Lunch Spawned Gift From Hughes

By WALLACE TURNER

In the summer of 1968 three said. men met for lunch in a Wash-

picions: ¶That an

A. Maheu, and the money was delivered to Mr. Rebozo at head the money transfers, has testified that Mr. Rebozo tase the person to whom money should be delivered." He did not say how he learned this.

Mr. Rebozo the resident's how with the said that me gave it back earlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back earlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back earlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back earlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back carlier this year.

He would not say when he gave it back parting the firm the proper that the head that he had taken the money had been intended for 1970 Congressional that the money had been intended for 1970 Cong

or where or in what form.

[The Washington Post, quoting what it called informed sources, said in its Sunday editions that Mr. Davis had received the money Mr. Rebozo said he had returned. The Post said that the inquiry into the \$100,000 transaction was part of a transaction was part of a broader investigation by the

the investigation, this official asked to help solve a problem in Las Vegas on the ground

men met for lunch in a Washington restaurant. That meeting set in motion a gift of \$100,000 in cash from Howard R. Hughes to Richard M. Nixon.

The gift, described under oath in Los Angeles count records by the men who delivered it, is under study by the Senate Watergate committee staff.

Officials studying the matter and lawyers involved in the litigation have asked questions litigation have asked questions picions:

The men met for lunch in a Washington restaurant. That meeting said.

The payment was found in the said in testimony. As a result of a series of requests initiated at the luncheon in the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes a result of a series of requests initiated at the luncheon in the summer of 1968, Mr. Hughes wanted to buy the Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Hughes had also told Mr. Maheu to give \$50,000 to Vice President Humphrey, which was delivered in cash by Mr. Maheu to give \$50,000 to Vice President Humphrey, which was delivered in cash by Mr. Maheu to give \$50,000 to Vice President Humphrey, which was delivered in cash by Mr. Maheu to give \$50,000 to Vice President Humphrey, which was delivered in cash by Mr. Maheu to give \$50,000 to Vice President Humphrey, which was delivered in cash by Mr. Maheu to give \$50,000 to Vice President Humphrey, which was delivered in cash by Mr. Maheu to give \$50,000 to Vice President Humphrey, which was delivered in

picions:

That an antitrust ruling favorable to Mr. Hughes was tied to the gift of the money.
That Mr. Hughes was able to use Internal Revenue Service \$100,000 from Mr. Hughes, the investigators in his dispute and legal wrangles with a former employe.
That there is something awry in the recent partial explanation that the money was returned to the Hughes inter-

That there is something awry in the recent partial explanation that the money was returned to the Hughes interests.

Of the three men who met at lunch that day five years ago, one would arrange for the gift and one would deliver the \$100,000.

Third Man at Table

The third man at the table, C. G. Rebozo, received the money. Robert A. Maheu, a former Hughes executive, who was not at the lunch but who said that he had been involved in one of the money transfers,

tended for 1970 Congressional Danner was lifted by the campaigns but was never used. Chester C. Davis, chief counsel for Mr. Hughes, also said that Mr. Maheu has said that Mr. Hughes personally approved that the money had been returned, but would not say when or where or in what form.

[The Washington Post, of Mr. Rebozo.

Problem Left From Election

transaction was part of a broader investigation by the Watergate committee into Mr. Nixon's finances.]

An official on the Watergate committee staff said the Internal Revenue Service had discovered the payment to Mr. Nixon, Mr. Rebozo, but that the service's investigation of those payments had "stopped, bang, like a curtain coming down" shortly after the discovery.

The staff wants to hold hearings on the \$100,000 payments and the I.R.S. performance in Vegas awhile, Mr. Danner was where it is leas vegas, Nev.

In his deposition, Mr. Danner had reported that the first delivery of \$50,000 had been made to Mr. Rebozo at San Clemente.

