Nixon Committee Returns \$655,000 to 3 Big Donors

Robert Allen, Texas Oilman, Confirms It Was His \$89,000 That Ended Up With Barker, a Watergate Defendant

NYTimes

By CHRISTOPHER LYDONMAR 1 0 1973 Special to The New York Times

President Nixon's re-election paign committee reported, it committee said today that it had \$4.7-million on hand at the had returned \$655,000 to three end of February, including \$100,000 to Robert H. Allen, the made since the beginning of Texas oilman. Mr. Allen was this year.
the source of \$89,000 that Letters made public by the passed through a Mexican bank re-election committee today into the leader of an alleged dicated that Nixon campaign political espionage operation lawyers had taken the initiative against the Democratic party in returning Mr. Vesco's money, headquarters here last June.

nounced that it had returned a Allen for "personal reasons" \$305,000 note to Walter T. Duncan, a financially troubled financial problems. Texas land speculator who had borrowed money for large con-that he would make "major tributions to the Nixon cam-contributions to Republican paign and earlier to the unsuc-candidates in 1974 and 1976 if cessful nomination drive of I am able to recover my fi-Senator Hubert H. Humphrey nancial situation to my satisfaction by that time."

Further, the committee confirmed the return of \$250,000 president of the Gulf Resources to Robert L. Vesco, a principal and Chemical Company, to defendant in the Securities and Maurice H. Stans, finance chair-Exchange Commission's investi- man of the Nixon campaign, gation of the alleged plundering confirmed that it was Mr. Alof Ios, Ltd., and a subsidiary len's \$89,000 that had ended up mutual fund.

WASHINGTON, March 9-money, the re-election camcontributors, including \$246,000 in new contributions

but that Mr. Allen and Mr. Dun-The committee also an- can had asked for theirs-Mr. and Mr. Duncan because of his

Mr. Duncan said, however,

The letter from Mr. Allen,

Even after the return of this Continued on Page 14, Column 4

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

in the hands of Bernard L. Barker, one of four Miami men who pleaded guilty to breaking into the Democrats' Watergate of-

fices here. But Mr. Allen insisted that he would not have given the money if the had known how it would be used. He said that his gift had been routed through Mexico for reasons of "con-venience" and "privacy"—not, as has been charged, to rid the money of traces to other sources.

Mr. Allen told Mr. Stans that because he made his contribu-tion on April 5, 1972—two days before the new Federal dis-closure law effect—"I felt, and ciosure law effect—"I felt, and still do, that under the law I had every right to expect and enjoy the right of privacy and full anonymity."

"It was for this reason, as well as convenience, that I arranged to have the contribution delivered from Mexico" had

tion delivered from Mexico," he said, "I realize that this resulted in some embarrassment to you and the committee, in that the press made preposterous and bizarre assumptions concerning the purpose of this procedure. In actual fact, your committee did not participate in that ar-rangement in any way."

Mr. Allen did not explain why he had requested the refund.
Mr. Duncan was an obscure real estate dealer in Bryan,
Tex., before he gave \$300,000 to the Humphrey campaign last May and June and instantly became the largest recorded con-tributor in the 1972 campaign. It was later discovered that

he had borrowed heavily for the Nixon and Humphrey con-tributions but had concealed large outstanding obligations from the banks that lent him the campaign money. Since then, he has been through foreclosure on several large tracts of land in Texas for failure to pay notes. He faces trial in July on a \$2.2-million suit by an insurance company over another Texas land deal.