Stability:

Chairman: W. Carter Hughes
10100 Bentcross Drive
Potomac, Maryland 20854

Treasurer: Gordon Silcox
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Association of Neighborhood Volunteers:

Chairman: Roston N. Jacks
1451 Aldenham Lane
Reston, Virginia 22070

Treasurer: Jackson Ritchie
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Citizens for More Effective Community Involvement:

Chairman: John L. Kilcullen
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: J. G. Addison
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Americans Dedicated to Support of Democracy:

Chairman: Jerome Powell
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Susan Kuhn
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.
June 29, 1971

Harold S. Nelson, Esq.
General Manager
Associated Milk Producers, Inc.
GPM Building, Fourth Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78216

Re: Contributions

Dear Harold:

Do you think Bob Isham or somebody can move fairly fast on the 25 checks discussed in my letter to you of June 16? The people on the other side of the fence took forever and a day to get us the addresses of the committees but inasmuch as we have had the names of the committees for several months, it might be good politics to move fast.

We enclose a list of 24 more committees, in the same format as the original 25. All 24 are from the list I originally gave you. In sequence, beginning with the first page, the committees as they correspond to that list are #20, 26, 29, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 60, 61 and 62.

If it would delay getting in the original 25 to add these 24, I would suggest we move on the original 25 forthwith and then take up these 24 in due course.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

MARION EDNYN HARRISON

Enclosure
FROM THE DESK OF ....... Jane S. Wright

4/1/71  3 P.M.
FROM:  Marion Harrison

Don't do anything with the following as there will probably be a name change... will be back in touch in a day or two.
August 5, 1971

Mr. David L. Parr
Associated Milk Producers, Inc.
P. O. Box 9569
Little Rock, Arkansas 72209

Re: Contributions

Dear Dave:

In the absence of Marion Harrison, I am taking the liberty of furnishing you the list of 100 committees.

Please note that the single circle around the number indicates it was sent to Harold Nelson on June 16, 1971, in the first group of 25 committees.

The double circle around the number indicates it was in the list of 24 committees sent to Harold Nelson on June 29.

It will be appreciated if you will make the committees available to Mr. Isham with the thought in mind that prompt action will be taken along the lines we discussed.

With best personal regards.

Cordially,

MURRAY H. CHOTINER

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Robert O. Isham
The League of Mature Americans

Chairman: Clarence Tolley
4101 North Randolph Street
Arlington, Virginia

Treasurer: John C. Merwin
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Volunteers for Good Government

Chairman: Clarressa Fix
Room 515
1625 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Treasurer: Ronald M. Miller
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
78. Volunteer Against Citizen Apathy
Chairman: Wanda Wiles
1735 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Treasurer: T. Edward Morris
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

79. League for American Volunteers
Chairman: Mary Elizabeth Rill
7305 Masters Drive
Potomac, Maryland

Treasurer: Benjamin McCeney
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

80. Americans United for Effective Government
Chairman: Timothy McEnroe
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Treasurer: John E. Onyun
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

81. Association for Better Communities
Chairman: Lin Jones
1729 H Street, N.W.
Suite 310
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: John D. Pollard
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
82. Association of Concerned Neighbors
Chairman: William Heimlich
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 612
Washington, D.C. 20036
Treasurer: Donald L. Scott
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

83. Americans United for Safer Streets
Chairman: Christine Heimlich
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 612
Washington, D.C. 20036
Treasurer: Harry W. Sipe
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

84. Americans Dedicated to Volunteer Action
Chairman: Diane Konowalski
1729 H Street, N.W.
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20006
Treasurer: Neil F. Stull
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

85. Americans for a More Informed Electorate
Chairman: E.W. Norris
1323 Pinetree Road
McLean, Virginia
Treasurer: Louise V. Tew
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
90. Americans Dedicated to Progressive Politics
Chairman: Joe Baroody  
1100-17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Treasurer: Esther M. Botancourt  
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005

91. Association of Americans for Retention of Sound Ideals
Chairman: Gary Terry  
1000-16th N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Treasurer: Helen F. Bruder  
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005

92. Committee for Better Communities
Chairman: Gus Rauschenbach  
855 L’Enfant Plaza South,  
Washington, D. C. 20024

Treasurer: Helen W. Candee  
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005

93. League for Political Expression
Chairman: Martha Armstrong O’Hare  
2100 Massachusetts Avenue  
Washington, D. C.

Treasurer: Anna B. Clagett  
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005
Committee for Involvement in Public Affairs
Chairman: Barbara Walsh
3127 - 51st Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
Treasurer: Hazel George
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Americans for Greater Awareness in Public Issues
Chairman: Douglas Caddy
2121 P Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
Treasurer: E. Evelyn Lee
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Americans Dedicated to Greater Citizen Activity
Chairman: Mary Lee Hester
600 Roosevelt Boulevard
Falls Church, Virginia
Treasurer: Esther D. Nails
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Citizens for Volunteer Action
Chairman: Robert L. Hubert
7600 Colshire Drive
McLean, Virginia 22101
Treasurer: Pamela J. Redlund
15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
98. **Americans Dedicated to Sound Political Philosophies**

**Chairman:** Edna Mullen

1729 H Street, N.W.
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20006

**Treasurer:** Mary Lou Simpson

15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

99. **League of Thoughtful Americans**

**Chairman:** Rose Marie Kobylinski

3712 Fulton Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

**Treasurer:** Ruth E. Springman

15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

100. **Association for Concerned Citizens**

**Chairman:** Lawrence S. Jeppson

9004 Honeybee Lane
Bethesda, Maryland 20034

**Treasurer:** Lina S. Walters

15th and New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Suite 272  
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C.  20006  

April 12, 1971

Personal

Mr. John Dean  
Counsel to the President  
Executive Office Building  
Washington, D.C.

Dear John:

For our conversation this morning, please find enclosed a revised list of the fifty committees which I intend to activate in the immediate future. As we discussed, I have substituted the word "improved" for "better" in Committees 4, 7 and 9.

Best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Hugh W. Sloan, Jr.

enclosure
36. Citizens Committee for Effective Government
37. Citizens Committee for A Better America
38. Citizens Committee for Government Reform
39. Citizens Committee for Better Government
40. Citizens Committee for Good Government

41. Citizens Council for Effective Government
42. Citizens Council for A Better America
43. Citizens Council for Government Reform
44. Citizens Council for Better Government
45. Citizens Council for Good Government

46. United Citizens Committee for Effective Government
47. United Citizens Committee for A Better America
48. United Citizens Committee for Government Reform
49. United Citizens Committee for Better Government
50. United Citizens Committee for Good Government
Organization of Dedicated Americans:

Chairman: David L.
1420 New Avenue
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Harriet Ann Pals
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

League of Involved Citizens:

Chairman: Jordan S. Himelfarb
1420 New York Avenue
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Clifford C. Caslow
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Committee for a Better Nation:

Chairman: Sampson P. Holland
1809 Varnum Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Brainard H. Warner III
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Citizens for Sound Policies at Home and Abroad:

Chairman: Harold Louie
Woodward Building
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Beedy T. Ritchie
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.

