

10-MILLION SPENT AT NIXON HOUSES

Security Is Cited as Reason
for Outlay — Accounting
Is Pledged by Nixon

8/7/73
By WALLACE TURNER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Aug. 6—

The Nixon Administration announced today that it had spent about \$10-million for Presidential security at San Clemente, Calif.; Key Biscayne, Fla., and Grand Cay in the Bahamas, and at the places where the Nixon daughters have lived.

The White House also announced that Mr. Nixon planned to commission at his personal expense a "detailed accounting" by a "highly respected firm" of his acquisition of the Key Biscayne and San Clemente homes soon after his 1968 election. The White House said this accounting would be made public.

Since April, Mr. Nixon has been under criticism for large sums spent by Government agencies on his homes in California and Florida. He has also been under pressure to make public the entire transaction involving his acquisition of the \$1.4-million property at San Clemente. The White House has said he bought it with loans from Robert M. Abplanalp, a New York industrialist, who then took title to part of it to satisfy the loans.

The announcements on spending on the Presidential properties were made in three places today and came after repeated meetings over the last 10 days at the White House between representatives of the agencies involved.

First, Gerald L. Warren, the deputy White House press secretary, announced approximate figures of spending by the military services. These were about \$5.9-million, and details given were scant.

Next, Secret Service spokes-

Continued From Page 1, Col. 4

men responded to telephone calls with the information that their agency had spent about \$390,000 from appropriated funds to buy detection devices that were generally portable and were recovered to be used elsewhere.

This afternoon the General Services Administrator, Arthur F. Sampson, held a full-scale news conference lasting more than one hour. He read a statement, issued a longer statement, passed out detailed printed studies and insisted repeatedly that almost no Federal funds had been spent that would be of lasting value to Mr. Nixon's property.

Previously, the General Services Administration had said it spent \$703,000 on the Nixon-owned property at San Clemente and \$1,180,000 at Key Biscayne. Today, Mr. Sampson added to that \$1,741,000 spent on an office complex on a Coast Guard base adjacent to the San Clemente home; \$16,000 spent on Grand Cay, the Bahamas island owned by Mr. Abplanalp; Mr. Nixon goes frequently, and about \$50,000 spent to provide security for the Nixon daughters as they lived in Bethesda, Md.; Atlantic Beach and Virginia Beach, Va.; Cambridge, Mass., and New York.

Amount Recoverable

This raised the G.S.A. total to about \$3.7-million.

It was not clear how much of this total of \$10-million was in some way recoverable. According to the sketchy figures given by Mr. Warren, about \$300,000 of the military spending was for communications equipment that would help Mr. Nixon keep in touch with world affairs. About two-thirds of this would be recoverable, Mr. Warren said.

About \$160,000 in military equipment was placed on Grand Cay and all this will be recovered, Mr. Warren said. But what he called "recurring costs," mostly in communications, of about \$330,000 a year would presumably not be recovered.

Nor could there be a recovery of the \$418,000 spent by the Army Corps of Engineers to build a helicopter pad in Biscayne Bay at Mr. Nixon's home there.

Mr. Sampson said he could not estimate how much of the G.S.A. expenditures could be recovered, but he said it was obvious that the investment in buried cables and landscaping would not be recovered. However, he pointed out that the office complex at San Clemente

and some portable buildings at Key Biscayne could be reused.

Previous Administrations

A Secret Service spokesman said that virtually all of its \$300,000 expenditure had been for reusable detection devices.

Officials said it was not possible to give comparative figures for similar costs during previous Administrations, but Mr. Sampson said that they would be much less.

This would be due to the increased concern for the safety of public figures after the assassinations of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy, he said.

Mr. Sampson said the G.S.A. was now pulling information out of its files to attempt to give an answer to Congressional questions about security costs in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

Just getting answers to questions about spending on Mr. Nixon's properties has cost the G.S.A. \$100,000, Mr. Sampson estimated. In his news conference today, he had charts to illustrate expenditures, pictures of the San Clemente home before and after the G.S.A.-Secret Service work

done in 1969, and a 70-page book packed with the statistics of that expenditure.

One of the major costs at San Clemente was for landscaping, and Mr. Sampson insisted that this had been required by the Secret Service need to have power lines and television coaxial cables buried as a part of its detection system. Then the property had to be restored to its original condition, he said.

One item that many reporters have asked the G.S.A. about was a bullet-resistant glass screen erected on the west side of the swimming pool. While the pool itself was paid for by Mr. Nixon, the screen was purchased by the G.S.A. Reporters familiar with the climate at San Clemente have asked previously if it were not really there to serve as a wind screen. The G.S.A. has said it was to prevent someone from shooting at the pool from a boat at sea.

Today, during his news conference, Mr. Sampson referred to the structure as "a wind screen," but when asked to discuss it further, he insisted that he had never used the words, and that it was a "security screen." Tape recordings of the news conference showed he had called it a wind screen. The screen cost about

Continued on Page 20, Column 7

\$10,000.

Basic Argument

Mr. Sampson defended spending \$4,834,50 for furniture in the President's study at San Clemente. This is just another Presidential office, he said, and so should be furnished at Government expense. Invoices for the work show that the furniture came from the same interior decorating concern in Los Angeles that decorated the rest of the house.

Inherent in all of Mr. Sampson's justifications for the spending was the basic argument that if the Secret Service asked for something in the name of Presidential security, it was incumbent on the G.S.A. to provide it.

Thus, he said, when the Secret Service said that gas furnaces are inherently unsafe, it was necessary to pull out a gas furnace in the San Clemente house, and another that heated a part of the Nixon property in Florida, and replace them with electric heat.

"The original heating system was safe for you or I," he said of the San Clemente furnace, which was replaced at a cost of \$13,500.

At another point he said in reference to President Nixon and the San Clemente house: "I am sure that when he bought this home, he didn't have in mind that it would cost this much for security."

"This Administration should be judged on how it met its obligations," Mr. Sampson said. "If we abused that obligation, slap our wrists."

'The Full Story'

At the White House briefing, Mr. Warren said that "it has been the President's position from the start that the full story should be made available."

But Mr. Sampson gave a different picture of how it looked in the middle levels of Government in 1969. He said that a meeting of White House personnel, the Secret Service and G.S.A. representatives was held at San Clemente in the spring of 1969, and that a policy was adopted of how to deal with questions about the place.

What he called "a basic policy decision" was arrived at, which held that no information whatsoever would be given out because any revealed might endanger the President's security.

But this policy has now been suspended, he said, by the pressure of the time that forced the Government to produce information.