104-10065-10033

SECRET

File HSR A

DRAFT 12 September 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

VIA : Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : S.D. Breckinridge

SUBJECT : Letter of 11 September 1978 from

Chairman Stokes, House Select Committee on Assassinations

1. Action Requested: A recommendation for your approval is at paragraph 3.

- 2. <u>Background</u>: The House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) has let a subpoena lapse without execution, and the 11 September letter from Chairman Stokes, a copy of which is attached, lists five items of interest to the Committee, some of which were the subject of the earlier request. The five items are noted and commented on briefly below:
 - a. The letter specifies interest in "mug books" shown to a Cuban defector. Having raised the questions, the letter then goes on to say that this "is no longer a matter in dispute." The material has been available for review by HSCA personnel for some two weeks now.
 - b. The Committee is interested in "all debriefing memoranda" relating to a Cuban defector. This was one of the subjects in the subpoena and relates to a labriefing memorandum

SEURET

00° 5719

SEORET

(numbered 40) in a series of sequentially numbered documents. In fact, we believe that a debriefing memorandum that is unnumbered, but that appears to have been in sequence of debriefings, has been reviewed by the HSCA investigator. That investigator has been briefed on this and a written summary has been available for his review. Chairman Stokes may not have been informed accurately on this point and we think that the explanation available is a valid one.

- c. The HSCA requests "all files and file references" to a person not named in the letter, but who was William K. Harvey. The HSCA has seen the official personnel folder on Mr. Harvey for the period requested (1959-1966). The Office of Security files were also reviewed, but these had been sanitized to remove references to personal difficulties experienced by him in a later part of his career. No complaint had been made to the Office of Security about the sanitization, and they are ready to show these sections to a senior member, only, on the HSCA staff.
- d. The HSCA request for "the three volume history and analysis" of the Mexico City
 Station was a subject of the subpoena. It is

-- - SFORET -- C

inaccurate to describe it as an anlysis, and it is more a compilation of terse summaries than a true history. It covers a in the history of the Station from to 1969. with a wide range of subject matter that by any normal reasoning is irrelevant to the question of the assassination of President Kennedy. rationale offered up by Mr. Blakey is that he must understand the history of the Station to evaluate its performance during the investigation of the assassination. While the position has been that this is irrelevant to the charter of the Committee, LA Division is prepared to let either Mr. Blakey or his deputy, Mr. Cornwell, review this. We realize that both gentlemen are very busy, but the total compilation is too sensitive to let the young men on the staff have access to it.

e. The request for access to "all files and file references to a Cuban citizen" for the period 1 September 1963 through 31 January 1964 raises the question of the Proenza case and a deception operation in which Miss Proenza was one of the targets. Contrary to the statement in the letter,

SECRET: C

14-00000

a House investigator was shown the 201 file for the period from January 1963 through May 1964. Access to the operation file on the deception matter was denied the Committee on the recommendation of the DDO, approved by the DDCI. LA Division certifies that the operation file, for the period requested, contains no references to assassination plotting or any subject that could by extension be related to the subject of the investigation. The origin of the interest in this was in Miss Proenza herself, and the relevant period about her and any ties to her association with the Agency would be reflected in her 201 file. The Committee interest in the unrelated sensitive operation seems unreasonable to us.

3. Recommendation: It is recommended that a meeting be arranged between either you or Mr. Carlucci and Chairman Stokes to review our understanding of the status of the first four items, which have already been satisfied or can be, and to persuade the Chairman to not precipitate a confrontation on the sensitive operational file.

S. D. Breckinridge