
Agency Information

AGENCY : HSCA
RECORD NUMBER : 180-10111-10191
RECORD SERIES : NUMBERED FILES
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 014624

Document Information

ORIGINATOR : HSCA
FROM :
TO :

TITLE : EXECUTIVE SESSION-BUSINESS MEETING

DATE : 11/15/1976
PAGES : 146

SUBJECTS :
HSCA, ADMINISTRATION, STAFF
WC
SPRAGUE, RICHARD A.
PHOTOGRAPHS AND FILMS

DOCUMENT TYPE : TRANSCRIPT
CLASSIFICATION : Unclassified
RESTRICTIONS : Open in Full
CURRENT STATUS : Redact
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 08/17/1993

OPENING CRITERIA :

COMMENTS : Hearings 3 successive folders (2-2), 1st hearing marked "Dupolicate Corrections", also Dodd's opening statement. MLK materials withdrawn pp. 31-35. Box #:263.

*Duplicate
Connections*

01462

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

ON

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, November 15, 1976

Washington, D. C.

Official Reporters to Committees

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EXECUTIVE SESSION

5212
CAPS
CTR

Committee
BUSINESS MEETING

- 5 -
- 74 -

1268
CAPS
CTR

Monday, November 15, 1976

U.S. House of Representatives, [] [] [] []

Select Committee on Assassinations, [] [] [] []

Washington, D. C. []

The committee proceeded into executive session at 10:35 a.m., in Room 2310, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Thomas N. Downing (Chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Downing, (presiding), Devine, Gonzalez, McKinney, Preyer, Thone, Stokes, Fauntroy, Burke, Dodd, Ford, and Anderson.

Also present: Richard A. Sprague, Chief Counsel and Director; Kenneth Brooten, Counsel; Donovan L. Gay, Chief Researcher; Richard Feeney, Billie Gay Larson, Rebecca Martin, Committee Staff; Gus Edwards, Christine Groden, Robert Groden, Consultants; Gail Beagle, Bruce Gwinn, Percy Harvey, Joe McGee, Vicki Peckham Administrative Assistants; Peter D. Lennon, Robert H. Maloney, Henry Spring, Legal Assistants; Quentin L. Burgess, Staff Assistant; and William Briggs, Staff Member.

1 Chairman Downing. For the purposes of the record, I
2 would like each person in the room to identify themselves
3 with their title.

4 Mr. Burgess. Quentin Burgess. I am with Mrs. Burke's
5 office.

6 Mr. Maloney. Robert Maloney. Congressman Stokes'
7 office.

8 Ms. Beagle. Gail Beagle, Congressman Gonzalez's office.

9 ~~Mr.~~ Mrs. Martin. Rebecca Martin, with the committee staff.

10 Mr. Gay. Donovan L. Gay, committee staff.

11 Mr. Sprague. Richard A. Sprague, chief counsel.

12 Mr. Feeney. Richard Feeney, committee staff.

13 Ms. Peckham. Vicki Peckham, Mr. Thone's office.

14 Ms. Larson. Billie Gay Larson, committee staff.

15 Mr. Lennon. Peter Lennon, Mr. Dodd's staff.

16 Mr. McGee. Joe McGee, Mr. McKinney' staff.

17 Mr. Spring. Henry Spring, Mr. McKinney's office.

18 Ms. Groden. Christine Groden, consultant.

19 Mr. Groden. Robert Groden, consultant.

20 Mr. Briggs. William Briggs, Congressman Fauntroy's staff.

21 Chairman Downing. The first item on the executive
22 session will be a presentation by Mr. Sprague.

23 Mr. Sprague. Mr. Chairman and members of the select
24 committee:

25 I would like to take up what has been done up to this

1 point, what analysis has been made by the staff with regard
2 to what the needs are of staff in the direction of the
3 investigation. Suffice to say that in being asked to
4 become chief counsel and director of this investigation,
5 I have entered upon those duties with a number of assumptions.
6 The first assumption is that it is the intent of the Congress
7 in passing the resolution on the investigation of the two
8 assassinations of Dr. King and President Kennedy, to see
9 that the investigations are done in a thorough professional
10 manner, the kind of manner that can withstand, as it ought
11 to, any searching analysis as to what has been done on a
12 day-by-day basis.

