

under some degree of surveillance. It would seem to me strange that the FBI did not transmit this information to the Secret Service.

Mr. Rowley. Well, as I said earlier ---

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chairman, may I say something off the record a moment?

The Chairman. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

The Chairman. Back on the record.

Rep. Boggs. My question was inaccurate -- I am sorry.

Mr. Rowley. The FBI, Mr. Congressman, are concerned with internal security. And I think their approach was internal security as it related to this individual, whether or not he was a potential recruit for espionage, intelligence, or something like that.

Their concern was talking to him in this vein, in the course of which there was no indication that he bore any malice towards anyone, and particularly to the President of the United States. If someone said that Henry Smith didn't like the President, and we got the file, we would get to the point where you have three million names in the file. How effective are you going to be then?

Rep. Boggs. Well, that is right.

Mr. Rowley. And then you get in the area of civil rights and all, if you start going into individuals ---

Rep. Boggs. And if I remember correctly, there has never been -- we have had no testimony from anyone that Oswald ever threatened the President of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. Rankin. That is correct.

Rep. Boggs. That was the only question I had.

Mr. Dulles. Along that line, I just raise the question as to whether maybe too much emphasis is not put on the threat angle, because a clever fellow, if he is going to assassinate the President, the last thing he is going to do is go around and talk about it and threaten it.

Mr. Rowley. That is right. Well, this has been so with loners, too.

As you say, you read the assassinations. Some of them just kept to themselves, and traveled, and the next thing you know they confronted their victim. Sometimes they were successful, other times they were not.

Mr. Dulles. I recognize the difficulty of working out adequate criteria. But I just think you ought to do some more seeking, and there is more work to be done on that.

Mr. Rowley, Yes, sir.

Sen. Cooper. May I ask this question: It hasn't been clear to me. Is it correct that now a defector does come within the scope of your service?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir, we are furnished the names of the defectors by the FBI and they investigate these people. And then in their report, if it shows that the individual is -- has emotional instability or propensity for violence, we pick it up from there.

But all the reports on the known defectors in this country are submitted to us, and then we evaluate from the case history of the report whether or not he would be a risk for us subject to investigation.

Sen. Cooper. I understood that was the procedure before. But my question is now, is the defector per se classed as one of those against whom you would take protective measures?

Mr. Rowley. No, no, sir. Not unless we had --

Sen. Cooper. Since the assassination?

Mr. Rowley. Not unless we had these three categories of factors we just enunciated.

Sen. Cooper. I would suggest -- first, I understand there are not many defectors who have returned to the United States.

Secondly, it seems to me a man who has defected from the United States to go to Russia or a Communist country indicates that he has pretty strong convictions against the United States, or else there is something questionable about his mental processes.

I would think that fact alone would make it important to

watch his activities when he came back.

Mr. Rowley. It would. And I think the FBI properly conducts the investigations, from the standpoint of internal security, and furnishes us a report. And then if there is something in the report that indicates he could be a risk to the President or the Vice President, we could take it from there.

Rep. Boggs. Mr. Rankin, I have to go to a meeting in two or three minutes. There is just one question I would like to ask before leaving.

Is it not a fact that probably the greatest deterrent that you have is the very fact that the public knows that there is a Secret Service.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Rep. Boggs. That you do guard the life of the President. And that the chances of an assassin escaping with his own life are pretty remote. So this psychological weapon is one of the things you rely on?

Mr. Rowley. That is correct.

Rep. Boggs. And you must necessarily keep a degree of secrecy about the methods you employ.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir. Otherwise they could develop countermethods to thwart anything we might set up.

Rep. Boggs. Exactly.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Rankin. Chief Rowley, do you in the Secret Service obtain the benefit of cooperation with other governmental agencies in the protection of the President?

Mr. Rowley. We receive cooperation from every agency. If I may name a few -- we were scheduled to visit Puerto Rico in 1948 or 1947 -- I am not quite certain -- with President Truman, who was then vacationing at Key West. We had no office in Puerto Rico at the time. We did not know the situation other than that it could be sticky because of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico.