The testimony of both Mr. Danner and Mr. Maheu discussed the Justice Department's ruling on Mr. Hughes's acquisition of a casino in relation to the delivery of a second \$50,helped Mr. Nixon to acquire this home at San Clemente, On the delivery of a second \$50,In 1968, the Justice Department had blocked Mr. Hughes's purchase of the Stardust Hotel

delivered in cash by Mr. Maheu directly to the Vice President, according to Mr. Maheu's testimony. Also, he said \$25,000 was given to help pay off the deficit of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy's 1968 Presidential campaign. The three payments were reportedly made from \$125,000 drawn from a Hughes bank account in Los from Weshington "carting to Mr. Danner returned from Weshington" "carting to Mr. Mitchell's office at the Department of Justice. On the second one, he said, Mr. Mitchell and made two trips to Mr. Mitchell's office at the Department of Justice. On the second one, he said, Mr. Mitchell in Antitrust Division lawyers, who gave a go-ahead to Mr. Hughes's plans. Mr. Hughes never bought the hotel. Hughes bank account in Los Angeles.

the two deliveries were either both in 1970 or that one was in 1969, and that they were on either July 3 or Aug. 19 or 20.

He made one delivery at San Clemente and one at Key Bis-Mr. Danner went to work for Mr. Hughes in February, 1969, and by 1972 he was an \$85,-1000-a-year general manager of the Sands Hotel in Las Vegas, Nev.

In his deposition, Mr. Danner had reported that the ner said he had made a trip Danner had reported that the

left over from the 1968 electhat it would give him too

Mr. Maheu testified that when Mr. Danner returned from Washington "certain po-Angeles.

Mr. Rebozo had called off the first attempt to give the Nixon donation, according to testimony, because the President's brother, F. Donald Nixon, and John Meier, a Hughes employe, would have played a role, which was not described.

Working through the then Governor of Nevada, Paul Laxalt, a Republican, Mr. Maheu testified he had accompanied Mr. Danner to use to meet the obligations.

Mr. Maheu testified he had accompanied Mr. Danner to use to meet the obligations.

Mr. Maheu testified he had accompanied Mr. Danner to use to meet the obligations, which was all very to Mr. Maheu testified he had accompanied Mr. Danner to was delivered to Mr. Rebozo at the President electrical was a result of the trip."

Mr. Maheu said he had ordered by Mr. Hughes, and turned it over to Mr. Danner to use to meet the obligations.

Mr. Maheu said he had ordered by Mr. Hughes, and turned it over to Mr. Danner to use to meet the obligations.

Mr. Maheu said he had ordered by Mr. Hughes, and turned it over to Mr. Danner to use to meet the obligations.

Mr. Maheu said he had ordered by Mr. Hughes, and turned it over to Mr. Danner to use to meet the obligations.

to Nixon

agents who were investigating Mr. Maheu. The circumstances

were seized upon in the questioning by Morton Galene, Mr. Maheu's lawyer.

Mr. Galane implied that the circumstances indicated improper acts by the revenue service in its investigation of Mr. Maheu, who was notified soon after Mr. Hughes dismissed him at the end of 1970 that he was the target of a criminal investigation.

Mr. Danner was interviewed by the agents in May, 1972. What upset Mr. Maheu's lawyer was the discloseure that the interview had been in the Hughes Tool Company board room in Houston, although both Mr. Danner and a tax agent interviewing him live in Las Vegas. The lawyer was also critical of the fact that the interview was observed by Mr. Davis, the chief counsel of the Hughes interests, but who Mr. Danner said did not represent him. Mr. Danner is still employed by Mr. Hughes. Two other Hughes employes were interviewed the same day, Mr. Danner said.

In April, 1973, some 11 months after the interview, the agents brought a transcript of his statement to him to sign or amend, Mr. Danner said. He made so many changes, he said, that they asked him instead to sign a newly drawn affidavit.

Among the changes he made, Mr. Danner said, were some that emphasized his uncertainty about the dates on which he gave the payments of \$50,000 to Mr. Rebozo.

Mr. Danner said that last Aug. 30 he was interviewed by investigators for the Senate Watergate committee who served a subpoena on him for an appearance before the committee but did not set a date.