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COMMENTS: Box 1. Folder title: Executive session business meeting.
The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 a.m., in Room B-236, United States Capitol, Hon. Louis Stokes, (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Stokes, Preyer, Fauntroy, Burke, Dodd, Edgar, Devine and McKinney.

Also present: R. Blakey, K. Klein, M. Goldsmith, J. Smith, E. Berning, G. Cornwell and S. Brady.

Stokes. A quorum is now present. The committee will be in order.

The Chair will recognize Professor Blakey.

Mr. Blakey. Mr. Chairman, the matters that will be brought before the committee this morning deal with the substance of what procedure of investigation it would be appropriate therefore that the meeting be in executive session.

Stokes. The Chair will entertain a motion.

Mr. Preyer. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Stokes. It has been properly moved that the committee
go into executive session for reasons stated and the clerk will call the roll.

Ms. Berning. Mr. Stokes.

Stokes. Aye.

Ms. Berning. Mr. Devine.

Mr. Devine. Aye.

Ms. Berning. Mr. Preyer.

Mr. Preyer. Aye.

Ms. Berning. Mr. McKinney.

Mr. McKinney. Aye.

Ms. Berning. Mr. Fauntroy.

Mr. Fauntroy. Aye.

Ms. Berning. Mr. Thone.

[No response.]

Ms. Berning. Mrs. Burke.

Mrs. Burke. Aye.

Ms. Berning. Mr. Sawyer.

[No response.]

Ms. Berning. Mr. Dodd.

[No response.]

Ms. Berning. Mr. Ford.

[No response.]

Ms. Berning. Mr. Fithian.

[No response.]

Ms. Berning. Mr. Edgar.
and missing it again. Then you lose the umbrella and you can see the President.

We have photographs taken by other people immediately after the shooting. Everyone in the plaza is facing the knoll, running in that direction, and the umbrella man and his friend are the only two people standing facing the complete opposite direction and then the umbrella man is sitting down, which no one else is doing. That is why the critics have focused on him so much, though they have never seen this particular photograph.

Chairman Stokes. Mr. Devine has offered a very good suggestion.

Mrs. Burke. Could I suggest a resolution that would authorize the Chairman, in his discretion, to approve the press release, consistent with the dignity of the committee, not involving the committee in an umbrella theory and consistent with Time-Life's permits.

Mr. McKinney. I would so move.

Chairman Stokes. You have heard the resolution. Do you want a record vote?

Mr. Blakey. I don't think that is necessary.

There are a couple of matters of information you should be aware of.

The committee is going into court on Monday in Memphis to examine the records of a hospital dealing with
There are two other matters I would bring to your attention. One is an outstanding issue. Former President Ford was a member of the Warren Commission. Some time in the next thirty to sixty days he probably ought to be talked to and I would solicit your advice on the way in which that occurs.

If he is in town for another purpose, it might be appropriate to have an executive session in which he could come in and talk about the Warren Commission and his role on it.

If he is going to be in Colorado for any period of
would it be advisable for the committee, with due dignity, to release these to the press with an effort being made to solicit anyone who could identify the individuals?

The umbrella man is in no sense a central figure in the committee's investigation. He is a central figure in the critical literature. The argument is made that he had an umbrella on a sunny day and that the umbrella was raised just before the assassination and was somehow a signal relating to the assassination.

If it were possible to identify him and have him come forward, it might be one way which that aspect of the critical literature could be explained.

Our ability to identify him simply by showing this photograph to people in Dallas is limited. If we release it to the press, they could obviously give it nation-wide circulation.

There are plusses and minuses if we did this. It might appear to some credible people we are pursuing the umbrella man theory, which lacks a certain credibility.

On the other hand, if these are printed and we indicate we don't know who the person is, I suppose one of the first things that will be raised is, "Why didn't you give it to the press earlier? We could have identified him at any time."

I don't know that there is an easy answer either way. I also don't know that this is a terribly important issue, but if we were to do it, it probably ought to be done now and
it would require a committee resolution to make them public.

I might add it might also require the permission of Time-Life, since they are their photographs.

Mr. Dodd. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Stokes. Mr. Dodd.

