•

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

1

IN RE: POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS

18 USC 2511 and 18 USC 2512

11.2

United States District Courthouse 3rd & Constitution Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C.

January 30, 1974

10

11

12

The testimony of HARRY R. HALDEMAN was taken in the presence of a full quorum of the Grand Jury.

13

14

BEFORE:

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

riand 20760

RICHARD BEN-VENISTE, ESQ.
Assistant Special Prosecutor
United States Department of Justice

JILL VOLNER
Assistant Special Prosecutor

United States Department of Justice

GERALD GOLDMAN, ESQ.
Assistant Special Prosecutor
United States Department of Justice

GEORGE T. FRAMPTON, JR., ESQ. Assistant Special Prosecutor United States Department of Justice

KAREN S. SCHEINBERG 14 Wade Court Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760 (301) 340-2119 A Let me raise one other point that is not specifically I guess in response to that, but very definitely I would assume now relates to it which is that in the meeting with John Mitchell, John Dean, John Ehrlichman, and myself, in my office on March 22nd, which was the day following this, and which was when John Mitchell came down for the meeting with the President, we met separately before the meeting with the President.

I do recall, and I think I have testified to an interchange, as I recall it, between John Dean and John Mitchell where the question was asked in some way, "What about the Hunt problem?", and Dean saying, "What's the situation with Hunt?", or "What's happened on Hunt's problem", or something, and Mr. Mitchell saying something to the effect of, "That's no problem", or, "That's taken care of", or "That's okay", or something like that.

There was in no way, that I recall, any reference to a payment having been made or not been made, or any specific definition that that was what the Hunt problem was.

Looking back at it now, I assume that it was. I can't confirm that it was.

Q Does that not refresh your recollection about your conversation with Mr. Mitchell the previous day on the telephone in which you invited Mr. Mitchell to Washington, and more specifically, does it not refresh your recollection as to

2

1

5

6

10

9

11 12

13

15

14

16

18

17

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

(AREN S. SCHEINBERG 14 Wade Court Baithersburg, Maryland 20760 301) 340-2119

whether you asked Mr. Mitchell whether he was going to do something about Mr. Hunt's problem?

- It does not. I don't recall discussing that.
- Did you not learn that in substance on March 22nd, that Mr. Hunt's demandhad been in essence acceded to?
- I wouldn't say so, no. The only thing is I in ... effect overheard a conversation between Mr. Dean and Mr. Mitchell, as I just recounted.
- You were all present, meeting together, were you not?

Yes, but in this meeting, as most of these meetings are, people are in and out. There are side discussions. People are on the phone during the meeting, and that sort of thing.

This was a bilaterial conversation between Mr. Dean and Mr. Mitchell.

- Well, it was fundamental to your meeting on the 22nd as to what would be done with Mr. Hunt, or what position the White House would take with respect to Mr. Hunt.
- No, that's not my recollection of the March 22nd. It is not my recollection that that was fundamental or even consequential. The points of those discussions on the 22nd were on a much broader subject which was dealing with the prime question of White House, and so on.
 - We have the tape of that meeting, Mr. Haldeman, with

KAREN S. SCHEINBERG 14 Wade Court Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760 (301) 340-2119 the President, but my question, if you listen to it carefully, sir, dealt with the purpose of the meeting, and if it was not fundamental that Mr. Hunt's problem or the question of how to deal with Mr. Hunt was not fundamental to your having the meeting, and most respectfully, if it was stated at the outset of the meeting, which you have testified it was, that Mr. Hunt's problem was no longer a problem for the White House in essence, then you could move on to other things, could you not?

A No. Let me correct an apparent misimpression there.

I don't believe it was stated at the outset. I believe it was something that came up peripherally during the course of the meeting. I don't think it was a part of the meeting-discussion as such.

My recollection is that this was a side discussion incidental to the meeting between Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Dean at a point where maybe someone else had walked in or out of the room, or something like that, or there was a phone call, and they were conversing incidentally to the course of the general discussion.

Q Mr. Haldement, isn't it a fact that in the course of the meeting on the 21st with the President, the question of whether or not to accede to Mr. Hunt's most recent demand was a subject of discussion?

A In the Dean meeting with the President?