13 ¶ With that in mind, I have also accepted the basic
14 assumption that since one of the reasons that these
15 investigations have come to pass is that $\frac{2}{H}$

16 Chairman Downing. Let me interrupt, Mr. Sprague.

17 John Anderson has been appointed to fill in the vacancy
18 IN THE POSITION formerly occupied by Congress^{MAN} Talcott, and he is on his way
19 here now, so if you will just desist for the moment, and
20 we will wait for Mr. Anderson.

21 [Short recess.]

22 Chairman Downing. The committee will again come to
23 order.

24 I have a letter here from Mr. John J. Rhodes, minority
25 leader, addressed to the Speaker: "As a result of the

1 resignation of the Honorable Burt L. Talcott for the
2 Select Committee on Assassinations, I now make the appointment
3 of the Honorable John B. Anderson."

4 *P* Mr. Anderson, welcome aboard. This committee is very
5 grateful to have your talents.

6 Mr. Anderson, Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

7 Mr. Harvey. Percy Harvey from Mr. Harold Ford's staff.
8 Chairman Downing. John, Mr. Sprague is just beginning
9 his presentation.

10 All right, Mr. Sprague.

11 Mr. Sprague. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I will just
12 start from the beginning.

13 As I was stating, upon taking this position as chief
14 counsel and director, I have taken it with a number of
15 assumptions which I think I ought to state preliminarily.
16 One is that the Congress of the United States, in passing
17 the resolution for the Select Committee on Assassinations,
18 intends that there be a thorough, hopefully definitive
19 investigation with regard to each of the assassinations,
20 Martin Luther King and President Kennedy.

21 Second~~ly~~, I have made an assumption that one of the
22 reasons that these investigations have come into being is
23 that questions have arisen, criticism has arisen, with
24 regard to prior investigations, the extent to which other
25 agencies of government, particularly the ~~Executive~~ Branch
of government, participated in those previous investigations,

1 and the extent to which those other agencies withheld
2 information, or did certain acts that perhaps indicate
3 destruction of documents affecting the results of the
4 investigation.

5 ¶ I am not stating, saying whether those things are
6 so or not. I want to say to this committee that I have
7 no conclusions, I have not the slightest opinion, with
8 regard to either death, with regard to any wrongdoing by
9 any agencies of government, with regard to any inaccuracies,
10 with regard to what has been developed in the past. I take
11 the function now to be to thoroughly investigate and
12 ascertain what is the evidence, indicating who in fact
13 were the participants in either of the assassinations.

14 Is there any additional evidence that was not known
15 earlier?

16 In addition, is there any evidence indicating that
17 there may have been participation in each of the assassinations
18 by more than one person, and whether or not any agencies
19 of government have impeded attempts to ascertain the answers
20 to those questions before?

21 With that again being an assumption on my part, I take
22 it that this Congress would not, in authorizing this
23 investigation, have as its investigators the agencies of
24 the Federal Government that perhaps might be part of the
25 area to be investigated. By that, to be specific, it seems

1 to me that what has to be for this investigation to be
2 thorough, at least attempt to be definitive, is an independent
3 investigative staff of the Congress, not beholden to any
4 other agency of government. Again that is one of the
5 assumptions that I have made in analyzing what has to be
6 done, and making a determination to recommend to you as
7 to what kind of staff is necessary for this investigation. I
8 am not stating whether or not the Congress was aware as
9 to what really is involved in the investigation of two
10 homicides, two deaths. It is not something that you do with
11 three investigators and two file clerks.

12 Upon taking this assignment, I have instituted a number
13 of measures, and have taken certain actions up to this
14 point, one of which was to be in touch with agencies of
15 the ~~Executive~~ Branch of government, the CIA, the Department
16 of Justice, who spoke in behalf of that department and the
17 FBI, to initiate requests for access to material in their
18 possession. Suffice to say that the indications up to this
19 point have been that of full cooperation, and I might say
20 that in speaking to the representative from the CIA, he
21 advised me that just at the initiation of our investigation,
22 the CIA has some 64 cartons of documents for examination
23 and review, which points out to some extent really the
24 size of the task that is being undertaken here, because
25 we are dealing there with just one ~~branch~~ ^{AGENCY} of the ~~Executive~~

1 branch of government in terms of a mass of materials.

