

WXPost FEB 4 1976
Pike Data
Action Up
To Albert

By Walter Pincus

Washington Post Staff Writer

The future of the controversial House intelligence committee report was left to Speaker Carl Albert (D-Okla.) yesterday as committee members and staff employees fired charges and countercharges over the report's content and quality.

Committee Chairman Otis G. Pike (D-N.Y.) yesterday refused to permit his committee to recommend how distribution of the report should be handled.

He won support for his position that since the House blocked publication of the report last Thursday his committee no longer has authority to recommend either distribution of the report to House members as a classified document or negotiations with the White House to delete portions the White House believes should not be made public.

House Clerk Edward Henshaw has custody of the printed copies of the report and said through a spokesman that he will await orders from Albert.

Rep. Dale Milford (D-Tex.) was one of the committee members critical of the report. He said in an interview: "Over 50 per cent of the charges and conclusions are not based on the committee record. . . They come from resources you can't find in the committee record and from material the committee itself never considered."

The House intelligence committee staff director, A. Searle Field, responded that staff interviews under oath, documents supplied by the CIA, closed hearings plus the public record referred to by Milford provided the basis for the report.

"Almost every line is documented and footnoted," Field said, "and every committee member had access to that material."

Rep. Robert McClory (R-Ill.) called the report "a diatribe against the CIA."

"The report was not pulled out of the air," Field said. "Charges are now being made because no one has the report and can judge for himself."

In his final press conference Jan. 26, former CIA Director William E. Colby charged that the report's statement about the CIA's "frequent manipulation of Reuter wire service dispatches" was an example of the committee staff "taking a side

PIKE, From A1

reference" during an interview with him, "and making a major statement of it."

Colby, along with Reuter officials, have denied any CIA manipulation had taken place, and the report does not contain any specific examples.

Field, however, said the report was not based solely on Colby's interview. "That is all Colby is aware of," Field said. "We went out, and checked with other people."

Another committee member, Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.), has explored the possibility of rewriting some portions of the report. "The charges and conclusions just are not supported by the footnotes," one congressional aide said.

McClory said he considers the report "a 'pure, cheap paperback substitute' for the serious work done by the committee. 'I'd like to throw the whole report out and start over.'"

Field said that charges of poor writing "were never raised during the week the members studied the document."

Another controversy surrounds the last-minute inclusion in the report of a CIA memo outlining how Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) made suggestions to CIA Director Richard Helms on how to head off a Senate

inquiry into the agency's operations in Chile.

The memo was added as a footnote after the first draft had been delivered to committee members and the CIA. Reporters covering the committee, however, had been alerted to its existence.

One source, who read the memo in context, said its connection to a description of CIA methods of reporting to Congress was "tenuous" although that was where it was footnoted in the report.

Further complicating this controversy is the allegation by the CIA's lawyer, Mitchell Rogovin, that a copy of the Jackson memo was missing from a reading file provided a committee staff member at CIA headquarters in Langley. Under the CIA-committee procedures, no documents were to be taken from reading files but rather were to be requested for later delivery.

Pike has denied the paper was taken from the file, saying there were other available sources for it. Jackson's supporters believe, however, that the memo was put in the report to embarrass his campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Field and Committee counsel Jack Boos put together the initial overall draft report which was returned to each investigator

for checking and final footnotes.

Field takes issue with some committee members who have argued that the requested deletions would not change the substance of the report. The CIA, in its requests for deletions, included suggested rewrites mainly for the section on covert operations.

"They took a horrible, distasteful, venture," Field said referring to an undisclosed covert operation in the report, "and rewrote it to look like a success."

Field said the leaks of portions of the report to the press "hurt us badly" by "creating a phony issue that played into the executive's hands." He argued, however, that no one outside the committee has a full copy because "several major sections have not been reported."