

By ANTHONY RIPLEY Special to The New York Times

Special to The New York Times WASHINGTON, April 24— The Watergate special prosecu-for's inquiry into illegal cam-paign donations has broadened into an investigation of Federal officials who might have done favors for the big donors, ac-cording to sources close to the investigation.

favors for the big gonors, ac-cording to sources close to the investigation. The inquiry began by focus-ing mainly on businessmen who gave money. Its aim has now changed to one first suggested last August under former spe-cial prosecutor Archibald Cox: Studying whether Federal de-partments and regulatory agen-cies tempered their rulings in response to White House pres-sure generated by campaign contributions. The general change in direc-tion, unannounced by the pres-ent special prosecutor, Leon Jaworski, was made several months ago, the sources said. Staff members for Mr. Cox drew up last year a list of items in which it was thought "undue influence" might have been drew up last year a list of items in which it was thought "undue influence" might have been brought to bear by the White House. One list showed more than 20 items relating to at least half a dozen Federal agencies and departments. Mr. Cox approved the plan to set up a study group to handle the subject but the plan was never pressed, the sources handle the subject but the plan was never pressed, the sources said, because of a lack of staff and because it seemed to over-lap with existing efforts. A number of the items on the original list were studied and then dropped for lack of avidence, one source at the

evidence, one source at the special prosecutor's office said. But early this year, the cam-paign contributions group, un-der Thomas F. McBride, began moving in the direction of "undue influence."

"undue influence." The campaign contributions group adopted an early policy of making an example of the first few corporate donors. The idea was to show others who might have given illegal dona-tions that the law was after them and perhaps snowball a dozen more corporations into

them and perhaps snowball a dozen more corporations into coming forward voluntarily and admitting their guilt. In the last three months of 1973, nine corporations and eight corporate officers were taken to court, the last on Dec. 19. Then there seemed to be a pause as the strategy shifted. On Feb. 21, Jake Jacobsen, an Austin, Tex., lawyer, was indicted by a Watergate grand jury on perjury charges involv-

Campaign Donors Under White Hous e

ing \$10,000 in cash that he sen's indictment, Herbert W. with the special prosecutor and touched in a safe deposit box. The special prosecutor contended in the indictment that lawyer and one of his top camatement in the indictment that an illegal campaign committee Milk Producers, Inc., "was to be paid to a public official for bassador a better assignment in his assistance in connection with the price support decision." A major impact of the indictment that going after the donor of the dairy farmer group. Former Treasury Secretary John B. Connally has said that Mr. Jacobsen made Milcal to him for political purposes, but that he ever used it. Four days after Mr. Jacob-

Pressur

volved denied the Kalmbach quote and the lawyer said the money had never been paid. He said the International Tele-phone and Telegraph Corpora-tion case had broken open with allegations of a favorable antitrust settlement for I.T.T. in exchange for a \$400,000 pledge to the Republican Na-tional Convention. The result-ing publicity made Mr. Kalm-bach cautious, the lawyer said. But if there is any truth to in a position to tell the special prosecutor just how such a matter could be arranged. The campaign contributions study group has not abandoned its actions against money giv-ers, however. Last March 7 a case was brought against the inter the story in the special prosecutor just how such a matter could be arranged. The campaign contributions study group has not abandoned its actions against money giv-ers, however. Last March 7 a case was brought against the inter the story how such a matter could be arranged. The campaign contributions study group has not abandoned its actions against money giv-ers, however. Last March 7 a case was brought against the inter the special comparison of the two investigations of the special prosecutor in which the two investigations of the special prosecutor in the two investigations of the special prosecutor in the special prosecutor i