2 9 In order to investigate, it seems to me that there
 3 must be a review made as to what has been done up until now.
 4 I do not see how, in looking and deciding the directions
 5 to go, there can be any intelligent approach without finding
 6 out what has been done, analysis ^{ZING} ~~of~~ it, determination ^{ING} ~~in~~
 7 ~~these areas~~ ^{WHAT MORE} ~~what~~ needs to be done, ~~if anything in addition,~~
 8 ~~to be able~~ ^{IN ORDER TO} be able to make a determination what else has
 9 to be done.

10 Each of you has before you a book in which we have
 11 laid out an approach in each of these two cases. The
 12 question I think was raised as to why should we proceed on
 13 both matters, the two assassinations at the same time?

14 With regard to that question, let me respond as follows:
 15 I think it important that we proceed simultaneously, for
 16 the reason that, as I look at it, as a homicide investigator-
 17 prosecutor, we are being called to the scene of two homicides
 18 really 13 years later and 8 years later. I do not think
 19 it is in the interests of this Congress, if it means what
 20 it said, investigating the matters thoroughly, that the
 21 Congress ought to be part of any further delay.

22 For example, it has come to my attention that since
 23 at least the resolution on which this committee is presently
 24 here as passed by the Congress, that authorities in Tennessee
 25 have destroyed some documents relating to the surveillance

1 on Dr. King. If that be so, and I have sent an investigative
2 team down to Memphis, it emphasizes the fact that any delay
3 on either one of these investigations is not really in the
4 interests of the Congress to do a thorough job.

5 ¶ There is another reason. As again an investigator
6 and homicide prosecutor, to me one of the essentials in a
7 thorough investigation is not to have a time limitation.
8 This is a different species of animal than the Congress
9 wanting to have say the unemployment statistics in Michigan
10 a week from Thursday and you can get it. You cannot in this
11 area say wrap up that matter by ~~six~~ months from today. Once
12 you put a limitation, a time barrier, that is destructive of
13 the investigative team, because what happens, and I speak
14 from experience here, the areas of inquiry, the people
15 who are being subject to the investigation, (use then) that
16 time limitation as a point where they know that if they get
17 a delay, if they get lost for a while, if they tie you up in
18 court for a while, they can really end up preventing the
19 conclusion of the investigation. I think it would be a
20 mistake, and again my main assumption is that what is
21 intended here is to do a thorough job, professional job,
22 definitive as can be, to start imposing some barrier of
23 time. If we were to proceed, for example, in the King
24 assassination first, there would be a great push to get that
25 wrapped up, so we could get on Kennedy, ~~and vice versa~~. If

1 we were to be proceeding on Kennedy, there would nonetheless
2 be a push to get that wrapped up, to be proceeding on King
3 ~~and~~ I think that that kind of pressure ought not to exist,
4 that again in our main thesis of doing it thoroughly, we
5 ought to be willing to do them both.

6 ¶ Now what do I mean when I say "thoroughly"? I am aware
7 of Perry Mason on TV, and the appearance that you start
8 at ~~X~~ Point A^v and you go to ~~e~~ Point Z^v and it is a nice path.
9 Maybe I am not that good an investigator. I have never been
10 able to do that.

11 I think a great number of questions have arisen in
12 each case, which I will get into in a moment, which
13 unfortunately make the public question the integrity of
14 government, the integrity of officials. Questions have been
15 raised on each of these cases going into the thoroughness
16 of the investigation. For my part, as your chief counsel
17 and director, I feel that it is necessary in the investigation
18 to be willing to be patient and thorough. I never can tell
19 whether a street, an avenue of an investigation is a dead
20 end, whether it is in fact not relevant until I go down
21 that street.

22 What I think is required when we talk about a thorough
23 investigation is a willingness to take up the areas of
24 tangential materiality, to be willing to ^(o) go down those
25 roads, make a determination when we get down there, yes,
5

1 what we found out in no way aids, in no way is really
2 ultimately relevant to what we are seeking, but if we
3 are unwilling to be that thorough, then again I say there is
4 no reason to be engaging in this investigation.

