

Jaworski Says He Presses Inquiry Into I.T.T. Matter

By E. W. KENWORTHY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27 — Leon Jaworski, the special Watergate prosecutor, gave assurances today that his office "is vigorously pursuing" an investigation into allegations of wrongdoing, including possible "improper" White House influence, in "the I.T.T. matter."

The "I.T.T. matter" involves the merger of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation and Hartford Fire Insurance Company in 1969 and the settlement of an antitrust suit in July, 1971, that permitted I.T.T. to retain Hartford.

Mr. Jaworski's assurance of a vigorous investigation into possible misconduct by the corporation, or Government officials came today in a letter to Representative J. J. Pickle of Texas, the ranking Democrat on the investigations subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee.

That subcommittee, which has oversight responsibility for the Securities and Exchange Commission, has been investigating various aspects of the merger and settlement for nearly a year.

Letter Pleases Pickle

Mr. Jaworski told Mr. Pickle that his office had jurisdiction over "all allegations of misconduct by Government officials, including allegations of improper influence in connection with the S.E.C. and I.R.S. [Internal Revenue Service] proceedings," and that these allegations "are being or will be investigated."

Mr. Jaworski further informed Mr. Pickle that he and Acting Attorney General Robert H. Bork had agreed that the special prosecutor's office would have responsibility for investigating "allegations of Federal criminal offenses by executives, including alleged misconduct in the relationship between I.T.T. and any Federal agency or official."

Mr. Pickle said that he was "pleased with the clarifying letter." He added, "Mr. Jaworski is a man of integrity. Now that that the possible jurisdictional hole has been filled, I have the fullest confidence in his pursuit of the facts behind the I.T.T."

Mr. Jaworski's letter followed

a mix-up over investigative jurisdiction between his office and other Federal agencies during an exchange of notes among Mr. Pickle, Mr. Jaworski and Mr. Bork.

On Oct. 31 and Nov. 1, Mr. Pickle wrote to them, saying that he was concerned, as a result of testimony before the subcommittee in December, 1972, and June, 1973, about five matters.

Questions Are Raised

He indicated that the following questions had been raised about possible perjury and obstruction of justice, questions that had been referred to the gation.

¶Whether William J. Casey, former S.E.C. chairman, acting "with the knowledge and encouragement of certain White House officials" had "improperly" tried to keep 13 politically sensitive I.T.T. documents detailing meetings in 1970-71 between company and Administration officials away from Congress by sending them to the Justice Department on Oct. 6, 1972.

¶Whether John D. Ehrlichman, former domestic affairs adviser to the President, had obstructed justice under the Federal criminal code when, according to Mr. Casey's testimony, he had asked the S.E.C. chairman on March 6, 1972, whether the S.E.C. staff found it necessary to subpoena these sensitive documents.

¶Whether Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst acted improperly when after receiving the 13 documents from Mr. Casey on Aug. 25, 1972, he did not send them to the Criminal Division of the Justice Department for investigation.

¶Whether Charles W. Colson, former White House special counsel had committed perjury when he told the investigations subcommittee last June 14 that he had not seen the documents, except for one addressed to himself, until shown them that morning by the subcommittee staff. Mr. Pickle said that in a memo to the White House chief of staff, H. R. Haldeman, on March 30, 1972, Mr. Colson said he had examined "all the documents."