

OGC 73-0994

(b)(3)
(b)(6)

4 June 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT:

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

REFERENCE:

1 Jun 73 Memo for Record fr General Counsel "Watergate Case"

1. The Inspector General furnished me information which indicated that [Redacted] whose name had come up in my conversation with FBI representatives as described in referent, [Redacted]

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

2. I called Mr. Angelo Joseph Lano of the FBI and gave him this information, saying we had had no contact with [Redacted] since his retirement except in connection with an income tax case. Mr. Lano said he had been thinking over the problem of why they had been called off and felt that maybe it was a general direction against further investigations in [Redacted] rather than a prohibition as to one individual. He thanked me for giving him the information on [Redacted]

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON
General Counsel

Att-Referent and
Background on Subject

cc: ES/CIA MC
IG

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

W-5

1 June 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Watergate Case

1. At their request, I met with Mr. Daniel C. Mahan and Mr. Angelo Joseph Lano of the FBI on 1 June 1973. They said they wished to discuss the so-called McCord letters received by the Agency beginning in July 1972 through early January 1973. They told me that after talking to the U. S. Attorney they thought it proper to give me a Miranda warning for which they had a standard form which I signed.

2. I gave them a copy of the affidavit I had prepared for the congressional hearings and then talked to them at some length about the circumstances and rationale for not sending the first McCord letter to the Bureau. I said the decision on the first letter controlled the handling of the succeeding letters which they could query Mr. Howard Osborn about. Mr. Mahan had some difficulty in understanding why I did not read the first letter as indicating a possible high level cover up and I merely asked him to consider the position we were in at the time in early August of 1972 and read the letter in that light. I also explained how we had traditionally worked with U. S. Attorneys in those cases where defendants had tried to involve the Agency in a criminal defense. I did say that at the time we prepared the October 24, 1972 report to the Attorney General, which I had discussed on the 24th with Mr. Petersen so he could brief Mr. Silbert, it was a pure failure of memory on my part that the letters were not included and there was no reason whatsoever at that time why they could not have been given to Mr. Silbert. Actually when we compared notes it was agreed there was only the original letter at that time but we could

have given the succeeding letters as they came in. I again said I could only plead a faulty memory for not thinking of the letters after the cover up became apparent but they did not come to mind until I was reminded after a check at Mr. Silbart's request for the latest contacts with Mr. McCord.

3. At the request of Messrs. Mahan and Lano, Mr. Osborn joined us and we gave them Mr. Osborn's affidavit and Mr. Gaynor's affidavit. They said these in effect answered all the questions they wanted to ask Mr. Osborn and we spent a while discussing other aspects of the Watergate case. In particular they said they were bewildered why when they wanted to talk to a [redacted] in [redacted] in July 1972 they were called off by higher authority. They thought [redacted] had something to do with the Agency. I said I had never heard of this and did not see why we would have interfered. I said I would check and let them know.

[redacted]

LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON
General Counsel

OGC:LRH [redacted]

Note for File:

[redacted]

cc: ✓ ES/CIA MC
IG