

White House Says ITT Leak Proves Cox's Bias

Washington

The White House charged yesterday that the disclosure of President Nixon's intervention in an antitrust case supported Mr. Nixon's contention that Archibald Cox had been running a partisan investigation for months before he was dismissed as special Watergate prosecutor.

The statement, apparently approved by the President, was made by Deputy Press Secretary Gerald L. Warren after Cox acknowledged in congressional testimony that he may have been the indirect source of the disclosure.

Cox referred to a story in yesterday's New York Times that said Mr. Nixon ordered the Justice Department in 1971 not to appeal a phase of the case against the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, even though administration officials had testified repeatedly that the President had played no such role in the case.

CAPITAL

The disclosure set off several reverberations in a capital that was still reeling from the Cox dismissal and the Justice Department shakeup.

They included the following developments:

- Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, the Senate Republican leader, joined the White House in the attack against Cox and his staff of lawyers, saying he found the news leak "very disturbing" and that the lawyers, who are still on the government payroll, should be questioned as to their "loyalty."

- The White House, while decrying the leak of confi-

Back Page, Col. 5

From Page 1

dential information, maintained that Mr. Nixon had every right to intervene as he did in the ITT case in his legitimate interest of directing "antitrust policy." This was believed to be the first time it was proven that a recent president had directly

More Nixon news on Pages 8 and 9

intervened in an antitrust case in the courts, although there had been frequent allegations of such action in the past.

- The future of the staff of about 40 lawyers that Cox had assembled was more than ever in doubt as both the White House and Scott accused them, too, of partisan action against the President.

- Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Dem-Mass.), said that Cox, after he was fired, told him about the President's action, not as part of a criminal case but as a "single shocking example" of how the judiciary committee had been lied to by administration officials earlier this year in the confirmation hearings for former Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst.

MATTER

Cox said he did not supply any of the information to the New York Times but added that he had spoken of the matter to Kennedy and a member of his staff; to Senator Philip A. Hart (Dem-Mich.) and a member of his staff; and to two law associates of Cox, who had helped him set up the office of special prosecutor, James Vornberg and Philip B. Heyman of Cambridge, Mass.

"I was greatly upset," Cox said when he saw the

article yesterday morning. "I may have spoken more freely than perhaps I should have."

"It is quite clear I broke the attorney general's confidence," he said. "I feel terrible this morning."

But Cox said that his staff had been very diligent in protecting the confidentiality of information gathered in its investigation and he had assurances from the two Senators that they had not leaked the information.

New York Times