

JL

Colby's blast

2/20/75

I had a visitor when the radio news was on and caught only part of the report of Colby's counterattack on criticism as unpatriotic and dangerous to the national security.

Idl has to see Mr. Maio, so we're accepting a delayed dinner invitation. This means I'll miss the TV news, which might show me his face and have more of his words and the Establishmentarian attitude.

I think we need the full text, not just the excerpts a reporter or desk man believe newsworthy. Especially not restricted to what the Post will use. If you can get it without much trouble there may be many uses. Or needs.

It was inevitable, so we can't blame it on the nuts who have worried us. Their value to the spooks and their partisans lies elsewhere, in giving a semblance of credibility to such complaints.

When Rockefeller/Belin issue their whitewash this nuttiness may be and I believe will be more important.

But if I were Colby I'd be using it now - unless they have reason to expect more of it - to help the partisans by giving them more than "national security" to chop with.

It is conspicuous to me that there has been no more from Gregory/Robert/Schoenman. They had promised more. I know it was to have included the Ex 133 A & B work Newcomb did for me. I have seen no such story. As recently as today, when he discussed the forensic-~~stances~~ meeting he covered, Finley had nothing new from them. Except Gregory's unavailability. Larry has not gotten any response to numerous calls asking for an interview.

(He may interview me on this if Gregory will <sup>not</sup> be interviewed, with the angle this is inevitable when there is no real investigation. He mentioned this in a letter covering more of the paranoid, subject to my approval. I made no reference to it after getting the letter and he didn't ask.)

Off the top, if anything like this eventuates - and I've not had time to think it through - I think the line might well be why have then not responded to WW IV?

Why are they silent in the face of such charges?

Why do they leave such questions unaddressed?

When they do not address such significant questions what else are people to do but assume the worst? What other explanation is there for the layman? Etc.

Have you any ideas, assuming one has a chance to be heard?

8:30 p.m. Fred Thompson was in the midst of his angled blast against the NYTimes on All Things Considered, NPR's evening news, when we got in the car leaving Idl's office. At the end the announcer said Harvey Idebengott, one of Thompson's WG minority counsel, had also had his say. We didn't hear HL and only heard part of Thompson, enough to get the line. This was followed by Lofton's ridicule from the right, a Gregorian variation about a guy who claimed the CIA had let a four-foot humanoid from outer space die and had kept 12 on ice at Wright-Patterson field after their craft crashed. (Ike had also rouched it.) Ipso facto all these nutty and extreme attacks on the CIA are endangering all national security, etcetcetc.

7 Democrats, 3 Republicans Are Named

# House Establishes Special Panel to Probe CIA

2/20/77

By George Lardner Jr.  
Washington Post Staff Writer

The House voted yesterday to conduct its own investigation of the Central Intelligence Agency and the government's other intelligence agencies after beating down a Republican bid for a bigger voice in the inquiry.

Speaker Carl Albert (D-Okla.) immediately named seven Democrats and three Republicans to the select committee that will be in charge of the investigation. Rep. Lucien N. Nedzi (D-Mich.), who already serves as standing House Armed Services subcommittee in charge of CIA oversight, was named chairman.

The House authorized creation of the committee by a vote of 86 to 10. It will have a maximum budget of \$750,000.

House Republicans, led by Rep. John B. Anderson (Ill.), pressed in vain for half of the seats on the committee as a guarantee that allegations of illegal or improper intelligence activities under Democratic as well as Republican administrations would be explored.

The Democratic majority refused to judge. The GOP bid was rejected by a virtually straight party-line vote of 265 to 141; only six Democratic congressmen joined the Republicans.

The Democrats appointed to the committee under Nedzi are Reps. Robert N. Giammo (Conn.); Don Edwards (Calif.); James V. Stanton (Ohio), Michael J. Harrington (Mass.), Ronald V. Dellums (Calif.) and Morgan F. Murphy (Ill.). The Republicans, who were picked by House Minority Leader John J. Rhodes (R-

Ariz.), are Reps. Robert McCloy (Ill.), David C. Treen (La.), and Robert W. Kaesten Jr. (Wis.).

During the House debate, both Anderson and McCloy complained that the heavily Democratic makeup of the committee would make the inquiry look like a "partisan effort" bent on overlooking any other agencies under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

"We want a thorough job for Democratic administrations as well as Republican," McCloy declared. "We don't want to have any cover-up of earlier activities."

Giammo, one of the spokesmen for the Democratic resolution creating the committee, denied any intent to use the inquiry for "partisan potshots" and predicted that the investigation would be even-handed.

"But we in the majority have report by next Jan. 31. The Senate committee has a Sept. 1 deadline for its report, but the panel is still in the organizational stages and will probably have to seek an extension.

Rep. William M. Brodhead (D-Mich.) said that "if the people wanted this House to be divided 50-50 between both parties, they would have voted that way" last fall. The House Republican vote was 145 to 289.

The Senate created its own select 11-member committee on intelligence operations last month. That panel's chairman, Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho), has indicated that he plans to meet with Nedzi shortly in hopes of reaching agreement on a "division of labor" and avoiding duplication of effort. The House committee was directed to submit its final

While Anderson's proposal for heavier GOP representation in the House inquiry was defeated, two other amendments he offered were accepted by the Democratic leadership and approved on voice vote.

One limits the House inquiry to a maximum budget of \$750,000, with no more than \$100,000 of that to be spent on outside consultants. The other calls for tight security precautions to prevent unauthorized disclosures of information and bars committee staff members from profiting with books, articles or speeches about the investigation.

Both the House and Senate inquiries were prompted by reports and allegations of illegal and improper surveillance of American citizens and other abuses of power, both by the CIA and the FBI. As one of those who pressed for the House investigation, Harrington had suggested that the chairmanship ought to go to a neutral third party rather than someone like Nedzi who was supposed to be overseeing CIA operations in the past. The House leadership, however, reportedly considers Nedzi a solid congressman and a possible counter-balance to Sen. Church, whom friends of the CIA look upon with great enthusiasm.