(At this point, Representative Boggs withdrew from the hearing room.)

Mr. Rowley. Our advance man called me and asked me if I would not talk to Mr. Hoover to see whether or not we could have the assistance of some of their agents who were down there in an office established there. And I communicated then with the Assistant Director, who said, "I will get back to you" and get the approval. That was an example of the beginning of the cooperation, when I was at the White House, with the FBI.

Now, in the years subsequent to World War II any time we were abroad, I made personal contact with Mr. Dulles, and I think for national security we should go off the record on this, because this is something that pertains today.

(Discussion off the record.)

The Chairman. Back on the record.

Mr. Rankin. Now, Chief Rowley, are you familiar with the provisions in the appropriation act with regard to the FBI concerning their protection of the person of the President?

Mr. Rowley. Yes.

Mr. Rankin. You know of that, do you?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, I do.

Historically, that was first passed in 1910. It stated that because of the limited number of Secret Service at that time, that appropriation -- a certain given figure -- was to be used by the U. S. Marshals to assist the Secret Service.

Mr. Rankin. Was the Secret Service opposed to that provision in the Appropriation Act for the FBI?

Mr. Rowley. No, it has never opposed that provision over the years. I started to say, Mr. Rankin -- subsequently, after the founding of the FBI, this was transferred, apparently from the Marshals to the FBI, and it has been in their appropriations as long as I can remember. We have never objected to that appropriation.

Mr. Rankin. Now, there is some language in H.R. 4158, I understand, which deals with the permanent organization of the government that you are objecting to, is that right?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, that has to do with the codification, wherein it states that the Attorney General will appoint -- I think, in substance, officials for the protection of the President of the United States. And this is a feature in the codification of the law we object to, because the Secretary of the Treasury authorizes and directs the protection of the President.

Rep. Ford. Is that a bill, Mr. Rankin, that is before the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Judiciary Committee?

Mr. Rowley. They are preparing it, and they asked for our opinions. It must be now. This is a month or so ago, Mr. Ford.

Mr. Rankin. I think I can give the Commission the exact language. It is Chapter 33 of the House rule that I have just described, and it is under Section 534, and the words are: "The Attorney General may appoint officials" -- and then in quotes below that, in (2) "to protect the person of the President" and -- and then it deals with other matters.

Now, will you tell why you have an objection to that?

Just briefly summarize it.

Mr. Rowley. Because of the long history of Presidential protection. We have been directed -- it has been under the

jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury. But this would confuse and be a conflict in jurisdiction. Conflicts would naturally arise in the future as to who had jurisdiction.

If anything happened like Dallas, we would get into an Alphonse and Gaston pantomime.

Mr. Rankin. You would get into a jurisdictional dispute?

Mr. Rowley. That is right.

Mr. Rankin. And that is why you object?

Mr. Rowley. That is right.

Mr. Rankin. But as far as any provision that has been made historically for the FBI to have funds so they can supplement and assist you, you have no objection to that?

Mr. Rowley. No objection at all.

Rep. Ford. Do you know how much in the way of funds have been utilized through that provision?

Mr. Rowley. No, I would not know of my own knowledge, Congressman, because that would be under the jurisdiction of the FBI and the Budget Bureau.

Rep. Ford. In other words, they don't take money that they get through their appropriation bill, and transfer it to the Secret Service?

Mr. Rowley. No.

Rep. Ford. This is simply a provision which authorizes them to use whatever funds they get for this purpose?

Mr. Rowley. That is correct.

Mr. Rankin. Chief Rowley, I understand that regarding House 4158, the Treasury and the Justice Department have agreed that the language may be changed so that it will read "Assist", is that right?

Mr. Rowley. That is correct.

Mr. Rankin. And that is satisfactory?

Mr. Rowley. That is right. That is what we worked out.

