

Conflict Indicated in Flanigan Letter

By FRED P. GRAHAM

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 25 — Records of the New York Stock Exchange appear to contradict a statement by Peter M. Flanigan, an aide to President Nixon, about the subject matter of a White House meeting involving a director of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.

In a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday, Mr. Flanigan informed the Senators that he met with Felix G. Rohatyn, a director of I.T.T., in Mr. Flanigan's office on June 29, 1971.

At that time officials of I.T.T. and the Justice Department were engaged in intense negotiations over a proposed settlement of three Government antitrust suits against the corporation. On that same day Mr. Rohatyn dropped into the office of Acting Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst to complain that his subordinates were being "rigid" in refusing to settle.

Mr. Flanigan assured the Senators, however, that Mr. Rohatyn had come to see him on an entirely different matter.

To Discuss Securities

He said that Mr. Rohatyn, a New York investment banker, had requested the meeting "in his capacity as chairman of the surveillance committee of the New York Stock Exchange" to discuss "the current situation of the securities markets."

Neal Ball, a spokesman in the White House press office, said "Mr. Rohatyn was not in his capacity" as chairman of the surveillance committee when he came to the White House to see Mr. Flanigan.

"It was a wrap-up session to discuss matters that had been his responsibility in that capacity," Mr. Ball said.

He pointed out that Mr. Flanigan said in his letter to the

Judiciary Committee that it was "one of a series" of meetings on this matter with Mr. Rohatyn. This implied that Mr. Flanigan knew Mr. Rohatyn had quit and was wrapping up the discussions, Mr. Ball said.

In New York, Mr. Rohatyn's secretary said she did not know where he was.

Work Was Too Heavy

Today, James Hill, manager of the news bureau of the New York Stock Exchange, confirmed that Mr. Rohatyn resigned as chairman and had withdrawn from the committee last June 11.

His withdrawal, which attracted some attention at the time, came in a letter to Ralph D. DeNunzio, chairman of the board of the Stock Exchange, and to Robert W. Haack, its president. Mr. Rohatyn told friends he had quit because the committee work had taken too much time from his job as a partner of the investment banking firm of Lazard Freres & Company.

In his letter Mr. Flanigan said that at the June 29 meeting, after he and Mr. Rohatyn discussed the surveillance committee matter and before Mr. Rohatyn left, he did mention the I.T.T. settlement negotiations. According to Mr. Flanigan, Mr. Rohatyn complained that the Government's terms were "so tough as to be un-

acceptable to the company"—information that Mr. Flanigan passed along to Mr. Kleindienst.

On July 31 the cases were settled.

The Judiciary Committee investigation began after the publication by Jaak Anderson, the columnist, of a memorandum bearing the name of I.T.T.'s Washington lobbyist, Mrs. Dita D. Beard, which linked the antitrust settlements to the company's "noble commitment" of \$400,000 toward the expenses of the 1972 Republican National Convention.

Charge By Kennedy

The development today, coming on the heels of a number of contradictions in testimony during the I.T.T. hearings, could strengthen the position of Democratic Senators when the committee meets tomorrow to decide how to wrap up the investigation.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, who has demanded that the hearings be resumed for more questioning of Mr. Flanigan and Mr. Kleindienst, charged today that I.T.T. and the Justice Department had failed to provide documents requested by committee members.

His list of requested documents included the corporation's settlement offers and a roster of people who visited the Justice Department last year during the negotiations.