By John P. MacKenzie Washington Post Staff Writer

long received specialing. Presidential tax handling, but the attention handling, out the attention given President Nixon's re-turns—from the filing to the rugged congressional auditappears to have no precedent.

Two Internal Revenue Service commissioners from the Kennedy-Johnson years, Mortimer M. Caplin and Sheldon S. Cohen, said yesterday that few, if any, Presidents have undergone audits, much less the massive inspection just completed by the IRS and a congressional committee staff.

the IRS, which resulted in a might not have been so sur-letter of commendation "on prising to have accepted Mr. the care shown in the prepara-Nixon's returns without call-

The author of the letter, William D. Waters, was promoted recently from director of the district office in Baltimore to chief of the IRS regional headquarters in Philadelphia. But the congressional audit said Mr. Nixon now should pay back taxes of \$110,-048 for 1970 and \$100,214 for 1971, and the IRS apparently agrees.

Caplin said the Waters let-ter was itself an indication of Caplin said there is no a possibly unique event, an known precedent for the first audit of presidential taxes ini audit Mr. Nixon received from tiated within the IRS itself. It

tion of your returns" for 1970 ing for an audit, he said, but it was surprising to see such compliments after an audit of returns that raised so many questions.

Caplin, IRS commissioner from 1961 to 1964, said the general practice has been to accept a President's returns "at face value" unless they showed some "obvious" errors. He said he never saw any major discrepancies in the returns of John F. Kennedy or Lyndon B. Johnson. Cohen, commissioner from 1965 to 1969, said he never saw Mr. Johnson's returns.

Usually the President's re-

turns were hand-delivered by render further such aid upon White House messenger, Caplin said, and the IRS has special security storage in one room for all the presidential returns since 1913, the first year of federal income taxa tion.

Both Caplin and Cohen said there was no precedent for the special services offered to Mr. tions. Nixon by Roger Barth, assistant to former commissioner Randolph W. Thrower.

Recently disclosed commu-ications with the White nications White House show that Barth advised Nixon aides on such devised Nixon aides on such details as whether wages paid to Julie Nixon Eisenhower should be deducted as a business expense, and offered to of Mr. Nixon's tax bill, based "investment property."

request.

Barth defended his role, saying White House tax inquiries showed that the President recognized that he was subject to the same laws as ordinary citizens. He added that members of Congress often get special IRS help with their tax ques-

Recalling that the President mente nce said he had practiced states. once considerable tax law, Cohen told the Women's National Democratic Club yesterday that Mr. Nixon and his aides had displayed "a shocking lack

on less information than was available to the auditors, had been in the \$360,000 range.

Caplin's guess did not include such items as the congressional staff recommenda-tion that Mr. Nixon declare as income \$27,015 in family travel at government expense and \$92,298 in personalized im-provements to his San Clemente and Key Biscayne es-

But Caplin noted that in one respect the staff may have opened up a new method of tax avoidance: Although disal-