Mr. Rankin. Now, in connection with your protection of the President, have you drawn upon various people in the Government and consultants to assist you in regard to scientific problems?

Mr. Rowley. Yes. Some eight or nine years ago, we evolved a relationship with the Defense Department -- I think more specifically in the last four years -- a relationship with the President's Scientific Advisor.

This is off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Rankin. Why, Chief?

Mr. Rowley. This has to do with national security.

(Discussion off the record.)

The Chairman. Back on the record.

Mr. Rankin. Chief Rowley, do you find in work of the Secret Service that you have need for scientific advice and consultation concerning problems that develop regarding the protection of the President, so that if you had some arrangement whereby you could have the assistance of either the President's Scientific Advisor or consultation with independent consultants, it would assist and in fact be necessary to your work?

Mr. Rowley. I think it would be a great help and it is necessary today, because under the crash program that we are endeavoring to undertake, I think it is important that we know in Presidential protection what the current devices are that are available and are efficient in connection with countermeasures against eavesdropping and other things that we have been researching over the years. But this is necessary on a day-to-day basis and it would be on an informal basis with other agencies. I think it is necessary to have somebody of that type who is conversant with the subject, a trained expert who knows precisely where to go.

We might spend a lot of time going around the paths, but by having an expert, he knows precisely the organization, the contracting company, what they have, whether it is suitable, whether it is efficient for our purposes.

Rep. Ford. Mr. Rankin, is the letter of April 22, 1964, from Mr. Rowley to you with the enclosures a Commission Exhibit?

Mr. Rankin. Yes, that has been offered. That is 1027.

Rep. Ford. In this enclosure, Chief Rowley, on page 4, under subheading (c), the following is stated: "The Secret Service has no funds for research and very limited funds for the acquisition of protective devices. In the Fiscal Year 1964 budget, the Service requested \$23,057 for two positions for technical specialists. The Congress did not make any appropriation covering this request, and it was repeated in the 1965 budget request, and has been included in the appropriation passed by the House several weeks ago."

Could you define more particularly what you had in mind for these so-called technical specialists?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir. This was someone that knew something about electronics or electronic engineering for the sweeping of different places. We felt that to date we were utilizing the services of agents who primarily came with us on the basis of criminal investigation, and that, therefore, it was my feeling that we should have this type of expert.

As I said earlier, I realize the shortcomings and the requirements which we are operating under -- and I was endeavoring to get the funds from Congress, the personnel that I thought were necessary, as well as the equipment I thought we should have, primarily to have this operation under control for us.

Now, I might say, that the CIA have been most helpful. The equipment we used in the early days was from that organization and the State Department.

But now they have gotten so busy, as you well know, that they haven't much time to assist us.

So that we feel we want to have our own equipment, our own experts, and people that know our work, and devote their time to it.

Rep. Ford. When you talk about technical specialists here, you are referring to electronics specialists?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. You are not referring to a general research and development program, however?

Mr. Rowley. No, sir. This confusion is why it was refused a year ago.

Rep. Ford. Let me ask this, then, Chief Rowley.

Would these technical experts, or technical specialists, have been on duty in Dallas on this particular trip if you had

had the funds and had employed them?

Mr. Rowley. Yes. But they would have been employed in something entirely different.

Rep. Ford. They wouldn't have had any relationship to the motorcade?

Mr. Rowley. No, sir.

If I may go off the record.

Mr. Rankin. Will you tell us why you are going off the record?

Mr. Rowley. Because it involves national security.

(Discussion off the record.)

The Chairman. Back on the record.

Rep. Ford. As I understand it, then, the deletion of these funds for these technical specialists in fiscal year 1964 did not in any way handicap your operation in Dallas at the time of the assassination?

Mr. Rowley. No. We have never said that. We are just saying that if we had the equipment -- in other words, what I am trying to do, Mr. Congressman, is to move forward. And the only way I know, after a period of years, is to ask for a sum of money, but then my experience is that sometimes the Congress becomes alarmed. But this is a need that we have. And this is what I am trying to explain. This is an example of what we are trying to do, in equipment and manpower.

