

Nixon Contributions

WASHINGTON (AP) ^{NOV. 2 1972} The General Accounting Office said today it has referred details on \$27,000 worth of contributions to President Nixon's re-election committee to the attorney general for investigation of possible violation of law.

The GAO said \$12,000 in contributions came from corporations and \$15,000 from a Hong Kong citizen, both categories prohibited by law.

It said the re-election committee reports refunding the money from the foreign citizen and taking steps to regularize the corporate contributions.

Eric Ho Tung of Hong Kong contributed \$15,000 Aug. 31 to the Finance Committee to Reelect the President

and affiliated committees, the GAO said in a report.

It quoted Paul Barrick, the finance committee's treasurer, as saying the money was refunded seven days later. It said the committee's Oct. 24 finance report showed the refund.

But the GAO said "we do not know the circumstances of this transaction" and so referred it to the attorney general.

In the second case, the GAO said, \$12,000 contributed by various corporations to the National Black Committee for the Re-Election of the President were passed on to the President's campaign finance committee.

"The committee suggested that each corporate check be replaced with a

Under Investigation

personal check from the donor," the GAO said, "and stated that for record-keeping purposes the corporate check would be returned upon receipt of the personal check."

Some of the corporate checks were still in the hands of the President's finance committee last month, the agency said, even though the contributions were made in May and June.

The report was the second on the President's finance committee by the GAO's Office of Federal Elections, set up to oversee the new campaign contribution disclosure law.

The report also said the GAO found 28 discrepancies in transfers of campaign money between the President's finance committee and the Republican

National committee.

In seven cases, it said, transfers of money ranging from \$1,000 to \$15,000 were not reported at all. It said in the remaining cases there were discrepancies in the amounts reported.

But the GAO said these instances were not referred to the attorney general as apparent violations of law because it is trying instead to reconcile such discrepancies.

The GAO also said there were numerous instances in which the new law's requirement that any contributor of more than \$100 be identified by occupation and place of business was not adequately met.