Mr. Dodd. I have read that one "Thirty Seconds in Dallas." In fact, they even have it that there is a gun in there; that you open it up and it fires. I just wonder how many theories there are. I know the signal theory and I know about you opening it up and somehow there is a triggering mechanism in the top of the thing. Those are basically the two.

Mr. Blakey. Yes.

Mr. Dodd. The former having a lot more support, I presume even among the critics, than the latter.

Mr. Blakey. He is one of the mystery figures. It is the kind of thing people want explained. Why would a man have an umbrella up on a sunny day?

Mr. Edgar. Do we have that picture with us?

Mr. Blakey. No; we don't. It is part of the Zapruder film. You can see right below where the President is. It actually raises just before the assassination. These are separate pictures. You can see the umbrella laying right here to the right of the light post. This is indeed an umbrella man.
Mr. Fauntroy. The thing that has always puzzled me about this is, with all the attention focused upon this theory, we have had no one to come forward (from Day One) to say "I am he."

With respect, therefore, to the question, shall we publish this in the hope of finding the person, I tend rather to be pessimistic about the prospects.

Mr. Devine. He looks like he is 65 years old in that picture. That would make him 80 today.

Mr. Fauntroy. No; that is not the man.

The question is, what public relations value is there to feeling that we are pursuing every lead? I just don't think it will be productive. If people have been talking about the umbrella man and he hasn't come forward 2/7

Mr. Dodd. If that is our only public pronouncement, I think it is going to focus an awful lot of attention on this one single aspect of the thing. It makes it look as though we place a lot of credibility in that.

Chairman Stokes. Mr. Edgar.

Mr. Edgar. One of the suggestions I would have on a public pronouncement would be to make, on the first or second day of public hearings, a major emphasis on this photograph. That way you would have major TV coverage with a statement that at the beginning of our hearings 1/P and this is one of the unanswered questions 1/M I kind of agree with Walter, if we
go out to the public now on this one picture, people will
pick that up and say, "Oh, they are only pursuing that idea
and that thought."

It would have to be handled very well.

Mr. McKinney. Obviously if I were "the umbrella man"
and all of a sudden people were writing about me, I would
be the last person to come forward.

A president has been shot and who wants the FBI, Secret
Service and everybody else pouring over them because they
were sitting there with an umbrella.

This is the first time we have seen this man's face
and I think we should say many of the critics have mentioned
this umbrella man and we have found no vast importance to
it, but here is his face and would someone please come
forward and tell us if they know him?

The individual himself would be crazy to come forward.

Mr. Blakey. This is the first time there has been a
picture of him from the front. In the past it has always
been a person from behind.

If the background was given to the newspaper people
and the statement was made, "This is only one among a number
of things being pursued by the committee and it is not of
central importance to us, but is a question raised by the
critics and it is a matter of some interest that he be
identified."
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Mr. Devine. Have we other photographs we could have identified at the same time to lessen the focus on this one?

Mrs. Burke. I suspect there are other photographs.

Chairman Stokes. When you release this photo and ask the press to find out for you who he is, doesn't this lend credence then to precisely what the press is saying? "See there, I told you; they haven't found out anything."

I think you just invite that reaction from the press.

Mrs. Burke. Of course, we could indicate we have found a photograph of the umbrella man, which nobody else has until now.

Mr. Devine. But we would want to talk to him as a witness rather than as a suspect.

Mr. Fauntroy. It would be nice to clear that up one way or the other.

Mr. McKinney. One thing the critics will say is that they didn't follow up the umbrella man.

Mr. Dodd. They are going to be saying things for the next hundred years. If we go into this thing with that in mind, we will be basket cases.

Mr. Fauntroy. The idea of a fellow having an umbrella on a sunny day that is opened up just as the President is coming by. This photograph is after the shooting.

He is calmly sitting there on the curb.
Mr. Fauntroy. This photograph is after the shooting.

Chairman Stokes. Yes.

Mr. McKinney. He is probably lifting his black umbrella to indicate some protest.

Mr. Fauntroy. After he is shot he sits down and says "Well, let's wait here."

Mr. Devine. Do you know what was the temperature that day?

Mrs. Goldsmith.

Mrs. Burke. About 65.

Mr. Devine. Some people have an umbrella to shield themselves from the hot sun on a hot day, but 65 in November wouldn't apply.