Rep. Ford. Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Rankin, I have to go shortly over to a session of the House. And since we are in the budget area, I think it might be well for the record to develop some facts concerning your budget -- what they have in the past and what you are suggesting they might be in the future.

Mr. Rowley. Well, I have here a summary of the appropriation allocations as it applies to manpower and equipment, and the number of persons on the roll.

Rep. Ford. Do you receive your appropriations in a lump sum or how do you receive Secret Service appropriations?

Mr. Rowley. I guess it is on a warrant. When the warrant is signed --

Rep. Ford. Your budget is included as a part of the Treasury Department budget?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. Now, do you have it in a separate part of the Treasury Department budget?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. Is it specifically earmarked for the Secret Service?

Mr. Rowley. It is, yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. It is a lump sum for the Secret Service?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dulles. That is a public appropriation, it is made public?

Mr. Rowley. That is correct, yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. Congressman Ford, if I may interrupt just a minute, I can ask Chief Rowley if the Exhibit No. 1028 is the one he just referred to in answer to your question about the budget.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

(The document referred to was marked Commission Exhibit No. 1028 for identification.)

Mr. Rankin. I then offer in evidence Exhibit 1028.

The Chairman. It may be admitted.

(The document heretofore marked for identification as Commission Exhibit No. 1028 was received in evidence.)

Mr. Rankin. Exhibit 1028, Chief Rowley, does include in this -- so it will be understandable to the Commission, the figures for your proposed budget of 1966, doesn't it?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. And those are shown in that manner on the exhibit?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. Is the figure we see here --

Mr. Rowley. This is what we call a tentative budget.

Mr. Rankin. That has been presented to the Budget Bureau?

Mr. Rowley. It has not been presented to the Budget Office of the Treasury which is the first step. Then it goes to the Budget Bureau and then subsequently to the House and Senate.

Mr. Rankin. You said it has not been.

Mr. Rowley. No, this is a tentative proposal that we have made.

Mr. Rankin. At this stage, so we get the record clear -- that is a consideration of what you think you should have, but it hasn't gone through the steps you have just described, is that right?

Mr. Rowley. That is right. But it does not include -- necessarily, until we complete our thorough examination -- what our requirements will be under the new revisions of our organization. Particularly, as it relates to manpower - we want to be sure that we have the proper justification. And so we hope by October or November to have a good estimate at that time.

Rep. Ford. Well, the figure that is shown here for Fiscal Year 1965 is \$7,550,000.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. Is that the budget submission to the Congress?

Mr. Rowley. To the Congress, yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. And do you recall what the House approved in its

version of the bill?

Mr. Rowley. \$7,500,000. They cut \$50,000.

Rep. Ford. Do you recall what the reduction was predicated to?

Mr. Rowley. No, I don't. I think it was just cut to a round figure.

Rep. Ford. What is the footnote here which is entitled "Pending action by the Senate." Is that a \$669,000 increase?

Mr. Rowley. That is right.

Rep. Ford. Is that a supplemental?

Mr. Rowley. No, we are just showing the increase -- this has nothing to do with the \$696,000. We show -- this was passed by the House, but it is now pending in the Senate for approval. In other words, you have your mark-up or something, and then it hasn't been submitted to the House for a -- to the Senate for approval.

Rep. Ford. But there is an asterisk there.

Mr. Rowley. Yes. This is the '65 budget. This figure that was reduced by \$50,000 by the House.

Now, it goes before -- for a mark-up -- it will be placed before the Senate for approval.

Mr. Rankin. Chief Rowley, when you say "this" it doesn't show on the record what you are talking about. So if you can tell what item on that exhibit, 1028.

Rep. Ford. On the same line with the language, "pending action by Senate," on the right-hand side is \$669,000, which is labeled as an increase. That increase relates to what?

