

SEP 1 1973
**Alterations Alleged
In Nixon Home Data**
NYTimes—SEP 1 1973

By PHILIP SHABECOFF
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Aug. 31—The chairman of a Congressional panel investigating public spending on President Nixon's private homes said today that some documents pertaining to Mr. Nixon's property at San Clemente, Calif., released earlier this week by the White House, had been altered previously.

Representative Jack Brooks, Democrat of Texas, who is chairman of the House Government Activities Subcommittee, said that dates on documents containing a legal description of 23 acres of San Clemente property, sold by the President

Continued on Page 36, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8

to two of his friends, had been erased and changed by the surveying company involved on orders from Mr. Nixon's personal attorney.

A White House spokesman, Gerald L. Warren, said at San Clemente today that Mr. Brooks was making "much ado about nothing." Mr. Warren released a letter from Bryce N. Harlow, Presidential counselor, to Mr. Brooks that, he said, shows that "there is nothing whatever improper or irregular about the transaction."

At a news conference on Capitol Hill today, Mr. Brooks said that he had written to Mr. Harlow asking for an explanation of "inconsistencies and inaccuracies" in some of the documents on San Clemente released by the White House. Mr. Brooks emphasized that he was making "no charge or accusation."

In his news conference, however, Mr. Brooks raised questions about a sales agreement dated Dec. 15, 1970, between President and Mrs. Nixon and Robert H. Abplanalp and C. G. Rebozo, two wealthy friends who helped finance the President's purchase at San Clemente and to whom the President sold a large part of the property.

Specifically, Mr. Brooks questioned the dating on attachments to the sales agreement that contained the legal description of the parcels of property reserved to the President and those transferred to the B. & C. Investment Company, the company organized by Mr. Abplanalp and Mr. Rebozo.

Erasure Alleged

His staff discovered, Mr. Brooks reported, that the surveying company, the South Coastal Engineering Services

Corporation, had, on Jan. 8, 1971, erased the original date on the attachments and substituted the Dec. 15 date. The change was made at the behest of Frank DeMarco Jr., one of Mr. Nixon's lawyers, Mr. Brooks said.

He said that Mr. DeMarco had insisted, when asked, that no change had been made on the documents. Mr. DeMarco would not respond to a newsman's question.

However, one of the owners of the survey concern, William Ayer, confirmed when reached today that the change had been made on the documents at Mr. DeMarco's request.

Mr. Brooks said that records in the possession of his committee indicated that the descriptions of the property were not actually prepared until about Dec. 28 and 29, 1970, and that some data contained in the Dec. 15 sales agreement

were not even in existence on that date.

The Texas Democrat said at first he did not want to "hazard a guess" about why the changes were made, but then he appeared to suggest that putting a 1970 rather than 1971 date on the agreement might have had something to do with President Nixon's taxes.

His committee is interested in fixing the exact date of the transfer, he explained, because it is concerned with who owned the property when the Government was paying for improvements on it in the name of Presidential security. "We need to know who did what when," he said.

The House committee has been conducting an intensive investigation into the expenditure of public funds for security at the President's private residences in Key Biscayne, Fla., and San Clemente and is scheduled to hold hearings on the issue in late September or early October.

So far it has been disclosed that governmental agencies have spent about \$10-million on Presidential security and safety at the various Nixon properties.

On Monday, the White House released a special audit on the President's purchase of the \$1.5-million estate at San Clemente and the \$252,000 Key Biscayne properties in order, according to a spokesman, "to put to rest once and for all the false allegations" about how Mr. Nixon acquired the properties.

In his reply to Mr. Brooks, Mr. Harlow said that "there was no basis for perceiving inconsistencies," in the documents questioned by Mr. Brooks and that there was no relevance between those documents and Government spending on Presidential security at San Clemente.

Mr. Harlow explained the altered dates by saying that the descriptions of the property had contained an error and had to be changed. But he asserted that the date of these descrip-

SEP 1 1973
tions was "irrelevant to the effective date of the sales agreement."

In fact, he wrote, "the sales agreement was prepared and executed before Dec. 15, 1970." As to the date of the actual transaction, "there was no significance to the date or even the year," Mr. Harlow wrote.

As evidence that the date of the transfer is immaterial to Government spending on security, Mr. Harlow said that the main gate of San Clemente is on property sold by Mr. Nixon but the gate is still operated by the Secret Service.