

CONFIDENTIAL

File

DRAFT

23 Aug 78

copy hand carried to

Acting Leg Counsel
OGC (Rininger)
SA/DDCI
ADDO.

Honorable Louis Stokes, Chairman
Select Committee on Assassinations
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Subsequent to our telephone conversation on 16 August, at which time you informed me that subpoenas had been voted by the Committee for four items of information, the matter has been the subject of exchanges between your representatives and mine. I assume that you are now aware that one of the items had been reviewed by one of your staff representatives the morning of the day before you told me the subpoena was voted. Another was for a paper that cannot be located, relating to a file that had been reviewed by your representatives. I assume these do not pose a question. The other two items, the subject of this letter, appear to have developed into a different problem.

One of these two remaining items deals with a history of the Mexico City Station, covering the period ⁰⁹ [] to 1969. That history contains only a few pages of reference to the five day visit of Lee Harvey Oswald to Mexico City (and that is described incorrectly), and to related subsequent events. This material has been reviewed by your representatives. Other than these few references the balance of the history deals with operational and management developments over a ⁰⁸ [22] year

22321

CONFIDENTIAL

RETURN TO CIA
Background Use Only
Do Not Reproduce

3/90

CONFIDENTIAL

period unrelated to the objective of your inquiry. In its entirety it constitutes a highly sensitive collection of information that should receive the most restricted handling.

The other item has to do with the so-called 201 file of a Cuban citizen, and a Covert Action operation in which she featured as one of those affected by it. The activity transcends the time period of the death of President Kennedy, its results evidencing themselves subsequently over the ensuing year and more. The nature of that operation has been described to Mr. Blakey and Mr. Cornwell. It is of an unusually sensitive nature, with ramifications well beyond the subject of your inquiry.

We engaged in discussions with Mr. Cornwell, trying in good faith to arrive at a procedure whereby your staff could have access to relevant materials, and at the same time limit the unnecessary exposure of unrelated sensitive operational activity. At his request, we took sections of the history designated by him and made them available for review, with knowledgeable officers present to discuss with him questions that may arise. Similarly, at Mr. Cornwell's directions, we provided the material from the 201 file of the individual of interest to your Committee for the period 1 September 1963 through 31 January 1964. Mr. Cornwell was able to review these various materials only hurriedly on 18 August, to be reviewed further by him on his return from Dallas. The 201 file in question was made available for review by your investigators.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

On 22 August Mr. Blakey came to review these materials but declined to review the history, insisting that he should see it all. Further, Mr. Blakey rejected the principle of any limitation on his review of the 201 file of the person in whom your Committee is interested. He also insisted on seeing the separate operational files as well, although advised that the activity was unusually sensitive and unrelated. In essence, this negated the progress made to date. In fact, we understand Mr. Blakey is indicating that the Committee plans to go ahead with its subpoenas.

I believe that you will recall that unusual access was extended to your Committee, specifically reserving, however, the question of special handling of material depending on their bearing on the authorized study and investigation, and on considerations of sensitivity. We were unaware that there was any problem different from any number of daily working problems encountered in this inquiry, until your subpoena. In fact, as noted, on two of the issues addressed by the subpoena your representatives had reviewed available material. Subsequent to that, the rather detailed exchanges between your representatives and mine had appeared to have been entered into in good faith, and we had proceeded accordingly. At this point please be advised of the sensitivity that bears on the handling of this material, if you have not been so advised previously by your staff.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Further, please be advised of my view that except as noted above, they do not appear germane to your authorization.

I trust that we will have the opportunity to discuss this candidly rather than under the conditions resulting from the subpoenas voted by your Committee. Please let me know when you return to Washington so we can discuss further how we might handle the matter.

Sincerely,

CONFIDENTIAL