Mr. Preyer. Mr. Chairman, would it be possible for Mr. Blakey to draft the press release they would propose to use to release this and see whether it would meet with your approval?

I agree that how it is presented is crucial. Of course, it could be misinterpreted regardless of how it is presented. We are going to be a loser on this one any way we go.

It does have the thrust of a new photograph and if it is presented in the right light so it does not appear we have bought the umbrella man theory, it might indicate the committee's desire to be thorough and follow up all leads. Otherwise, we could be accused of not following up an obvious step.
Mr. Devine. Must he be identified with the umbrella?

Mrs. Burke. We could say this was a man whose photograph we have and we have not been able to identify him and if anybody knows him, will they please write us.

Mr. McKinney. Are there any modern photography techniques that will upgrade those pictures?

Mr. Goldsmith.

No. This is about the size of a pinhead in an eight by ten. It has already been enlarged and enhanced and the grain is caused by the lack of information. There is no information there. If you saw the original 8 by 10, this is maybe just a one-inch the umbrella man may be one inch by one inch and the photograph is eight by ten.

Mr. Dodd. If you use anything like that, you are going to get confusion over which one you are talking about.

Chairman Stokes. Time-Life has never printed this picture? It is just something that was in their files?

Mr. Bakey. Yes.

Chairman Stokes. How do you establish the fact, Micky, that it was a photograph taken after?

Mr. Goldsmith. If you saw the rest of the picture, you would see in the background people running around, up the grassy knoll. There was a series of seven photographs. This is one of the seven. You can see people running in the background. It is just mass confusion. The photographs before
the assassination, people are standing there watching.

Mr. Devine. How many seconds per frame would you estimate?

Mr. Goldsmith. I couldn't say that.

Mr. Devine. Each frame is supposed to be in a second segment. Is this just a straight photo and not part of a motion picture?

Mr. Goldsmith. That is right.

Chairman Stokes. What does Zapruder show the umbrella man doing?

Mr. Goldsmith. You can only see the umbrella. You can see it opening up, being raised, lowered, raised again, simultaneous with the shooting.

Zapruder

When pans in you see the umbrella go up and down but you then continue watching the President and you lose the umbrella.

Chairman Stokes. What is the proximity of the umbrella man to the President's car?

Mr. Goldsmith. He is standing on the edge of the curb. I don't think he shot the President.

Chairman Stokes. We have this man sitting down while you say people are running around all behind him with the President having just been shot. He is raising his umbrella and then calmly sits down?

Mr. Goldsmith. He was raising and lowering the umbrella
time, it might be appropriate for three members of the
committee to go out and see him. I would suppose that prior
to contacting him in a formal sense, it might be appropriate
for the chairman to call him and outline for him the general
areas of our interest and concern.

Most of the other principal figures in the Warren
Commission and cabinet who we have talked to, of all of them,
obviously President Ford presents a special problem.

Mr. Devine. I know he has accepted an engagement at the
Danny Thomas Hospital out there.

I could inquire and find out when he will be in the
Washington area.

Mrs. Burke. Given our financial situation, if he is
here, it would be preferred if we could do it here.

Mr. Devine. He will be glad to do this without
publicity because if the word gets out we are going to question
him, it would be difficult. Perhaps he could be met somewhere
off the Hill.

Mrs. Burke. I am sure that could be arranged.

Mr. Dodd. This doesn't relate directly to President
Ford, but are we going to bother with inhabitants of the
car 2
\[ \text{Mr. Blakey.} \]
\[ \text{Governor Connally. We have talked to Governor Connally.} \]

We have not talked to Mrs. Connally.

Mr. Dodd. Are we going to pursue that in the committee?
Mrs. Burke. It is likely Governor Connally might be a witness in the hearings. We didn't feel it was necessary to present him to you in executive session.

Mr. Dodd. We will be apprised of what he will be saying.

Mr. Blakey. Absolutely.

Mr. Dodd. There is no reason to call Mrs. Kennedy, I presume?

Mr. Blakey. I hadn't thought about it. I have not talked to the former First Lady.

Mr. Devine. I can anticipate a question from President Ford, what do you want to talk about?