Americans United for Sensible Agricultural Policy:

Chairman: Calvin D. Johnson
2121 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20007

Treasurer: Mildred J. Warner
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, NW
Washington, D.C.
Citizens for a Better Environment:
Chairman: Edward Roggens
2504 South Dakota Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: James H. Haynes, Jr.
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Americans for Sound Ecological Policy:
Chairman: Walter C. Barber
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Thomas L. Anglin
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Committee for Better Government:
Chairman: Peter R. Taylor
103 Mimosa Lane
Silver Spring, Maryland 20904

Treasurer: James M. Johnston, III
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Association of Political Activists:
Chairman: Charles G. Botsford
1730 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Treasurer: Irma M. Orpin
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Americans Dedicated to Peace:
Chairman: Rose M. Botsford
1730 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer: Julian Gillespie
Union Trust Building
15th and H Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
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| No. 34-13 | (928) Copy of agenda prepared by Gordon Liddy for meeting of November 21, 1971, with Attorney General Mitchell and John Dean | Page 1150 |
| No. 34-14 | (931) Memorandum for Larry Higby from John Dean with attachments | 1151 |
| No. 34-15 | (935) White House memorandum for John Dean from Charles Colson concerning Howard Hunt, with attachments | 1157 |
| No. 34-16 | (939) FBI interview of Charles Colson | 1160 |
| No. 34-17 | (943) Memorandum for H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman from John Dean re: O'Brien letter concerning special prosecutor | 1161 |
| No. 34-18 | (944) Memorandum for John Dean from Charles Colson re: Chronology of Howard Hunt's activities | 1169 |
| No. 34-19 | (957) Memorandums re: Counteractions (Watergate) by Kenneth Parkinson and John Dean | 1173 |
| No. 34-20 | (959) Letter from Congressman Brown to Attorney General re: Banking and Currency Committee investigation into Watergate activities | 1181 |
| No. 34-21 | (961) Memorandum to John Dean from Kenneth Parkinson | 1183 |
| No. 34-22 | (961) Banking and Currency Committee notice of meeting change and subpoena list, with attachments | 1190 |
| No. 34-23 | (961) Letter to Congressman Patman from Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen re: Extensive public hearings into financial aspects of Watergate "Bugging" incident | 1194 |
| No. 34-24 | (965) Question and answer conversation between Ziegler, Ehrlichman, Chapin, and Moore. Statement by Dwight Chapin | 1200 |
| No. 34-25 | (967) Memorandum for H. R. Haldeman from John Dean re: Watergate and Segretti, with attachments | 1210 |
| No. 34-26 | (968) Information on campaign spending—HRIIF and Dean, dated May 18, 1971 | 1226 |
| No. 34-27 | (968) Memorandum for Herb Kalmbach from John Dean re: 1972 political filings | 1231 |
| No. 34-28 | (973) White House note to John Dean from Charles Colson “Now what the hell do I do?” with attachment | 1233 |
| No. 34-29 | (974) Handwritten note to Mr. John Caulfield re: Of taking things with oath attached to bottom of letter | 1235 |
| No. 34-30 | (976) Document entitled “Relevancy of Intercepted Communications” | 1236 |
| No. 34-31 | (977) Message given by Sandra Greene to Mr. Gordon Liddy | 1238 |
| No. 34-32 | (980) Memorandum for the President from John Dean re: Congressional hearings regarding Watergate | 1239 |
| No. 34-33 | (982) Memorandum from H. R. Haldeman for John Dean re: Appointment of minority counsel to “Ervin Committee,” with additional memos | 1240 |
| No. 34-34 | (988) Agenda—Matters to be discussed and resolved | 1243 |
| No. 34-35 | (988) Potential matters for discussion with Senator Baker (Meeting to be totally off the record) | 1245 |
| No. 34-36 | (989) Memorandum for H. R. Haldeman from John Dean, with attachment entitled “Talking Points for Meeting with the Attorney General” | 1247 |
| No. 34-37 | (990) Memorandum for Larry Higby and John Dean from Jerry Jones. Subject: Options for Jeb Magruder | 1249 |
| No. 34-38 | (991) Memorandum for the files from John Dean. Subject: Call from Secretary Dean to Jeb Magruder | 1251 |
| No. 34-39 | (997) Draft letter addressed “Dear Mr. Chairman” from John Dean with oath attached to bottom of letter | 1252 |
| No. 34-40 | (1004) Taped conversation between Dean and Magruder with attached Camp David envelope | 1258 |
| No. 34-41 | (1001) Statement of charges against White House and Committee To Re-Elect the President officials | 1251 |

*Note: Figures in parentheses indicate page that exhibit was officially made part of the record.*
1. The pending issue is the mechanics of reporting or not reporting for the 1701 activities. If 1701 is considered a "re-nomination Committee" it can be treated as a non-reporting activity. None of the Democratic candidates are currently reporting according to Dean. It is Dean's view that the legal question may have changed after the formation of the Committee was announced because of the choice of the word "re-election".

2. Dean and H agree that the expenditure should be kept low so that if the decision to report is made the facts don't look to bad. Large expenditures, and the activities with the milk money, would remain non-reporting.

3. The Attorney General concurred with the advice to do a mass mailing to 1000 to 2000 people from a list held by Lee Nunn. The letter would be signed by Frank Dale. Milbank has been approached and is not opposed.

4. Dean reported that Nunn is requesting use of the "500,000 White House List". If the list is not to be used now, could it be used later?

   H - "I don't think that we can."

   Dean - "What about interspersing the lists?"

   H - "Ever been done before? Under LBJ?"
Dean - "Will check and discover."

H - "Sort of interesting to get a run on the list and clean it up now."

Dean - "What was the criteria for setting up the list?"

H - "It is merely a list of people who indicated support for the President."

Dean - "There will be a 7-day turn around for any mailing."

H - "There will also be some telephone solicitation to establish a 'operating' activity."

H - "The Committee will be collecting funds in its own name."

Dean - "The pledge money that Kalmbach is seeking is to be brought in under the theory 'get as much as possible as soon as possible'."

H - "Nunn is also pushing separate from Kalmbach and getting it in fast."

H - "Strachan should push Kalmbach and Sloan to move on their money now."

H - "Kalmbach's pledges for 10 - can't they be put to work?"

Dean - "Maybe we should make arrangements for polling research, etc., and make payment now."

H - "Opposed to paying people in advance of work delivered. What about the possibility of creating a polling consultant - we give the money to him now and as our agent he holds the cash until the poll people actually deliver; presumably, he would pay income tax on the interest, but the interest could be his fee. We will have to do some checking on that."
H - "We should begin moving at once because when the law is passed it will be effective immediately (of course, 10 days for the President to sign)."

Dean - "Much campaign money has lost earning power money anyhow."

Dean - "To review the guidelines for Sloan: 1. He can not assure contributors that there will be no gift tax liability; 2. The reporting and disclosure requirements from the law are also open and so Sloan can give very little assurance to the contributors that he can comfort."

H - "What about the possibility of getting the money in now with the understanding that we would reimburse them for the gift tax: argue reduce the amount by the amount of the gift tax."

Dean - "Ottinger family paid three quarters of one million dollars in gift tax."

Dean - "Sloan creating committees with 200 chairmen and bank supplies the treasurer."

Dean - "We will have to look into the question of agreement to reimburse on the gift tax point as well as the question of the possibility of putting some of the 10 in pledges in municipal bonds to prevent federal tax liability."

Dean - "Evans, Nunn and Sloan have raised the surplus funds question."
H - "Forget this!"

"No, the surplus funds are not to go into 1701 - there is no need for cash in the 1701."

Dean - "What about the milk money? Our current thinking is to keep it totally separate and not even use the same bank."

H - "Agree"

Dean - "What should the milk money be used for?"

H - "The Citizens Committee can submit a budget at the appropriate time and in the meantime, the money can sit in the bank."

Dean - "Salaries at the Citizens Committee are currently being paid through a Kalmbach Trustee Account, so it is surplus money."

H - Fleming should not have access to the Kalmbach surplus money nor the 70 surplus money.