Mr. Rowley. It relates to the difference -- the increase between '65 and our proposed budget of 1966.

The asterisk here relates to the 586 positions.

Mr. Rankin. Is there any connection between those two? Chief Rowley, is there any connection between the asterisk, and the wording "Pending before the Senate," and the item on the right-hand column of the increase?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, it represents the increase that we are asking for in the '66 budget.

Sen. Cooper. You are not asking the Senate, though, to increase the House figure of \$7,500,000 by \$669,000.

Mr. Rowley. No, there is no connection between this increase. This should have been down here, where you explain what the asterisk is, where we have 586. Maybe it was put in the wrong position there. In other words, it is like a footnote. This is pending action -- meaning that the House has passed the '65 budget, but the Senate has yet to pass it.

Mr. Rankin. But to clarify, there is no connection between the increased figure and the fact that it is pending before the Senate?

Mr. Rowley. That is right. It happens to be on the same line.

Mr. Rankin. But there is no connection?

Mr. Rowley. No, sir.

Sen. Cooper. What you mean is the House has passed an appropriation of \$7,500,000 and the Senate has not yet acted upon it.

Mr. Rowley. That is correct.

Sen. Cooper. The \$669,000 is an increase that you hope will be voted in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Rowley. That is correct.

Mr. Dulles. Do you present the budget yourself, or does the Secretary of the Treasury, or someone else in the Treasury Department -- present and defend it?

Mr. Rowley. The Secretary presents the over-all Treasury budget, but then in detail, we appear before the appropriations subcommittee ourselves to justify our request.

Mr. Dulles. The Secret Service justifies itself on request in the over-all budget of the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. Chief Rowley, on page 5 of Exhibit 1027, the statement is made, "In the fiscal year 1965, the Secret Service has requested funds for an additional 25 positions. The House of Representatives has included the requested funds in the Treasury Post Office appropriation bill which passed several

weeks ago. These funds will not be sufficient to take the additional measures which we believe are required. However, since the 1965 budget figures had to be submitted in November 1963, it was not possible to make specific and properly justified requests at that time. We should be in a position to do so in the fiscal year 1966 budget submission."

You are not saying that you won't have whatever additional personnel you need now, or from now until the beginning of fiscal year 1966, for the protection of the President?

Mr. Rowley. No, we are not saying that. We are saying that in view of the circumstances of what happened in November, that this budget of 25 positions had already been submitted, and there was nothing you could do to take it back.

The '66 budget was also prepared and submitted. But, as I explain later, in all consideration, we cannot at this time helter skelter say we need so many men, taking advantage of the tragedy. We want to experiment and develop what we need in protective research in the way of manpower and equipment, and what we need in the field, because necessarily we will have to have special agents added to the field to conduct any investigations on risks that may be forwarded to them.

Rep. Ford. But if in the process of your analysis of your needs, you develop that you need more personnel, you need new devices, you need equipment of any sort whatsoever -- you

won't delay the submission of that request just because of the fiscal year budget coming up for fiscal 1966?

Mr. Rowley. No, sir.

Rep. Ford. Because we do have, as you well know, supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills.

Mr. Rowley. That is right.

Rep. Ford. So if you need something, you can request it of the Bureau of the Budget, and if it can be justified, it can be submitted to the Congress in one of the other forms besides the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. Rowley. That is right. Because now as I understand it the same committee handles the supplemental.

Rep. Ford. That is correct.

Mr. Rowley. We are aware of that. That is what we would do when we arrive at what our requirements would be.

Rep. Ford. We can have your assurance that if you come up with requirements, you won't wait for fiscal 1966 to make your submission.

Mr. Rowley. That is right.

Mr. Rankin. Chief Rowley, you are in the process of trying to arrive at your estimates of what you need in additional personnel and equipment and other assistance to make the protective services and the Secret Service in its work of protecting the President as efficient as possible, are you?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. And you are seeking the help and advice of people that you have named, such as the Rand Corporation, and others?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. And do you have any estimate now that you can give the Commission as to when you might have your estimates in that regard?