Mrs. Burke. If you are going to make that phone call what we should give you before hand is a briefing memorandum where we outline for you the various areas. Frankly, I think the committee probably has a duty to, in addition to going over how it was formed, and the pressures under which it worked, airing what came out of the release of the FBI document. That is, had Congressman Ford served as an information conduit for the FBI from the Warren Commission. There are memoranda written by de Loach indicating that is the case. I am aware that the newspapers or, I think it is CBS, has talked to President Ford about that and he has an explanation for it. I do not think that interview has been aired. I believe it was NBC, where Carl Stern talked to him.
We will be able to give you a memorandum.

Do I sense a consensus on the part of the committee that is the way we should proceed?

Mr. Devine. It doesn't make any difference to me. However you want to do it.

Mr. Stokes. It would appear that then is the way we should proceed.

Mr. Blakey. There is one other item I would bring up at this time before I suggest we go into the briefing and that is if the committee wants to discuss the memorandum that I circulated to you with the suggested date for the King hearings, the Kennedy hearings, and the King hearings again in the public meetings. I think Mr. Edgar, you wanted to speak to that.

Mr. Edgar. I have a couple of questions, or one specific one that I need to raise and that is, Floyd Fithian and I have been fairly active in the King case and we have tough elections and we may be counting fifty votes or one hundred votes at four o'clock in the morning. I notice in the schedule the day after the election we are scheduled to be here at nine o'clock for a public session. I think that is inappropriate.

Mr. McKinney. Let's call it impossible.

Mr. Edgar. I would rather come on a Saturday or make one of them nine to twelve or nine to five to make up for the
loss of hours. The Wednesday after election doesn't seem to
be a good day for any of us.

\textit{Mr. Blakey.} Would Thursday after election?

Mr. Edgar. I think I could probably make it by
Thursday if I am not packing.

I would urge not to use Wednesday.

Mr. McKinney. The consensus is unanimous that you are
right.

\textit{Chairman Stokes.} Is there anything further?

Mr. Dodd. I would like to use a few minutes to discuss
his. I have discussed this in the past and I have mentioned
it to a few people on the floor over the last couple of days
about the scheduling itself. We are looking at the week
in August and then the full month of September. I know,
Bob, you have expressed the feeling that it would be almost
impossible to conduct public hearings and be through by the
31st of December. I would like to raise for purposes of dis-
tussion here, whether or not we want to proceed with this
intensive public session in September.

Two, whether or not it is possible to conduct more
shifts on part or all of this until November, December and
write up the report simultaneously, if that is possible.

\textit{Mr. Blakey.}

Mrs. Beske. Let me outline the strategy involved in
setting this up. We are obviously dealing with problems.
If you push it in one place, it will push out in another
direction. I think the first two things that have to be said is that the committee has to begin its public hearings before the end of September on both King and Kennedy because we will have to come up in September for additional money to go through December.

While I am certainly not an expert in politics, having sat through the hearings and the floor debate on our money bill the last time, it is difficult for me to believe that the floor would give this committee more money unless it had started its hearings.

I think preferably we should finish our hearings as an integral presentation on both sides. It is just not possible to do that before September.

In addition, the King hearings would have a special problem with the appearance of James Earl Ray. We can anticipate that he will present new material of some kind and therefore we probably ought to get him out of the way in August and then finish up the King hearings in November or we will have the opportunity in September and October to run down anything he says is new.

If we don't begin in a substantial way demonstrating our competency, our professionalism and our serious dedication prior to the votes in September, I doubt that the Congress would finance it. This means, in my judgment, we would have to begin in August and September. Then I think in September
we should finish Kennedy as a whole, so that people can watch it as a whole and not have it broken up.

Mr. Dodd. May we go off the record, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Stokes. Yes.

[Discussion off the record.]

Chairman Stokes. Back on the record.

Mr. Blakey. Mr. Chairman, I have no further business to bring before the committee.

Chairman Stokes. There being no further business before the committee, the meeting is adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]
Mr. Edgar. Aye.

Ms. Berning. Seven ayes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Stokes. Seven members having voted in the affirmative, the meeting is now in executive session and all members of the public are requested to remove themselves from the room.

Mr. Edgar.

Mr. Edgar. Mr. Chairman, before we move to the agenda, may I inquire as to one of the agenda items, is the schedule for the public hearings?