H - Strachan is to discover the source of the original 35 given to Fleming and cover with Kalmbach that he is not to move any of the surplus money without express approval from H and no such approval has been given.

Dean pointed out that the expenses of the Citizens Committee would be approximately 35-40 thousand per month.

Dean - Why can't the current mailing be a cover for the other available money? Since presumably the amount received from the mailing will not be sufficient to cover the operating expenses.
H - Why can't the milk money be funneled into committees and into 1701 to pay operating expenses?

Dean, it is my understanding that the White House is to be completely hands off the milk money.

H - Agree.

H - The milk money can pay for the 1701 activities up to the campaign.

Dean summarized the remaining open questions:

1. Whether to be a reporting or non-reporting committee.
   H - Why report?

2. No surplus money is to be expended ever.

3. The direct mailing is a go and expenditures should come out of what is raised.

4. The milk money is to pay for operating expenses.

H - The operating people need not know the source of the money. The operating people should merely submit a budget and budget revisions for expenditures which they incur. They need not know the mechanism for covering the expenditures.

H - Any tap of Kalmbach or reserve funds must be cleared by H.
MEMORANDUM FOR: H.R. Haldeman
FROM: 00175 Gordon Strachan
SUBJECT: Kalmbach Telephone Call of May 21

After your meeting with John Dean on Wednesday on the Campaign Spending matters, discussions were held with Hugh Sloan and Lee Nunn. Their understanding of the financial arrangements corresponds with Kalmbach's as received in today's conversation with him in London. To summarize:

1. None of the Kalmbach, surplus, or pledge money is to be released without your express approval. Kalmbach and Sloan are fully aware of this rule. However, the "start up costs" of the Citizens for the Re-election of the President have been covered by Kalmbach collected money. These start up costs have been:

   $35,000 - Harry Flemming for salaries, travel and furniture at 1701

   $15,000 - Harry Flemming for salaries and expenses at 1701

   $25,000 - Maryland Election

   $2,500 - Rita Hauser

Kalmbach and Sloan assured me today that these amounts are fully reimbursable from Citizens funds as soon as received.

2. The responsibility for the collection of the milk money has been shifted entirely to Lee Nunn. After your call this morning I talked with Nunn in Texas. He explained the status, checked with Chotiner, and called me back. Currently, 76 checks for $2,500 each have been transferred into Bennett created committees. Another 26 checks could be delivered if Bennett had the committees ready.
3. Nunn and Sloan have been pushing Bennett. They have not pushed harder because Kalmbach and Chotiner agree that it is important to have Senator Bennett's son as the transfer point. Nunn will politely increase the pressure on Bennett to hasten the transfers.

4. Kalmbach and Nunn argue that the milk money currently collected and that which will be received should be banked in the Bennett committee names. It is readily accessible, and any transfer into the committees holding Kalmbach collected money might contaminate them. It is their view that the milk money should not be used for the ongoing expenses of the Citizens because of the risk of discovery as the Campaign approaches. Rather, Kalmbach and Nunn argue that the money being collected by Nunn through the direct mail solicitation and the 0-100 contributors should cover Citizens' expenses. This money would also be the source for reimbursement of the Kalmbach collected funds under your direct control.

Recommendation:

Kalmbach and Nunn seem to have the situation under control, though there has been some delay due to Kalmbach's European trip and the shift of responsibilities from Kalmbach to Nunn. Their arguments for use of Nunn solicited money for the Citizens ongoing expenses seem valid. The milk money should be kept as far removed, but as available as possible.

Agree

Disagree

Comment

5. No decision has been reached as to who should be the accountant. Kalmbach says he mentioned J. Patrick Dugan to the Attorney General and followed up with a note that Dugan's position as Executive Vice President of the Export-Import Bank would have to be considered as well as Dugan's relationship to Henry Kearns. Kalmbach did not receive a direction from the Attorney General to proceed on Dugan. The result is that Citizens' bills are paid by Fleming, the Attorney General's original designate. Fleming receives the money from Sloan with no disclosure of its source.
6. Kalmbach's new departure date from Europe is June 5. He is anxious to meet with you and the Attorney General to review his collection activities in Europe and the general financial situation. He suggests June 12, 13, or 14. These can be confirmed at a later date.
MEMORANDUM FOR:

H.R. HALDEMAN

FROM:

GORDON STRACHAN

SUBJECT:

Milk Money

Lee Nunn reports that $232,500 has been realized. This is slightly more than one-half of the amount that should have been delivered on the commitment ($90,000 per month).

However, a much more disturbing element has emerged. Frank Wright, a reporter for the Minneapolis Star has interviewed six of the chairmen of the front committees and Bob Bennett (the man handling all of the transactions). Bennett has told Nunn that no damaging information has been released. Kalmbach, Dean, Nunn, and Tom Evans of New York discussed this development late yesterday. No action has been taken.

It is Nunn and Sloan's opinion that Colson has established a separate agreement with the milk people in order to have cash available. I have not checked with Colson as this may be an agreement outside of my area of responsibility. If the alleged Colson agreement has your approval the matter will be dropped. If it does not you may want to re-emphasize your policy of single contact (Kalmbach) with all contributors.

Drop this matter

Check Colson

Other

EXHIBIT C
Lee Nunn reports that $332,000 has been realized. This is slightly more than one-half of the amount that should have been delivered on the commitment ($90,000 per month).

However, a much more disturbing element has emerged. Frank Wright, a reporter for the Minneapolis Star has interviewed six of the chairman of the front committees and Bob Bennett (the man handling all of the transactions). Bennett has told Nunn that no damaging information has been released. Kalmbach, Dean, Nunn, and Tom Evans of New York discussed this development late yesterday. No action has been taken.

It is Nunn and Sloan's opinion that Colson has established a separate agreement with the milk people in order to have cash available. I have not checked with Colson as this may be an agreement outside of my area of responsibility. If the alleged Colson agreement has your approval the matter will be dropped. If it does not you may want to re-emphasize your policy of single contact (Kalmbach) with all contributors.

[Signature]

Drop this matter
Check Colson

Other

EXHIBIT C
TO: ADEPT COMMITTEE
Ken Varner
Dale Hendricks
Dale Schaufelberger
Gordon Walle
Edgar Lampe
Curtis Phillips

FROM: Gary Hanman
DATE: September 13, 1971

SUBJECT: Quarterly Report

Attached is the Quarterly Report filed by Trustee Delano for the ADEPT Fund.

The $15,000 contributions were a part of the continuing commitment which we had with the Administration. Several administrative decisions, favorable to dairy, have been rendered — more perhaps than any other administration: (1) Restore Special School Milk Program; (2) Curb imports in four major categories, with the over 47¢ cheese still being considered; (3) Use of CCC stocks of cheese in schools; (4) Export of butter (a summary of this program attached); (5) Increase in price supports by 27¢ per cwt.; (6) Class I Base Plan promotion deductions under federal milk orders; to name a few.

GH:bd

Encls.
April 26, 1971

Mr. Dean Kloock
Brooklyn,
Iowa 52211

Dear Dean:

Ethan Rasmussan has advised me of your agreement to establish September 1, 1971 as the deadline for obtaining definite commitments from all Mid-Am members relative to their participation in the ADEPT Program. I hope you will be able to meet this deadline. I think unless we have some definite deadline or due dates, many of us tend to let things drag.

I want to compliment you and other fieldmen within the Iowa Division, on your activity in the ADEPT Program. Had it not been for the ADEPT Program, and similar programs such as TAPE and SPACE, the recent support price increase could not have been obtained. However, much remains to be done. We need the final touches to our import quotas, to keep out cheap cheese - and need to expand our export business. All indications are that there will be a world shortage of dairy products. Even the common market countries are short of butter currently, where a year ago they had it running out their ears. The Canadian Government has recently increased their price supports, in an effort to encourage additional output. If we can encourage exports, we can avoid production discipline programs such as Class I Base Plans.