5 ¶ To do it in a manner where we do not seek and intend to
6 be that definitive and thorough from my own feeling means
7 really don't do it in the first place. I am aware that
8 there are people in the Congress who perhaps felt that, no,
9 these investigations ought not to be pursued, for various
10 reasons, but my point is the Congress has decided to do it,
11 and I think that there is literally a vested interest in
12 each member of Congress, whether he was for it or not in
13 the first instance, that if it is to be done, it must be
14 done thoroughly. To do it in a manner that is going to
15 raise as many questions as have been raised up to now is
16 self-defeating, and I would urge the members of this
17 committee not to participate, just for your own sake and
18 for the sake of the Congress, in an investigation that is
19 just going through an appearance for the sake of appearance,
20 without the desire to do it thoroughly.

21 What do I mean when I say "thoroughly"? Let me bring
22 to your attention a number of matters. In the brief period
23 of time that I have been working on this matter, not only
24 going through concepts of what kind of an organization is
25 needed to do a thorough investigation, reviewing applications,

1 and not getting them all reviewed yet, trying to interview
2 people, trying to take up questions with regard to the
3 commitment of the Congress in getting space, I have sought
4 to get some investigative effort underway. I did not see
5 why, just because I happened to be sitting doing some house-
6 keeping chores something could not be done in the meantime.

7 ¶ Let me present to this committee some things, and I
8 want to emphasize this is just the first blush of an investi-
9 gation that we have ascertained. I will utilize at this
10 point the Dr. King assassination, not that I think of one
11 have ^{ING} priority over another. Both have to be pursued, but
12 let me bring to this committee's attention what we ascertained
13 just by sending and obtaining the guilty plea of James Earl
14 Ray in the assassination of Dr. King. This is a document
15 of only 140 ~~to~~ 160 pages. You will find in the book that
16 you have in front of you a whole area of threshold inquiries
17 in just the Dr. King assassination.

18 Let me point out that those threshold inquiries only
19 came about from an analysis of one document, the guilty plea.
20 We have not even yet availed ourselves, obviously we have
21 not had the time, of other areas of the investigation that
22 have existed before or interviewing ~~really~~ any witnesses.

23 When James Earl Ray had been arrested and was in
24 Tennessee to be prosecuted for assassinating Dr. King, an
25 approach was made in behalf of Mr. Ray to the Tennessee

1 authorities to work out a plea bargain for James Earl Ray
2 to plead guilty. The State of Tennessee had been seeking
3 the death penalty against James Earl Ray. They worked out
4 a plea bargain. The State of Tennessee agreed that in
5 return for the plea of guilty, they would agree to a
6 sentence of 99 years in prison for James Earl Ray, and
7 that they would forego asking for the death penalty.

8 ¶ Now Mr. Devine is a former member of the FBI, and I
9 would say to him without any question, I am sure had he been
10 a participant at this time in these proceedings, that when
11 James Earl Ray wanted to plea bargain and was going to
12 plead guilty and get a term of years, the first thing that
13 the prosecution team in my experience normally does,
14 particularly in a case of this magnitude is say "Fine, give
15 us a confession. We will work out a plea bargain if it
16 is appropriate, but tell us what you did. Tell us whether
17 or not there was anybody else who participated in this
18 assassination with you. Let's subject you, Mr. Ray, to a
19 lie detector test, and find out whether or not what you
20 are saying is the truth. Let's use that as an investigative
21 aid. Let's also make sure, if there is to be a plea bargain,
22 and we ascertain that there is somebody else involved, that
23 you are going to be a witness against that other person."

24 This is just to me the most natural flow of what
25 happens when someone is plea bargaining in a first degree

1 murder case, and certainly a case that had at least the
2 threshold questions as to whether or not there was a
3 conspiracy, but what did we ascertain?

4 ¶ We have ascertained that no one from the prosecution
5 team asked, as part of that deal, that they be able to
6 interrogate Mr. Ray, James Earl Ray, and get from him a
7 statement at least as to his participation. There wasn't
8 even a request made. As a matter of fact, when I heard this
9 I couldn't believe it, and I sent as I say some investigators
10 immediately to Tennessee to find out, and we were told,
11 one, that that is true and, secondly, that they just did not
12 think that that was the thing to do. But what else do we
13 find in an examination of just the notes of testimony of
14 the plea of guilty?

