1. Since Paul 2 you do not involve the CIA or our people in any way and since you have given Goldwater the straight story, I propose to do nothing about it.

2. Para 3 is potentially much more serious. It is subject to the construction that Haig participated in some possible "cover up." However, it is also subject to the construction that Baker had suggested to Haig that his underlying doubts about possible CIA participation be surfaced and that Haig sought Kissinger's counsel and passed it on. I will discuss the account with Kissinger on his return and either let the matter drop or proceed as might be required at that time. Until I can do that I propose to hold it closely in its present ambiguous state. Obviously I sincerely appreciate your passing it on to us however.

3. Sen. Baker on 14 December had a full two hour question

HR70-14
(U)

APPROVED FOR RELEASE
DATE: MAR 2000
SECRET

SESSION (WITHOUT US) W/ ROBERT BURNEST PLUS OUR RECORDS TO REVIEW OUR DEALINGS WITH THE MULLIN CO. AT THE END OF THE MEETING, BURNEST SAID THAT IT WAS "BECOMING CLEARER THAT WE WERE NOT INVOLVED IN WATERGATE ALTHOUGH WE STILL RESERVE THE OPTION TO PURSUE THE MATTER WHICH HE DOESN'T WANT TO GO TO HIS GRAVE WITHOUT HAVING GOTTEN TO THE BOTTOM OF IT." HE THEN MADE AN OBSCURE REFERENCE TO MONEY" BUT DID NOT CLARIFY. I AM GOING TO STAND IN ON THIS MATTER OR BAKER'S CONTINUING QUESTS AND WILL ADD THE COMMENT THAT WE MAY BE OBLIGED TO REPORT HIS QUESTS TO SPECIAL COUNSEL JAWORSKI IF WE CAN NOT FULLY RESOLVE THEM.

4. MERRY CHRISTMAS. EZ. IMPEL.
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