If I can be of any assistance in your contacts, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ADEPT

Gary Hanman

GH:bd

A copy of this letter was sent to all Iowa Div. fieldmen
April 26, 1971

Mr. Dean Kloock
Brooklyn,
Iowa 52211

Dear Dean:

Ethan Rasmussen has advised me of your agreement to establish September 1, 1971 as the deadline for obtaining definite commitments from all Mid-Am members relative to their participation in the ADEPT Program. I hope you will be able to meet this deadline. I think unless we have some definite deadlines or due dates, many of us tend to let things drag.

I want to compliment you and other fieldmen within the Iowa Division, on your activity in the ADEPT Program. Had it not been for the ADEPT Program, and similar programs such as TAPE and SPACE, the recent support price increase could not have been obtained. However, much remains to be done. We need the final touches to our import quotas, to keep out cheap cheeses and need to expand our export business. All indications are that there will be a world shortage of dairy products. Even the common market countries are short of butter currently, where a year ago they had it running out their ears. The Canadian Government has recently increased their price supports, in an effort to encourage additional output. If we can encourage exports, we can avoid production discipline programs such as Class I Base Plans.

If I can be of any assistance in your contacts, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ADEPT

Gary Hanman

A copy of this letter was sent to all Iowa Div. fieldmen.
37. In August 1971 Colson asked that AMP! make a contribution to People United for Good Government, a political committee, without specifying the purpose of the contribution. On September 2, 1971 AMP! contributed $5,000 to the People United for Good Government. Without the knowledge of AMP! officials, this money was later used to reimburse Joseph Baroody of Wagner & Baroody for funds he had loaned to Colson. The loan has been used to pay expenses incurred by the White House Special Investigations Unit (the "Plumbers") in connection with the break-in of the offices of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

37.1 Marion Harrison testimony, SSC Executive Session, December 4, 1973, 43-45.
37.2 Joseph Baroody affidavit, SSC, January 30, 1974.
37.3 George Webster deposition, Common Cause v. Finance Committee to Re-elect the President, December 24, 1973, 33-35.
37.4 Charles Colson testimony, People v. Ehrlichman, June 8, 1974, 652-56.
37.5 Memorandum from Gordon Strachan to H. R. Haldeman, September 16, 1971 (received from White House).
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of had organized for him, for projects that did not involve
directly involve monies to the re-election of certain candidates
either in '70 or '72.

Mr. Harrison. I knew of one, but my source of information
is totally hearsay. Namely, Mr. Robert Sale, who was one of
the assistants, special prosecutors.

Mr. Wais. Besides, from what you have heard from either
the prosecutor or what you have read in the paper, you know
of nothing of any committees organized in behalf of Mr.
Colson to receive contributions?

Mr. Harrison. No.

Mr. Wais. On that point, did there not come a time in
either August or September of 1971 when Mr. Colson requested
a $5,000 contribution from the dairy people? Asked of you to
obtain a $5,000 contribution of the dairy people?

Mr. Harrison. Well, the precise way you phrased it does
not lend to a "yes" answer.

If I can rephrase it slightly, the answer will be yes.
That is the one Mr. Sale told me about.

Yes, there came a time sometime in 1971, about August,
when Mr. Colson wanted to know if a dairy client, one of the
trusts, would make a contribution to a committee, and he
named the committee.

Mr. Schochet. Which committee?

Mr. Harrison. I do not know; it was one of those nameless
Mr. Schochet. Would you recall if you were refreshed?

Mr. Harrison. I do not think I would.

Mr. Schochet. People United for Good Government?

Mr. Harrison. It could be; I am sure that it is one and the same committee I am going to testify to but I do not recall the precise name.

The committee had as its treasurer, had an address -- had as its treasurer George D. Webster, a very prominent Washington lawyer.

Mr. Colson either asked if that could be added to the list of committees or asked whether it could be contributed to, whatever way he phrased it. The net result was the same as asking me if I would recommend to the client that they make a contribution to that committee.

So I said, sure, and passed on the request to somebody in the client organization.

In due course, TAPE made a contribution of $5,000 to that committee. I remember it very, very distinctly because George Webster has one of those little converted tombsoul offices on Jefferson Place, N.W. Our law firm had thought of buying a building and converting it; I had the idea that I would take the check over to him and have him show me his office, which he did.

Except for that, I would not remember so distinctly.
Mr. Waitz. You delivered the check to Mr. Webster?

Mr. Harrison. Personally, I did.

Mr. Waitz. How did you receive the check?

Mr. Harrison. Independently.

I do not remember. Mr. Sale of the prosecutor’s office thinks he has it established that at the NPI annual meeting in 1971, at which I was in attendance, along with 40,000 people and the President and everybody else, a great number of senators and congressmen, somebody handed it to me there.

Mr. Waitz. You do not remember that?

Mr. Harrison. I do not remember having it handed to me.

It could have been handed me; someone could have brought it to the office; it could have been mailed to the office.

Mr. Waitz. Do you know to what purpose the money was put?

Mr. Harrison. I know what Mr. Sale told me.

Mr. Waitz. Did you know other than that?

Mr. Harrison. No.

I was pleased to get the name of a committee — I thought Mr. Colesa was doing us a favor — which had a prominent lawyer as the treasurer and not some bank clerk at Union Trust.

I have nothing against bank clerks. I was very suspicious at the names of some of those committees that Mr. Lee Munn had come up with, with bank clerks as treasurers. They were not organized as knowingly and thoroughly as they ought to
AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH BAROODY

I, JOSEPH BAROODY, being duly sworn, hereby depose and say:

Since 1970 I have been employed in the public affairs consulting firm of Wagner and Baroody, 1100 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. The consulting services which my firm renders consist of representing clients affected by Federal Government actions.

From October, 1970, to January 1972, my firm was retained for consulting services by the Associated Milk Producers, Incorporated for a fee of $2,500 per month. This consulting relationship was initiated with the assistance of the law firm of Reeves and Harrison of Washington, D.C., of which Marion Harrison, Esq. is a partner. I have met Mr. Marion Harrison on two or three occasions. Mr. Charles Colson, former special assistant to the President of the United States, was aware that my firm represented AMP! It was my understanding that my firm was expected to look for ways in which we could advance the interests of AMP! At no time, however, was I - or was any other person in my firm - connected in any way with, or aware of, any discussions between representatives of AMP! and the Administration concerning either milk price supports or possible contributions to the 1972 Presidential Campaign Fund.
I have been personally acquainted with Mr. Charles Colson for several years. In the latter part of August or the first part of September, 1971, Mr. Colson telephoned me and told me that the White House had an urgent need for $5,000 and he asked me to lend him this amount for a short period of time. He did not tell me why the money was needed. I gathered this sum together from my personal funds ($1,500 to $2,000) and from funds ($3,000 to $3,500) which had previously been given to me by Mr. Colson's office to use in preparing television responses to a Common Cause statement on ending the war in Southeast Asia.

The next day I put $5,000 in an unmarked envelope and took it to Mr. Colson's office in the Executive Office Building. Mr. Colson told me to take the money to an office and give it to a person whom I would find there. I went to the office I had been told to go to and gave the money to a man whom I did not know but whom I now believe to have been Egil Krogh, Jr.