15 At that time Ramsey Clark, who was then the Attorney General
16 of the United States, had made a public statement that there
17 was no conspiracy involved in the assassination of Dr. King.
18 Mr. Hoover had made the same statement. At this plea of
19 guilty by Ray, the State prosecutor made the statement there
20 in open court that they have investigated far and wide, inter-
21 viewed thousands, examined thousands of documents, and that
22 they find no evidence of a conspiracy. The State prosecutor
23 did not say to the judge "But the man who is pleading
24 guilty here, that we are working a plea bargain, we are not
25 bothering to even question about his participation."

1 9) After the State prosecutor made the statement in
2 open court, it is right there and as a matter of fact it is
3 in an excerpt that we have got in the report to this
4 committee here, Mr. Percy Foreman, who was the lawyer for
5 James Earl Ray, got up and he also made a similar statement
6 saying that since he has been in the case, investigating it,
7 the defense lawyer for Ray, for a month, he has checked and
8 he is satisfied himself that the statement by Ramsey Clark,
9 by Mr. Hoover, by the State prosecutor, that there was no
10 conspiracy, is correct, and that there is no conspiracy.

11 Now this is said in open court. Fine, but what then
12 happens right in that open court proceeding?

13 A little later in the very proceeding, James Earl Ray
14 says, and I am paraphrasing: "Judge, can I say something?"
15 The judge says "What would you like to say?" Mr. Ray says
16 "Judge, I don't want to upset the deal that I have got, and
17 I don't want to add anything, but I do not agree with the
18 statement by Ramsey Clark, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Foreman and the
19 State prosecutor about this conspiracy business."

20 Now that is said, believe it or not, right on the record.
21 Your point here isn't whether Mr. Ray is telling the truth
22 or is a liar. That is not the point. The point of it is that
23 having made that statement at that point, what would you
24 expect? Wouldn't you normally expect at least the judge
25 there or the prosecutor to say "Mr. Ray, what are you talking

1 about? Tell us what you know."

2 ¶ We find from an examination of just that transcript all
3 the judge said is "Are your answers any different, Mr. Ray,
4 about the plea bargain?" Of course what did Ray say? "No,
5 I am not changing any of my answers."

6 Now just this area alone raises many, many questions
7 in terms of threshold areas of inquiry. Let me present
8 another, if I may. May I say to the committee, in going
9 into this kind of detail, this is really the reason why I
10 thought it ought to be in executive session, because I do
11 not think that it would be really advantageous in proceeding
12 with the investigation to be discussing areas that we are
13 going to be looking into. I think that that could be
14 harmful, but let me point out what else is found in the
15 Ray case, and then I will switch over to President Kennedy.

16 Just from that very same transcript, the guilty plea
17 alone, we find the following sequence of events, and mind
18 you, these are not laid out on the basis of questions
19 being asked. They are just a narration of events, but
20 look what questions they do raise. James Earl Ray was in
21 a Missouri prison. Who was Ray? He was really a two-bit
22 kind of thug, nothing sophisticated in the crimes he had
23 committed in the past, holdups. He is visited one day by his
24 brother in the Missouri prison. Ray escapes the next day,
25 makes his way through Illinois and up into Canada, goes to

1 Montreal. What does Ray do when he is in Montreal? He now
2 assumes and takes an alias, the name of Galt. It is
3 obviously an area to develop in the investigation. This
4 Ray while in Canada, for the first time in his life is
5 now getting tailor-made clothes, not ready-made suits in
6 stores, but doing things with an indication at least of more
7 money than he has been used to in the past. He uses this
8 alias, the name Galt, and bear with me because it develops
9 and it is in this same transcript, that in not Montreal, the
10 city he was in, but in Toronto, there lives a person by the
11 name of Galt, who has a remarkable similar resemblance
12 physically to Ray, and is approximately the same age group.
13 I am not saying at this point that when Ray took the name
14 Galt in Montreal that meant that he is necessarily referring
15 to that Galt that is in Toronto, but bear with me as we
16 complete the circle here.

17 ¶ Ray, after using this name of Galt in Montreal, comes
18 back to the United States, and I find that an area of inquiry,
19 whether a person who is a two-bit thug, who is wanted in the
20 States, who is successful in getting out of this country,
21 would just be coming back to the States unless there was
22 something that is motivating it or making it worth his while.

