

CIA (D)  
**OFFICIALS DIVIDED  
ON SPY AGENCIES**

FEB 16 1976

**Ford Reform Plan Could Be  
Delayed by Disputes—  
Meeting Today Set**  
NYTimes

By **NICHOLAS M. HORROCK**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 15—

Sharp disputes within the Administration over proposals to control the intelligence agencies could delay President Ford's announcement of reforms and dilute their impact, Administration sources said today.

The White House has scheduled a tentative meeting tomorrow with the heads of the intelligence agencies in hopes of ironing out differences over four areas of proposed controls. If agreement can be reached, President Ford is expected to make some public announcement of his reforms on Wednesday.

Nevertheless, both Administration and intelligence sources confirmed, the schisms are deep and emotional.

"There are people in the Government with some very strong feeling on these issues," one source said. An intelligence source said that one published report on the President's plan contained "a tone of finality that was wishful thinking."

#### 4 Areas in Dispute

The proposals creating the clearest differences, the sources said, fall into these areas: giving the director of Central Intelligence the power to control other intelligence agencies' operations, publication of the tasks of the various agencies, creation of a White House panel to oversee intelligence operations, and what legislative proposals the White House should make.

On the first point, a study group within the White House headed by a Presidential counsel, John O. Marsh Jr., has prepared a plan to end a power struggle over who should head the intelligence community that has been fought since the National Security Act of 1947 created the post of Director of Central Intelligence.

The proposal would give the

## Officials Divided on Ford Plan To Recast Intelligence Agencies

Continued From Page 1, Col. 4

director the tools to govern—budgetary control over member agencies—that he has lacked.

The Department of Defense, however, is strongly opposed to the concept of a director who would oversee all intelligence activities. The argument is deep-seated. For instance, a director of intelligence with budgetary control would, in effect, have command over large expenditures actually made by the Defense Department. It would that the Secretary of Defense, Donald H. Rumsfeld, and his new deputy for intelligence, Robert F. Ellsworth, would have less power on intelligence decisions than George Bush, the Director of Central Intelligence.

The second issue in disputes is that the White House plan calls for publicly outlining the roles of the intelligence agencies and the publication, in general terms, of the limitations Mr. Ford plans to place on them.

Several powerful segments of the intelligence community oppose this publication. They argue, for instance, that the United States has never before felt it had to identify the agencies it had doing secret work and that there is no need to now. Moreover, they say this country has not established what legitimate secrets are and it may be that once the nation selects a limit for official secrecy, some agencies and activities would "legitimately" remain in the shadows.

#### Task of N.S.A.

Particularly sensitive, these sources said, is whether the nation can officially disclose the assignment of the National Security Agency, which does worldwide electronic intelligence collection, without harming security.

State Department and long-time Central Intelligence Agency officials have opposed publishing the tasks of secret agencies on diplomatic grounds. They argue that once the United States establishes officially that certain agencies are in the field of intelligence and espionage, foreign governments must then officially oppose their operating in those countries.

The third area of controversy is over the question of oversight of the intelligence community within the executive branch. President Ford has already decided not to attempt to influence the method Congress

control of intelligence, the sources said.

The White House plan envisages a four-man or five-man oversight board within the executive branch that would get direct reports from the inspector generals of the various agencies. However, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which has a counterintelligence function, would not be covered this apparatus, one source said.

#### Stronger Agencies

The Administration decided last summer to strengthen the inspector general offices of the agencies and the C.I.A.'s office already has an expanded staff.

This move would downgrade the Presidential Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, which was created in the early 1960's to advise the President on intelligence matters.

The new board would have the power to recommend to the Attorney General that a particular activity in a particular agency was abusive and subject to possible disciplinary action or prosecution.

Some elements of the intelligence community have complained that this is unnecessary since the outcry in Congress and the country for control of intelligence has abated.

There's also controversy over what legislation the President should offer. Most officials agree that a strengthening of sanctions against the disclosure of national security information, a sort of official secrets act, is needed. The White House plan would provide legal penalties for violations by persons who signed a secrecy agreement in their government work.

There are substantial areas of Mr. Ford's proposals that are not controversial and that have been reported in the press over the last year.

The White House plan brings the entire foreign intelligence apparatus more directly under Presidential control, excludes political assassination as a technique of covert action, and sharply limits and defines covert actions in general.

The Attorney General would assume a stronger role in oversight and discipline of abuses and would have to approve electronic surveillance and mail opening in intelligence cases throughout government.

The 40 Committee, the section of the National Security Council that advises the President on covert actions, would be required to meet and make its decisions in a more formal manner with records that provide a history of operations.

Continued on Page 20, Column 4