Two or three weeks afterwards, I received another telephone call from Mr. Colson's office. I was told that I could be repaid by going to Mr. George Webster, Esq., an attorney whose office was on Jefferson Place, N.W., in Washington, D.C. At the time I was wholly unaware that Mr. Webster was engaged in fund raising activities in connection with the President's re-election effort. Soon after receiving the call, I went to Mr. Webster's
office. He was not in. I identified myself to a receptionist who went to a nearby desk, opened a drawer and pulled out an unmarked envelope which she handed to me. The envelope contained $5,000 in cash.

In June of 1972, Mr. Colson called me on the telephone and told me that it appeared that the $5,000 might have been used to finance the September 1971 break-in of the offices of Dr. Lewis Fielding, the psychiatrist of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg. The purpose of Mr. Colson's call was to establish the date of the loan so as to determine whether, in fact, the funds could have been used for that purpose.

In the Spring of 1972 I received $22,000 from Mr. Colson's office to place advertisements in several major newspapers throughout the United States supporting President Nixon's military directives in entering the country of Cambodia. Subsequently, the advertising project was suspended and this money was returned by me to Mr. Colson's office. Thereafter, it was decided that the advertisements would be placed on a smaller scale and I was given approximately $6,800 with which to defray the costs of the reduced program.

The instances referred to previously herein are the only ones in which I have received White House funds.

From August of 1971 to the Spring of 1972, I worked with
a committee called "Citizens for a New Prosperity". Its function was to place advertisements and hold press conferences to build support for the economic policies embodied in the Economic Stabilization Act and Phases I and II. The Committee was bipartisan; its two principal officers were Hobart Lewis and former Treasury Secretary Fowler.

DATE: Jan 30, 1974

SIGNATURE

Joseph Baroody

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of January, 1974.

DATE: Sept 14, 1976

Lila K. Zerrill
Notary Public
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

COMMON CAUSE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FINANCE COMMITTEE TO RE-ELECT THE PRESIDENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action
No. 1780-72

Washington, D. C.
Monday, December 24, 1973

Deposition of GEORGE DRUKY WEBSTER, taken on behalf of the plaintiffs, pursuant to notice and agreement of counsel, on oral examination under the Rules of said Court, at the office of Webster & Kilcullen, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., Suite 1000, Washington, D. C., before Stephen S. Maxson, C.S.R., a notary public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the District of Columbia, commencing at approximately 10:40 a.m.
MR. ROGOVIN: No, we won’t go into that then.

BY MR. ROGOVIN:

Q. In September of 1971 did you have a conversation with Charles Colson concerning the 5,000-dollar check that you believe was from T.A.P.E.?

A. I did.

Q. And where did the conversation take place?

A. Oh, I frankly don’t recall where it took place.

Q. When, specifically, was the conversation?

A. The conversation was in the first part of September, that the -- the check was put in that account on the 7th of September, and that was all fairly simultaneous.

Q. Was anyone else aware, at the time, of the conversation that you had with Colson?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. You didn’t tell anyone of your conversation with Colson?

A. Not at that time. I’ve told -- the whole world has now been told about it.

Q. And what was the name of your secretary at that time?

A. Jane Horsley.

Q. What did Mr. Colson ask of you?
A. He wanted to know if any of those committees that I'd set up to receive funds for the Republican National Committee were still alive.

Q. What was your response?
A. I said, "One."

Q. What had happened to the other committees?
A. We had closed them out.

Q. You say "we." Who?
A. Me.

Q. You.
A. Probably I told my secretary to do it.

Q. Who had authority to write checks on the People United for Good Government Committee?
A. The bank records would show, but I know that I did.

Q. What did Mr. Colson ask you, if anything, after you indicated that one committee still existed?
A. He said he wanted to put a deposit in there.

Q. Did he tell you the purpose of the deposit?
A. He did not.

Q. Did he tell you what he wanted of you after the deposit was made?
A. He did not.

Q. When did you receive the check?
A. About the -- about September 7th.

Q. What did you do with the check?

A. Put it in the bank.

Q. Then what did you do? : 

A. Left it there.

Q. How long was the check in the bank?

A. The bank records show, I think, that the money was taken out on September 21.

Q. And what were the circumstances surrounding the taking out of the money?

A. The circumstances, as I recall them, were that Mr. Colson called me up and said he wanted five thousand dollars in cash, and so I wrote a check for five and put the money in my safe. While I was away he called up -- I suppose it was he -- or came over -- I don't know which one it was -- and told my secretary that there would be a Mr. Baroody that would be over and pick up the $5,000.

Q. Were there any other funds in the account at the time, other than the five thousand?

A. None, to my knowledge, and also the records indicate there was nothing else in there.

Q. Did Mr. Colson tell you what the $5,000 was to be used for?
People v. Ehrlichman, et al. (A 300 388)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY TESTIMONY

Charles Colson
June 8, 1973
A. Yes. Mr. Ehrlichman asked me if I could obtain five thousand dollars for Mr. Krogh. And he indicated that the money was needed rather quickly, as I recall. And I obtained it from Mr. Joseph Baroody, who was at that time the -- that was a partner in the Public Relations firm that was organizing the committee for new prosperity, which was the group that was the outside support, public support or private -- a private group on the outside that was -- that had been formed to generate public support for the President's new economic policy.

I did not, during the course of that first interview, know that it was even Mr. Baroody that I had asked for the funds. I had to go back and check and discover that it was.

Q. Do I understand you to tell me that the -- that Mr. Ehrlichman asked you to obtain five thousand dollars for Mr. Krogh?

A. Yes.

Q. When did he make this request from you?

A. The only way I can tell is going back now, of course, and the benefit of piecing together the dates and the times and the places of what I now know, and looking at the records.

I would have to assume that it was the week before Labor Day. I can't, however, be more precise than that. It could have been after Labor Day.

Q. Where were you when you received this telephone call from Mr. Ehrlichman?
A  I was in my office.

Q  In the White House?

A  Yes.

Q  Do you have any idea where Mr. Ehrlichman was when he made that request to you?

A  No; but one reason that I think it was the week before Labor Day is that I think Mr. Ehrlichman was on the West Coast. But that's -- I haven't checked that. I know it was a phone conversation.

Q  Was that a highly unusual request for you to receive from Mr. Ehrlichman?

A  Not really. One of my assignments in the White House had been -- throughout the course of the time I was in the White House, one of my assignments was to maintain liaison with all outside groups. That would include all organized groups, like anything from League of Women Voters to the labor unions, to veterans' groups, what-have-you.
I spent a large part of my time, and my staff did, seeing people from outside groups who would come in and want to have discussions with the President, with the President's staff.

I was also responsible for forming or helping to form or encouraging the formation of outside groups that would support the policies that the President was following. For example, we formed a support group for the President's effort to get approval of the anti-ballistics missile. We formed a support committee for economic policy.

Q How does that relate to the request by Mr. Ehrlichman for funds?

A I'm sorry, I gave you a long-winded answer. Because of this relationship with outside groups, I would often be the person that either Mr. Haldeman or Mr. Ehrlichman would call and ask if I could get funds for a particular -- usually for an outside project, but something that they wanted done.

In other words, a poll to be taken in connection with the A.B.M., I recall, the publication or the reprint of some materials that had been printed in the Reader's Digest. I was often called and asked if I would be able to get someone to help finance a particular outside project.

Q Had Ehrlichman ever asked you to obtain funds for Mr. Krogh before?