AT FLWS

23

24

25

Tartaro
f Cantor
11:10

1 ¶ And there are lots of details in terms of what he does
2 when he is back in the States, such as, for example, out ^(o) in
3 the West Coast, ³ three weeks before the assassination he goes
4 to a plastic surgeon, not one of the sleazy plastic surgeons,
5 to get a nose bob, but he goes to someone who is highly
6 reputable, a plastic surgeon for the Hollywood movie stars,
7 again a question whether someone of Ray's background ¹/_M has
8 nothing sophisticated in his background ¹/_M would end up
9 going to a plastic surgeon who is operating on the level of
10 dealing with the movie stars and having the cash to pay.
11 We find that just ³ three weeks prior to the assassination
12 when Ray goes to that plastic surgeon for this nose job, the
13 plastic surgeon has a photograph, he always does of his patients
14 before the plastic surgery and afterwards.

15 Ray did not return after the surgery, and again the
16 suture, there were stitches that had to be removed. Question:
17 Where was the expertise to have done that?

18 After the assassination of Dr. King, that plastic surgeon,
19 in examining his files, finds the only picture that was removed
20 of any of his patients is the picture that was taken of Ray
21 beforehand, who is using the name Galt. Could Ray have done
22 it? Is it perhaps some indication that the person that
23 arranged for Ray to see this plastic surgeon may have removed it?
24 Maybe.

25 In any event, what I am pointing out is really threshold,

11110191
file no.
014624
pp. 31-35

RG: 233

TAB #:

ENTRY:

_____/_____/_____
COPIES/ PPS. /CLASS.

BOX:

ACCESS RESTRICTED

The item identified below has been withdrawn from this file:

File Designation _____

 Date _____
 From _____
 To _____

In the review of this file this item was removed because access to it is restricted. Restrictions on records in the National Archives are stated in general and specific record group restriction statements which are available for examination. The item identified above has been withdrawn because it contains:

- Security-Classified Information
- Otherwise Restricted Information

~~SECRET~~ MLK 08/22/93
 Authority Date

Withdrawn by NSCA

John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-526)

WITHDRAWAL NOTICE

1 even begin to guess.

2 ¶ We have the additional problem $\frac{1}{M}$ and I do not look
3 upon this investigation as merely critiquing what has been
4 done before. It seems to me that the mandate is to find
5 out what is the evidence and where it leads. But obviously
6 we have to look into what has been done, and we have it in our
7 report here.

8 In the Warren Commission investigation they had a
9 staff, direct staff of their own, of 83 people. They had,
10 in addition $\frac{1}{M}$ and it is the "in addition" that counts $\frac{1}{M}$ 150
11 full-time FBI agents assigned to that Warren Commission
12 with all of the secretarial and supporting personnel necessary
13 for those 150 full-time agents to operate. In addition, they
14 had 12 full-time and part-time professionals from the CIA
15 who gave, again, all of the clerical and supporting personnel
16 necessary for those additional people.

17 They had, in addition, 60, six-zero, full-time professionals
18 from the Secret Service assigned to work with the Warren
19 Commission, again with all of the filing, clerical, back-up
20 personnel that they needed.

21 The Justice Department has told us that they put four
22 full-time people and would not have figures for us as to what
23 they had in addition, or the clerical and back-up data.

24 The State Department advised us that they gave certain
25 full-time support, but did not tell us of the number.

1 ¶ The Internal Revenue Service stated that their Intelligence
2 Division provided six staff years of support. I do not know
3 what that figure means. But what I am pointing out is, this
4 is what was involved in the Warren Commission investigation.

5 We are talking here of an investigation that is
6 not covering just that one assassination, but covering two.
7 So that when I talk, as I am going to talk to you about
8 a staff need of 170, one-seven-zero, while that may sound to
9 the experienced people around Capitol Hill and the people in
10 the Congress of the United States as a big staff, the determi-
11 nation of big staff is only made on the basis: Well, it is
12 larger than what staffs other congressional committees have.

13 But I urge this committee not to evaluate it on that
14 basis, but to evaluate it in terms of the job to be done, the
15 need that exists.

