

RABORN REBUFFS FULBRIGHT PANEL

Says Senate Should Decide
Who Gets C.I.A. Data

WASHINGTON, June 17 (AP)—The Director of the Central Intelligence has informed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that he is willing to give it "substantive intelligence information"—but will not disclose "sources and methods," which he reveals to another Senate committee.

And that, Adm. William F. Raborn said in a letter Wednesday to Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, was the only kind of question the committee asked that he refused to answer at a February briefing that helped trigger the current Senate clash over who supervises cloak - and - dagger activities.

The exchange of letters, which was learned today, between Admiral Raborn and Senator Fulbright was interpreted as probably killing the last chance for a compromise that would avert a Senate floor fight between the two committees on the touchy issue.

Up to the Senate

Admiral Raborn put it diplomatically: "I have previously stated, once before your committee, that Senate supervision of the agency (C.I.A.) seems to be one which the Senate itself would want to resolve."

In attempting to keep the Senate from resolving it with a potentially embarrassing floor fight, the Senate Democratic leader, Mike Mansfield, has tried to work out a number of compromises.

Senator Fulbright's group has argued that because of its jurisdiction over foreign relations it should have some role in overseeing activities of the intelligence agency.

He and some committee members were disturbed when Admiral Raborn acknowledged in the February briefing that he did not feel he could give them as detailed information as he gives the Senate's executive C.I.A. watchdog subcommittee.

Russell Opposed

That committee, headed by Richard B. Russell, Democrat of Georgia and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, opposes a resolution approved by Senator Fulbright's group to add three of its members to Senator Russell's seven-man panel.

In what apparently was a compromise move, Senator Fulbright wrote Admiral Raborn Monday and said "it has been suggested" that he find out

whether the agency would give its recognition to a C.I.A. subcommittee set up by the Foreign Relations Committee.

In the response two days later Admiral Raborn said of the February meeting:

"The questions to which I stated I was unable to respond were questions directed to the activities of the agency as to 'sources and methods,' rather than to substantive intelligence information."

He said in declining to answer these questions he was following past practice and added, "the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, according to my understanding, is responsible for Senate oversight of C.I.A. and was thus the Senate body to be so informed."