A No.
Q  This was a request for five thousand dollars?
A  My best recollection is that the amount was
    five thousand, yes.
Q  And you secured the five thousand dollars?
A  No. I apparently -- I have had to go back and
    reconstruct this. I apparently called Mr. Baroody and asked
    if he could -- if he could get five thousand dollars, if he
    had it.
    And he was the fellow at that particular point
    in time raising money for the committee for a new economic
    policy. He said he could.
    And I asked if he would deliver it to Mr. Krogh's
    office, which he had subsequently told me that he did.
Q  Did he tell you when he delivered it?
A  No. His recollection, like mine, is that it
    was during this period of time, but the specific date we
    can't establish.
Q  Do you recall whether there was any immediacy
    attached to the request of Mr. Ehrlichman in terms of that
    money?
A  Well, it seems to me there was, but I'm not able
    to really be precise on what was said during that conversa-
    tion.
Q  Do you recall whether or not there was any
    immediacy attached to your request to Mr. Baroody for
    obtaining that money?
A  I would have conveyed the same immediacy that
    Mr. Ehrlichman conveyed to me. If it was "Get it today, if
you can," fine. If it was, "Get it tomorrow, we need it by tomorrow," or -- I just don't remember.

Q    Did you ever talk to Mr. Krogh about that money?
A    To the best of my knowledge, I did not.

Q    Did you ever find out whether that money was repaid?
A    Yes, I made arrangements for repaying that money through a committee in the District of Columbia, a political committee in the District of Columbia that was at that point raising funds, and it was repaid later -- late September, according to -- as I said, I have had to go back and reconstruct the events, but the money was repaid to Mr. Baroody in the latter part of September.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Administratively Confidential

September 16, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H.R. Haldeman
FROM: Gordon Strachan
SUBJECT: Milk Money

You asked me to check Colson regarding an independent agreement with the milk people for Colson to get cash. Colson confirmed that he had made a separate arrangement to obtain five thousand. This money was committed by Ehrlichman but never delivered in connection with a "project we (Colson and Ehrlichman) worked on together".

The only other variation from your directive of single contact with contributors is a Cashen request for $3,600 from Ireland for a poll over a year old. This $3,600 request has been shifted to Magruder.
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WARD & PAUL
410 FIRST STREET, S. E.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20003

(202) 544-6000
Mr. Nelson. Then after the second time --

Mr. Weitz. He advised you to do so?

Mr. Nelson. Yes. Well, yes, that's right.

Mr. Weitz. At the second conversation, was it explained to you or did you discuss what the firm would do for their fee?

Mr. Nelson. No.

Mr. Weitz. And to your knowledge they were hired for AMPI?

Mr. Nelson. Yes. We paid them. I know that.

Mr. Weitz. And if the billings for AMPI indicate a fee from October '70 through January 1972 of $2500 a month, is that consistent with your recollection?

Mr. Nelson. Let's see, that would be --

Mr. Weitz. That would be $30,000 a year.

Mr. Nelson. That's close enough.

Mr. Weitz. To your knowledge, did any employee at AMPI ever meet with or talk to anybody from the Wagner and Baroody firm?

Mr. Nelson. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Weitz. What did they do for their fee?

(No response)

Mr. Weitz. Nothing to your knowledge?

Mr. Nelson. I have said that repeatedly, nothing that I know of.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether they did anything for Mr.
Colson?

Mr. Nelson. No, I do not.

Mr. Weitz. Do you know whether they did anything for Mr. Harrison?

Mr. Nelson. I do not know that they did.

Mr. Weitz. Did you consider this in the nature of a contribution or gift of the firm to keep the favor of Mr. Colson?

Mr. Nelson. Well, I guess contribution is a better word.

Mr. Weitz. Did this have anything, to your knowledge, to do with the special projects referred to in the Hillings letter?

Mr. Nelson. I don't think so at all.

Mr. Weitz. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. Nelson. No.

Mr. Weitz. Was the firm of Wagner and Baroody or any of their principals ever mentioned to you in connection with the contribution? You have talked about the $5,000 contribution that was made at Mr. Harrison's request.

Mr. Nelson. No.

Mr. Weitz. Did you know whether Mr. Colson had made that request, by the way, or was this just another request from Mr. Harrison?

Mr. Nelson. It was just another request. To my recollection, it was just another request. I have no independent recollection of it.
Mr. Weitz. Mr. Colson's name was never recommended in that connection?

Mr. Nelson. No.

Mr. Weitz. Did Mr. Colson to your knowledge ever make any recommendation to you or to anyone representing ANPI about political contributions?

Mr. Nelson. I think he did. I can not tell you which area or what I think he did -- maybe to Mr. Harrison, suggested some committees or something.

Mr. Weitz. Committees or candidates?

Mr. Nelson. Maybe candidates.

Mr. Weitz. Was this in connection with the 1970 senatorial campaign?

Mr. Nelson. I am not sure about that, but I believe he did.

Mr. Weitz. Were you not present at that meeting in his office in the White House?

Mr. Nelson. What meeting?

Mr. Weitz. Mr. Colson and Mr. Harrison, where Mr. Colson made particular suggestions about particular contributions.

Mr. Nelson. That's what I'm saying. I think he did. I cannot tell you what candidates and so forth.

Mr. Weitz. But other than that, were there any other instances in which you were aware that Mr. Colson made recommendations for political contributions to either you, Mr. Harrison,
Mr. Wiles: And as you know, they were hired for NASA.

Mr. Nelson: Yes. We paid them. I know that.

Mr. Wiles: And if the billings for NASA indicate a fee between October '70 through January '72 of $2,500 a month, is that consistent with your recollection?

Mr. Nelson: That's close enough.

Mr. Wiles: In your recollection, did any employee at MAC have any contact with anyone from the Wagner and Barney firm?

Mr. Nelson: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Wiles: What did they do for their fees?

(No answer)

Mr. Wiles: MacAlpine or your firm ever?

Mr. Nelson: I have no such knowledge. Nothing that I know of.

Mr. Wiles: So NEI... and NCI... pay all anything for Mr.
Mr. Nelson, I do not know that they did.

Mr. Nelson, did you consider this in the nature of a contribution or gift of the firm to keep the favor of Mr. Olson?

Mr. Nelson. Well, I guess contribution is a better word.

Mr. White. Did this have anything to your knowledge to do with the special projects referred to in the bills to last year?

Mr. Nelson. I don't think so at all.

Mr. White. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. Nelson. No.

Mr. White. Was the firm of Wagner and Barlow to any of the firm principals ever mentioned to you in connection with the contribution you have talked about the $5,000 contribution that was made at Mr. Harrison's request?

Mr. Nelson. No.

Mr. White. Did you ever receive from Mr. Olson had made that request, by the way, or was this just another request from Mr. Harrison?

Mr. Nelson. To our exact another request. To my recollection, I do not just another request. I have no indication of it.
Mr. Wake. Mr. Colson, do you know anything about the

Mr. Wake. Yes.

Mr. Wake. Do you recall the name of the firm or the

Mr. Wake. Mr. Colson to your knowledge ever take any

Mr. Wake. In connection to you or to anyone representing your political contributors?

Mr. Wake. I think so did. I cannot recall the name of it.

Mr. Wake. Can you recall the name of Mr. Harrison, suggested some contributions or not?

Mr. Wake. Contributions or contributions?

Mr. Wake. Maybe contributions.

Mr. Wake. Was this in connection with the 1970 senatorial campaign?

Mr. Wake. I am not sure about that, but I believe he did.

Mr. Wake. Were you not present at that meeting in his

Mr. Wake. What meeting?

Mr. Wake. Mr. Colson and Mr. Harrison, where Mr. Colson and

Mr. Wake. No. I do not think I am trying. I think he did. I
cannot recall the name of the firm or the

Mr. Wake. But what gives you the idea that any other firm

Mr. Wake. Nor do I recall any other firm or the name of
others who might make recommendations for political contributions in 1970, if you, Mr. Harrison,
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a nation with the best environment in the world, a nation with the greatest progress in the world.