16 Let me say again, I do not want to keep repeating myself,
17 you do not know me. I am not giving a figure that is a padded
18 figure. I am not playing the game of saying, "Here is half
19 again what I need," going on the assumption that it will be
20 cut somewhat and then I am ending up with what I really need.

21 Now I consider, again, my function to effectively be
22 your counsel, not to play that kind of game, but to lay out
23 precisely what is the need. And I will, as I say, get into a
24 breakdown of what one-seven-zero means. But compare 170
25 with what existed with just the Warren Commission and we have

1 the task not only of reviewing the work that they did, but
2 it has come to the fore, and again we have threshold areas
3 of inquiry in the book that we have for you here, in the
4 investigation and assassination of President Kennedy. But it
5 has come to the fore, for example, that there was a destruction
6 of a document, at least, by an FBI agent, and let me say,
7 even there, I am advised that the Department of Justice may
8 shortly be prosecuting that FBI agent for perjury, although it
9 is interesting to note what that FBI agent said was that
10 his destruction of a particular document relevant in the
11 Kennedy assassination was based upon orders that he got from
12 his superior.

13 ¶ The question in my mind is the investigator here, I do
14 not want to be locked in by someone who is charged with
15 perjury before we have had even an opportunity to be inter-
16 viewing him.

17 It has also come to the fore at this time that the whole
18 area of our government's attempts to assassinate foreign
19 leaders, particularly Castro, was an area that was not made
20 knowable to the Warren Commission. So again we are talking
21 not only of an investigation that goes into what had been
22 done, but into many, many areas in terms of area that has come
23 to the public attention since, which I daresay[#] represents
24 some of the reasons that there is a public disquiet.

25 It is interesting, and we have it in our report to you,

1 when Patty Hearst disappeared, was kidnapped, with all due
2 respect to the Hearsts, as compared with the magnitude of
3 an investigation as to whether or not other people are
4 involved in the assassination of a president, where that was
5 a civil rights thing, but in ³three months' investigation by
6 the FBI in the kidnapping of Patty Hearst, the FBI alone, not
7 talking about state agencies, spent \$2.6 million. That is
8 a figure we got from the FBI.

9 ¶ Now when we are talking about what is necessary in an
10 investigation, I get back, you do not just compare it: What
11 does the $\frac{1}{M}$ I am sorry I am not that familiar with congressional
12 committees $\frac{1}{M}$ what does the Agriculture Committee have on its
13 staff? That cannot be the approach here. It has to be on the
14 job to be done and the need.

15 We have other documentation in our reports such as just
16 the House Impeachment Committee, it had a staff of 174
17 members. There was not the need, not investigating the
18 complexities and the mass of material and the areas involved
19 and the travel involved which is called for here in that
20 committee. That exceeds what I am asking this committee to
21 give its support for in terms of a staff.

22 As I say to you, frankly each time I have said this I
23 end up really feeling when I am talking about a staff of 170
24 it is being such a minimal figure that when somebody reacts
25 and thinks, "Oh, that is too much", you cannot do this job.

1 And I would say to you, and I mean it, every bone of sincerity,
2 do not tarnish this House of Representatives or yourself
3 by commencing an investigation with not the facilities to do
4 a thorough job and you are not going to be able to do it
5 with less than the minimum figure I am talking about.

6 ¶ Let me ~~give~~ ^{Show} you how that breaks down and, again keeping
7 in mind what I have been talking about here, just think how
8 minimal it is.

9 In each of these two investigations I am talking about
10 $\frac{1}{4}$ and we have a chart on the last page of the booklet that
11 is before you $\frac{1}{4}$ of the two investigative teams, basically
12 Kennedy and King. I am talking about 15 investigators on
13 each, attorneys that is, and 25 investigators. That is 40
14 people on each.

15 If anyone is going to think that that is too mammoth
16 a size investigative force, they just, you know, are not
17 realistic.

18 Forty people, getting into the complexities of each of
19 these, is as minimal a squad as you can hope to have.

20 Right there then, between 40 and 40, that is 80 people,
21 right there. Would you really think you can do it on less?
22 Do not attempt it. I am not talking about clerical.

23 Let me also say this, from the investigative standpoint,
24 to do a thorough job does not mean merely going to some
25 witness and saying to him "Come before our subcommittee or