Mr. Blakey. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, there are several items for general discussion, two of which could require a vote. The main issue before the committee, or the main question before the committee, however, is the nature and character of the hearings that will be held next week at night. I will not discuss those things on the record here, but at the conclusion of the meeting we can go into a briefing off the record on them so I would hope the items of business could be handled as expeditiously as possible so we could get to the main issue which is next week's hearings.

The first issue I would bring to your attention and solicit your advice deals with the Ray family.

As you are aware, of course, the committee has referred to the Department of Justice and the Parole Board the question of John Ray's perjury before the committee.
The Department of Justice has informed the parole board they are considering presenting the matter to the grand jury and ask the parole board to suspend his parole for a period of at least a month.

The parole board has indicated to us they would probably not grant him parole if the Department of Justice decides to charge him with perjury.

There will be a meeting on Tuesday at two between the staff and the Department of Justice officials to discuss that matter.

I would bring to your attention one other item in that connection. Evidence developed before the committee indicates that Jerry Ray probably committed a fraud on McMillan having to do with checks and other matters. Carol Pepper and Jerry Ray made available to Mr. McMillan leading Mr. McMillan to include in writing his book that the family was a conduit for funds while James Earl Ray was in prison. It turns out those materials were fraudulent.

Without going into the details, that transaction constituted federal wire fraud and is a prosecutable offense.

The issue I would bring to the committee this morning is whether it might be advisable to refer that matter to the Department of Justice for possible prosecution.

I solicit your advice on it. If we did settle, we would have to have a committee resolution turning over to the
Department the basic testimony we have available to us indicating Jerry Ray's involvement in the effort to defraud McMillan.

Mr. Edgar. Mr. Chairman, having sat through both hearings having to do with John Ray and Jerry Ray, unless I get more information, I would think that the John Ray perjury should be pursued and the Jerry Ray thing ought to be just noted in our report and not made an issue of unless we find more significant evidence against Jerry Ray.

I think we just muddy the waters by going after each of these cases, or this one case, in terms of wire fraud. I think our issue is trying to sort out the pieces of Martin Luther King's death and I think the pressure on John Ray may be of value in helping to break the case open, given some of the new leads we are pursuing.

I think we still have to keep pressure on Jerry Ray but I don't think that pressure is harassing him, which may be perceived as harassment in terms of a wire fraud issue. That is just a personal feeling on my part.

Mr. Fauntroy. He stated my predisposition on that question also.

Mrs. Burke. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I was not at the hearings so I don't have the background information on the
wire fraud.

Mr. Blakey. What happened is that McMillan, an author, came to the Ray family to find out more about James Earl Ray and the relationship between him and the family and during the course of those contacts, Carol Pepper \( \frac{1}{M} \) James Earl's sister \( \frac{1}{M} \) and Jerry Ray, sold to McMillan photographs they had bought from the Salvation Army and portions of her check books in which she had entered back-dated interest under two theories. One is the photographs were of the family and that the back-dated checks, or check interest, were designed to show money was coming out of prison and through Carol Pepper's account, and this played a part in McMillan's book. He paid money for those items and he in fact was defrauded by the Ray family. Mrs. Pepper indicated before the committee that these entries were fraudulent. They were, in effect, forgeries.

Mrs. Burke. I would reserve on the issue of the wire fraud, but I do think, having had to read the long, involved statement in the Los Angeles Times about the assassination developments \( \frac{1}{M} \) most of which were based on McMillan and his claim \( \frac{1}{M} \). I think that one way that strategically, if that information, when that is brought to the public light, and made clear the Justice Department can do with it what they want, that the whole attitude and approach toward the committee and the hearings will be different.
Mr. Edgar. My suggestion was not to cover it up at all. My suggestion was it is something that we need to have up front in our report, up front in our discussions as we go to public debate and let the Justice Department take it if they wish from there, but I don't think that it serves a purpose to tie up our lawyers now in trying to analyze and share with the Justice Department the information at this stage of our investigation. I may be wrong.

Mrs. Burke. I would agree with that.

I think the timing is very bad and could very easily be done at the conclusion.

Mr. Fauntroy. I would like to reiterate, however, the view that we must pursue the perjury charge on John Ray vigorously.

Mr. Edgar. May I speak to that, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Stokes. Mr. Edgar.