All these are American goals, but they will not be achieved unless we dedicate ourselves to the spirit that built American aviation. Let me describe that spirit.

Orville Wright flew with his brother only once. On that same day that he flew with his brother, the year 1910, 61 years ago, he flew with his 82-year-old father, that same afternoon. And the words that his father spoke as he flew with his son, Orville Wright, on that afternoon here in Dayton 61 years ago were simply these: “Higher. Higher. Higher.”

That was the spirit of American aviation. That is the spirit of the American Air Force. That is the spirit of the people of Dayton, of the people of Ohio who have created this great museum which reminds us of our great past.

Let that spirit, higher and higher, always be the spirit of the United States of America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:07 p.m. at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base at Dayton, Ohio.

For a statement by the President on the museum, see the preceding item.

As we consider those things, I think it is well to put this great convention in the context of the broader problems that the United States faces in the world today. You are, of course, milk producers, dairy farmers, you are justly proud of your professions. But you are also American citizens deeply interested in this country, interested as all Americans are, in what the future holds for our children.

Are we to have a world in which we have a better chance for peace than we have had previously, a better chance for a prosperity without war, a better chance for prosperity without inflation?

These are questions that all Americans are interested in, and you, as Americans, are also vitally interested in.

What we must recognize at this time is that we meet at a period of enormous opportunity and great challenge for America. On the one side, we find the most difficult and the longest war in America’s history being brought to an end, and we find, too, that we are beginning to build the structure for a new era of peace in the world. It is not easy; it is not sure. But the journey that I will take to the People’s Republic of China, the negotiations that we are undertaking in various areas with the Soviet Union, and the other initiatives that we have undertaken in the field of foreign policy, in my opinion, give us this opportunity:

I believe tonight that we have the best chance since the end of World War II for our children to have what we have not had in this century in America—a full generation of peace.

But the irony of that situation is that as the danger of war recedes, the challenges of peace increase. Not that we do not want those challenges and would not much prefer them to war; not, for example, that Americans, as we consider the fact that 2 million men have been let out of the Armed Forces since the year 1969 as a result of the winding down of the Vietnam war, out of the Armed Forces and defense plants, that they now are in our job market, that this, therefore, makes it necessary to develop new jobs, peacetime jobs for those individuals. This is a challenge we accept.

But on the other hand, we must recognize that as we look to the period ahead, a period when we are going to use our leadership as well as we possibly can to create peace for America and peace for the world, it will mean a new world of much greater competition for America.

Let’s look back just 25 years at the end of World War II. You will recall then that America, with 7 percent of the world’s people, produced 50 percent of the world’s goods. Not any nation in the world even approached us in the major areas of competition economically.

And in that period, the United States of America was a generous nation, generous to its allies who had fought beside us, and generous to its enemies whom we had defeated.

One hundred fifty billion dollars in foreign aid, military and economic, was given by the United States to other nations. And now, 25 years later this is what we find: we find that the United States is still number one in the
world economically, but we find that we have competition such as we did not have 25 years ago, competition from Japan, for example, and Asia, competition from the nations of Europe which we helped to rebuild after World War II, competition from the Soviet Union, and in the future the potential competition of the most populous and one of the most creative peoples on the earth, 800 million Chinese.

That is the picture we have in front of us. So the question that we confront in America is: What do we, 200 million Americans, do about this? How do we meet the challenge of peaceful competition?

There are two ways that it could be met. One is to build a wall around ourselves, a permanent wall, and to live within ourselves and to let the rest of the world pass us by. That is the philosophy which some have. Some suggest that it really doesn't make any difference whether the United States continues to maintain its position of world leadership economically, a position which is essential if we are to be the world's leader—free world's leader in the field of foreign policy.

But on the other hand, there is another point of view, a point of view that I strongly recommend to this great audience of America from over 25 States in this Nation tonight, and it is this: At the end of World War II the United States was in the position where it was our duty to help other nations get on their feet. It was also in our interest. We have no regrets about having succeeded and succeeding very well in that great gesture—humanitarian, and also in our economic self-interest as it turned out to be.

At that time one world statesman described the situation like a poker game. He said what happened was that at the end of World War II the United States had all the chips and no one else could play and so we had to pass out some of the chips to the other nations so that they could get into the game—and we did that.

Now they are in the game. They are strong, vigorous competitors. We should not resent that. As a matter of fact, we should welcome it because the stronger the competition, the better we do. That's the American spirit.

But on the other hand, as I pointed out in my speech to the Nation on August 15, let the competition be fair. Let us see to it that as far as the international monetary situation is concerned that unfair advantages of other nations be removed. Let us see to it that as far as trade barriers are concerned that it is a two-way street, that markets abroad are open to the United States as we open markets in the United States to nations abroad.

There was a time when the United States, 25 years ago, could afford to be generous, not only in our aid but in our trade policies. We still want to be generous where the situation requires it from a humanitarian standpoint. But at this time, when other nations in Europe and in Asia are on their feet, where they are our competitors, the time has come for the United States to quit trying to compete with one hand tied behind our back.

So the world that I see for America is not one in which we build a wall around ourselves, not one in which the United States fails to meet the challenge of competition, but one in which we set up fair rules of competition and then proceed to do everything that we can to do our best.

Now, let me relate all this to that great audience here in the heartland of America, an audience from American agriculture. A few months ago the Census Bureau announced that it had plotted the new population center of the United States. And that point where half of the population lives to the north and half to the south, and half to the east and half to the west, they found right here in the State of Illinois. They put a marker at the spot. It is about 5 miles outside of the town of Mascoutah.

I remember thinking how symbolic it was in this age of urbanization, great cities like Chicago, that the spot which had marked the exact center of population in America was right in the middle of a farmer's field.

But if we really consider the basic resources of this country—our natural abundance, our economic power, our physical and spiritual health—then we must conclude in 1970, as in 1790, that the heart of our Nation's strength still lies in our Nation's farms.

Look back just 75 years: Again, here in Illinois, in the great city of Chicago, a Democratic National Convention, William Jennings Bryan, taking that convention by storm and winning the Democratic nomination—his speech is remembered by every student of American history and of political science as one of the great speeches of all time. And this was something he said: "The great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies." He said, "Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

Now there are many more cities and many fewer farmers today in America than there were in 1896, but now as well as then, American agriculture contributes enormously to America's strength. There is one achievement of our Nation's farmers that is particularly pertinent to the remarks I have made with regard to the competitive position we have in the world today. It is the success of American agriculture in raising the level of productivity on our farms.

Productivity holds the key to America's ability to compete in the world. Only by increasing productivity can we achieve a higher standard of living without rampant inflation at home and only by increasing productivity can we win a stronger position over the long run in the marketplaces and the trading lanes of the world.

Now, let's look at productivity in America over the past 20 years. It has not moved up fast enough in some areas, but American agriculture is an exciting exception. In the nonfarm sector of our economy, productivity has gone up over 150 percent in the last 20 years. In the field of agriculture, however, productivity in the last 20 years has gone up 300 percent—nearly twice as much.
Now, what is the result of this? Well, first the American people are getting a great deal more value for their food and clothing dollar. Secretary Hardin, at our Cabinet table, often eloquently makes this point: We are the best fed people in the world—except for the 3500 that were not able to get served tonight, I understand, at this convention.

But despite all the talk about high farm prices and support prices and the rest, when you add it all up, the American housewife puts a smaller percent of her budget into food than any housewife in the world today. That is to the great credit of American agriculture.

