

Senate Watergate Panel to

Rebozo Is Said to Agree To Yield Financial Data

NYTimes

By JOHN M. CREWDSON

Special to The New York Times

MAY 10 1974

WASHINGTON, May 9—The Senate Watergate Committee voted in closed session today to recall Gen. Alexander M. Haig Jr., President Nixon's chief of staff, in its investigation of a \$100,000 campaign contribution from Howard R. Hughes.

A resolution adopted during the daylong meeting of the four Democrats and three Republicans who make up the panel rejected the claim of executive privilege invoked by General Haig earlier this month when he refused to answer questions related to the investigation.

A new subpoena will reportedly be issued, but sources said that the question of whether tempt of Congress if he did not comply was left unresolved.

The acknowledged recipient of the \$100,000 payment, Charles G. Rebozo, met with the Senators for more than four hours today in what one observer described as a "wild and woolly" session.

Other sources said that Mr. Rebozo agreed to produce some of the personal financial records that the committee's staff is seeking to help clarify the role of Mr. Nixon's close friend in the Hughes transaction.

Records Sought

One investigator said that the staff wanted to examine the records of Mr. Rebozo through March of this year because of its suspicion that "some of [his] transactions into 1974 relate to the funds" passed to him by the billionaire industrialist.

But in reaching what one source called a "negotiated settlement," the committee agreed to allow Mr. Rebozo, a Miami banker and land developer, the produce some of the earlier records by next Monday and to put off the question of the others until later.

The committee's investigation, which is scheduled to end in less than three weeks, is attempting to resolve two conflicting accounts of what happened to the 1,000 \$100 bills that Mr. Rebozo acknowledges having received in 1970 from an employe of Mr. Hughes.

Kalmbach Testimony

Mr. Rebozo has maintained publicly that he left the funds untouched for three years in a safe deposit box in the Key Biscayne Bank and Trust Company, which he heads, before returning them to a Hughes

representative late June.

The committee staff has reportedly taken testimony from Herbert W. Kalmbach, Mr. Nixon's former personal lawyer, that Mr. Rebozo once told him

of having given part of the Hughes money to F. Donald Nixon, the President's brother, and to Rose Mary Woods, Mr. Nixon's secretary at the White House.

Emerging from the committee's meeting, Mr. Rebozo said that he had "absolutely not" altered his testimony about his handling of the money.

One staff lawyer said afterward, however, that "it is our assumption that there's no question" that some or all of the \$100,000 that Mr. Rebozo has said he believed to be a contribution by Mr. Hughes to Mr. Nixon's 1972 re-election effort was converted to the private use of other individuals.

"The investigation," a source said in explaining the request for Mr. Rebozo's private financial records, "includes an attempt to determine how he replenished the money and who furnished the money for that purpose."

A Conflict in Stories

Asked about the reported conflict between his testimony and that of Mr. Kalmbach, Mr. Rebozo replied with a smile, "You haven't heard the end of that yet." He would not elaborate.

But committee sources said that Mr. Rebozo and his lawyer, William S. Frates of Miami, had agreed to drop attempts to have Mr. Kalmbach's testimony expunged from the committee's record.

One committee lawyer also disclosed that the staff had developed information that part of the money handled by Mr. Rebozo was converted to the use of other individuals "close to" President Nixon. Asked whether he was referring to members of the President's immediate family, the lawyer replied, "You're close."

Although Mr. Rebozo praised the members of the Watergate committee, headed by Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr. of North Carolina, for their courteous treatment, he left no doubt that he felt he had been subject to harrassment by some of the committee's staff investigators over the last few months.

"Harrassed," Mr. Rebozo said, "would probably be a mild

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1974

Recall Haig in Inquiry

Into \$100,000

Hughes Donation

term. I would have to use a—what do they call it?—expletive deleted."

Mr. Frates said that he believed the staff intended to account for "every dime" of Mr. Rebozo's personal expenditures in trying to establish the charge, which he dismissed as unfounded, that his client had made some undisclosed use of the Hughes money.