Mr. Edgar. I think that is a really key thing if I am reading John Ray right, and the testimony we have gotten from the Ray family. I don't think he wants to spend many more years in prison and I have a feeling he has not been cooperative with the committee and its investigation and I think shortly after we pursue this perjury we ought to get back to John Ray and have him back either before the committee or meet him in some context where he realizes he ought to be very factual and honest with us in terms of his involvement.
I think that is a clear case, where we have three or four witnesses.

Chairman Stokes. Let me ask counsel if any analysis has been made or any evaluation has been made with reference to the extent to which the testimony of the sister to the effect they did commit fraud and so forth how it would materially alter the book itself.

Mr. Blakey. I would have to pass on a real analysis of the book. The argument is made in it that with regard to the relationship of who Ray was and the relation with the family, that is not supported, but I would have to pass on a careful analysis of the book.

I think the point that would be made by the prosecution can ultimately be made by the final report and the prosecution, that the Ray family is not a reliable source of information and authors who have relied on statements by Jerry Ray or James Earl Ray, or Carol Pepper, have seemingly relied on an unreliable source. In fact, there has been fraud committed against Mr. McMillan.

Chairman Stokes. Aside from the fact that this information has been developed in our hearings, has there been any other public acknowledgement of this?

Mr. Blakey. No.

Chairman Stokes. This will be new when revealed to the public?
Mr. Blakey. That is correct.

Mr. Fauntroy. And is it not a fact that we have found no basis, no other evidence that checks in fact passed?

The bank records have no trace of those which are noted \( \frac{1}{M} \) rather ingenuously, to me \( \frac{1}{H} \) on the bank book which was shown to McMillan. I still have not figured out for myself how she put those two $1,000 entries in in a fashion to make them look authentic and yet the bank records show no trace of it.

Mr. Blakey. It was a matter that probably ought to be taken up now if it is going to be taken up. The staff has no special interest in pressing it or not pressing it.

I understand the sense of the committee is that we reserve it for the final report.

The statute of limitations is such that we have a year after the final report in which the Department can pass on the prosecution. There is not a time factor.

Let me raise with the committee a second question. You have had passed to you copies of photographs. The source was from Time-Life. They are enlarged. The individual you see sitting on the curb there is the so-called "umbrella man," with a front view of him. It would be possible if you knew him, I suppose, to identify him. These pictures came into our possession in this form only a week or so ago and the issue I present to you for your resolution is,
and blasing it again. Then you lose the umbrella and you can see the President.

We have photographs taken by other people immediately after the shooting. Everyone in the plaza is facing the knoll, running in that direction, and the umbrella man and his friend are the only two people standing facing the complete opposite direction and then the umbrella man is sitting down, which no one else is doing. That is why the critics have focused on him so much, though they have never seen this particular photograph.

Chairman Stokes. Mr. Devine has offered a very good suggestion.

Mrs. Burke. Could I suggest a resolution that would authorize the Chairman, in his discretion, to approve the press release, consistent with the dignity of the committee, not involving the committee in an umbrella theory and consistent with Time-Life's permits.

Mr. McKinney. I would so move.

Chairman Stokes. You have heard the resolution. Do you want a record vote?

Mr. Blakey. I don't think that is necessary.

There are a couple of matters of information you should be aware of.

The committee is going into court on Monday in Memphis to examine the records of a hospital dealing with Lisa Stevens.
All of you have received telegrams from Mark asking you to waive your congressional immunity as the price of a consent of turning over the hospital records. You should be made aware of the legal position of the staff.

Mark has no standing in law to participate in proceedings at all. He was notified of them as a matter of courtesy. You should also be aware that it is the position of the staff that the statute regulating the control of access to hospital records does not apply to a congressional committee; that our subpoena would be adequate and that the court would be so informed but that we are obtaining a court order to do it to make the hospital administrator feel better.

Mark would have no standing in that proceeding at all.

There are two other matters I would bring to your attention. One is an outstanding issue. Former President Ford was a member of the Warren Commission. Some time in the next thirty to sixty days he probably ought to be talked to and I would solicit your advice on the way in which that occurs.

If he is in town for another purpose, it might be appropriate to have an executive session in which he could come in and talk about the Warren Commission and his role on it.

If he is going to be in Colorado for any period of