Now, many of you have been reading about the crisis we have in our international balance of payments. But let's look at what agriculture does for us in this field. We find that our agriculture exports have reached a record high. Without our agriculture exports, which we trust will continue to grow as we open up the markets abroad, without those exports we would be in a crucial position in this field of balance of payments.

America today is number one in the world in productivity in agriculture, and I say, let us stay number one by seeing that our farmers get their fair share of America's increasing prosperity.

Now, I will be preaching somewhat to the choir as I talk about the dairy industry. The dairy industry has helped to lead the way in achieving this remarkable rate of progress. The amount of milk produced per man year has increased fourfold in the last 20 years, even better than the average for agriculture generally. No industry in America, no major industry, can match this increase in productivity of the dairy industry.

Within the industry this organization has been one of the strongest forces in blazing new economic trails. This is America's largest dairy cooperative. You have moved effectively to help improve the quality, expand the variety, increase the volume of American dairy products.

Let me share with you a personal recollection when I spoke of the quality of American dairy products. I mentioned the end of World War II. I recall as I returned after spending 14 months in the Pacific what I really wanted most in terms of the food on the table. Out there it wasn't bad but, of course, everybody gripes about the food when he is in the service. You know what it was—not a steak or none of the other things that you usually think of—just a glass of good, fresh milk, something we never had abroad. You don't have to go back that far. I remember a trip of 70 days I took as Vice President in the year 1953 to Asian nations and in country after country abroad, just getting a glass of good, fresh milk was almost impossible. It is improving around the world, but let me tell you, we in America should be thankful that we can get good, fresh, healthy milk any time we want it on our tables in the United States.

You have pioneered in developing a "total marketing concept," a concept which many other producers, I think, would do well to consider. All of this you have done on your own. You haven't whimpered helplessly about uncontrollable economic forces nor waited passively for Government to bail you out.

For its part, the Government has been working to create a climate in which such initiatives will receive their just reward. We're encouraged to see that cash receipts for dairy farmers have risen some 5 percent this year. That is not as much as we would like; it is, however, a significant gain. We look for even greater progress in the future.

Even as we have been working to increase farm income, we have also been working to reduce farm costs. A moment ago I pointed out the challenges that we face as we move from war to peace. One of those challenges is that war always leaves a legacy of inflation.

On August 15, I decided that a time had come for us to crack down on inflation because when we consider it, inflation is the cruel economic culprit that relentlessly whipsaws every family in America and every farm family in particular. You know the truth of this statement that I will now make. Inflation hits the farmer coming and going—it raises both the cost of living and the cost of farming. The result is a brutal cost-price squeeze.

The figures are striking. The prices farmers pay for all items have gone up 52 percent in the last 20 years while the prices they receive have gone up only 8 percent in the same time. Like a great invisible vise, inflation has been crushing our farm families and farm communities for many years now and this can be said about family after family in other walks of life as well. It is time that they got some relief.

Our new policies offer that relief. More than that, these policies promise, for the first time in many years, to achieve a new prosperity for farmers, for all Americans—prosperity without inflation and without war. This is a goal to which all Americans, I am sure, will subscribe.

I have spoken to this convention tonight about the contribution you have made, you in agriculture generally, to America's competitive position. I have spoken about the enormous contribution that your productivity makes to America in this critical time.

Let me now refer to another area in which this great audience, coming from the heartland of America—and the heartland of America is all over America—particularly centered in this area, of course. Let me indicate another area where your contribution has been and can continue to be decisive. That is in developing the spirit that America needs if we are going to maintain our competitive position in the world.

As we speak of that spirit, let me say that as I have traveled over the country I am convinced that it is strong. I am convinced that the people of this country are ready to respond to a challenge to compete. But I think it is important for us to remind ourselves at this time that if America is not to fall behind in this period of greater competition with our friends abroad, that it is going to be necessary for us to strengthen our spirit in several areas.
First, with Labor Day approaching, let us recognize in this country the dignity of work. By "the dignity of work" I should like to point out what was to me a rather disturbing report I read a few weeks ago with regard to some individuals on welfare in one of our cities who refused to take jobs because they considered those jobs to be menial.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I was growing up, my father at various times was a carpenter, he was a streetcar motorman, he was a farmer, he worked in a filling station, and he worked in the oil fields. I suppose you could call that menial, but I say that any job which provides self-support, self-reliance, self-respect, and human dignity is not menial in America.

So on this Labor Day let us recognize the dignity of men and women who work, whatever that field may be—the farmer, the worker, the laborer, 80 million of them. That's what made America what it is, and by recognizing that dignity, we can continue to be productive.

Then, second, it is necessary for us to recognize that in this Nation there are times when it is necessary for us to make some sacrifices. I do not speak of the sacrifice of life; I speak of sacrifices that do not even approach that ultimate sacrifice.

I again refer to the wage-price freeze. Certainly there is not any question but that some people who had their wage increases deferred, and others who were unable to raise their prices suffered a hardship. But where, by some individuals giving up a wage increase, and others giving up a price increase, we can stop the cost of living for all Americans—that is worth sacrificing for.

I am confident that with 70 percent of the American people, as indicated by various polls, supporting that proposition, that the spirit of sacrifice for the good of this whole country is still alive and strong in this country.

Then, finally, there is one other element of the American spirit to which I have already alluded. It very simply is this: It is essential in this period that the United States of America, as a nation, and the American people as a people, never resign themselves in any area to be second best. I do not suggest that America has to be first in everything. I do not suggest that we will be first in everything. But I do know this: Once a nation ceases trying to be number one, that nation will not be a great nation. Let it not happen to America.

One hundred ninety-five years ago America was almost a totally agricultural country, 3 million people, weak militarily, poor economically, and yet that small country on the Atlantic seaboard caught the imagination of the world. It was the hope of the world, not because of its wealth or its strength, but because the spirit of America was strong.

Americans then were proud of their country. They had a sense of destiny. They had a drive and a desire to do better, to have greater freedom, greater opportunity, greater progress than any nation in the world. It is that spirit that brought America where it is today. It is that spirit that America needs in this period when we are the richest nation and the strongest nation.

Without that spirit, all the wealth and all the strength in the world will be nothing. With that spirit, America can provide the leadership which will mean peace for a generation, we trust, and longer, for our children in the years ahead, and prosperity without war.

As I speak to this great audience coming from all over America, I feel that the spirit of competition, the spirit of hard work, the spirit of putting America first when it requires sacrifice, that it is strong in this organization. I think the future of America is in good hands, and I wish you well in everything that you do.

Ladies and gentlemen, since this is a bipartisan audience, and since we have Members of the House and the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans here, wouldn't you like to have them all up here on the platform with me for a moment?

All the Members of the House and Senate. There they are. Give them a hand.

Now, if any of you happen to go to Washington and visit the House or the Senate, right now you probably see more than on an ordinary day you will see on the floor of the House or the Senate.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:47 p.m., cdt., in McCormick Place, Chicago, Ill.

Disaster Assistance for New Jersey

Announcement of Disaster Declaration and Authorization of Federal Assistance for Relief Measures After Tropical Storm Doria. September 4, 1971

The President today declared a major disaster for New Jersey authorizing the use of Federal funds to supplement State and local resources for relief measures after heavy rains from the recent tropical storm Doria caused widespread flooding in New Jersey. The President acted at the request of Governor William T. Cahill.

Today's action by the President makes available Federal funds for disaster assistance including individual assistance, debris clearance, and repair or restoration of publicly-owned sewer and water systems, roads, streets, and bridges, and other public property damaged by the flooding.

Leo McNamee, of the President's Office of Emergency Preparedness, Region 1, is coordinating the Federal response and administering the President's funds allocated to this disaster.