

NY Times
**F.B.I. Study of Watergate Paper
 With Alleged Excision Reported**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 21— Well-placed sources said today that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was looking into an apparent excision from a White House document subpoenaed by the special Watergate prosecutor, Leon Jaworski.

The sources declined to specify the nature of the document or of the excised material, which they said was contained in two paragraphs that had been severed from a page of the memorandum. But, they said, Mr. Jaworski ordered the inquiry after his aides noted that the introduction was followed by a paragraph numbered "3."

If the first two paragraphs were removed after the subpoena demanding it was issued by the prosecutors, that might amount to the criminal offense of destroying evidence. However, informed White House sources maintained that the excision took place "long ago," well before the creation of special Watergate prosecution force last May.

Spokesman for Mr. Jaworski said they would have no comment on the sources' account.

Sources on both sides also would not say from whose files the document had been taken, or whether the F.B.I. had determined who was responsible

for making the cut, apparently with scissors, from the second page of the memorandum written on White House stationery.

Bureau agents attached to the special prosecutor's office have been investigating for weeks the circumstances surrounding an 18½-minute buzzing portion on a tape recording of a conversation between President Nixon and H. R. Haldeman that was also subpoenaed by Mr. Jaworski.

But the disclosure today, published first by The Los Angeles Times, marked the first indication of anomalies in any of the documentary evidence turned over to the prosecutors by the White House.

Mr. Jaworski hinted at the existence of other irregularities, however, in a letter last week to the Senate Judiciary Committee. He noted then that he had requested an F.B.I. investigation "into the possible obstruction of justice arising out of the destruction or alteration of evidence."

Sources speculated that, because of the obviousness with which the two paragraphs had been deleted — the excised page is shorter than the first one — it appeared not to have been done by someone who was aware that the material might eventually become evidence in the Watergate case.