Mr. Rowley. Well, I think, No. 1, with regard to the protective research, I think we need some expert there to assist us in developing our requirements, particularly in the criteria, on a full-time basis. We have assigned what we thought were sufficient men at this time to cope with the volume of work and reports that we have been receiving, which are now being received from the various organizations of approximately a hundred reports a day. So that we have cut down to a considerable point.

Now, following the evaluation and the processing of these reports, we will determine just what we actually need in the way of manpower.

Mr. Rankin. You also have the problem of being able to get that material out once you have it, don't you?

Mr. Rowley. That is right. And this is the point that we have to develop with IBM, or as I said initially, with

the CIA.

Now, they have facilities that would be available to us if it works.

Mr. Rankin. And you are also inquiring into the question of the sufficiency of the number of agents you have for this area as well as other Secret Service tasks?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. And you are going to present that to the Congress as soon as you have something definite that you can support?

Mr. Rowley. That is right -- in response to Congressman Ford's inquiry.

Mr. Rankin. Now, I think the Commission would be interested in the requirements or standards that you have for agents.

Do you require a college education now?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. And are there any other conditions or standards that you would like to describe?

Mr. Dulles. May I inquire for one point?

Is that a college education for the White House Detail?

Mr. Rowley. No -- that is for all the agents that we recruit for our work, for both criminal and protective, Mr. Dulles.

We require a minimum academic achievement of four years of college or university, and preferably those who attend police administrative schools, where they have in their curriculum subjects on science criminology and law. We find that these people are better adapted, they have an inclination, and they are interested.

But we do take people with BA's and BS's because they, too, have been most satisfactory. But we find when we need to recruit the men, we go to these colleges with special courses. As I mentioned earlier we first started recruiting them from Michigan State, because that was one of the first universities with a police administration curriculum. And we found each and everyone of them have been most satisfactory and have excellent records.

As a matter of fact, a good portion of them are agents in charge of our 65 offices throughout the country.

Mr. Rankin. What do you do as a matter of procedure in using your agents as -- do you keep them in Presidential protection, or do you shift them from that to other functions in the Secret Service?

Mr. Rowley. Well, when they are first sworn into duty, we assign them to an office, so during the period, the first six months, you would call it in-service training, because we are not in the position that the FBI is where they take in, say, a given number of agents -- let's set a figure at 30 --

and then they can start them immediately with their school of 12 weeks. We are not in a position to hire that many at a time. We are in a position to hire ten. So that after six months, ten now, after the character investigations are completed, and then we may get ten more later.

Then we send them to what we call the Treasury Basic School, after which we try to send them as soon as is practical to our Secret Service School.

Now, sometimes a new man might be a year in the Secret Service and during that period he is on probation, after which we determine through the agent in charge whether his service is satisfactory and whether he will develop into an agent.

Mr. Dulles. Is the FBI school open to any of your respective recruits?

Mr. Rowley. Well --

Mr. Dulles. FBI Academy

Mr. Rowley. The Police Academy would be if we had occasion to send them there, if there was something they could benefit from. We do send the White House police to the FBI Police Academy, because that is more in connection with their police function.

Mr. Rankin. How does your agent get into the Presidential protection?

Mr. Rowley. Well, some of the agents have indicated in their personnel history questionnaires submitted each year whether they wish to select an office of duty preference, and there are three offices listed. If an agent wants for one reason or another after a period of three years on the White House Detail to make a request for a transfer, we consider which of the three offices he selected has a vacancy, and we assign him to that office. We then bring in one of the other special agents from the field service to replace him. We then train him in the protective work.

Necessarily, you have to have a nucleus. So there are also a number of men in supervisory positions who have been on the White House Detail for 20 or more years.

Mr. Rankin. But your theory is that they should be able to be trained so that they could be shifted to any part of the Service?

Mr. Rowley. That is right. And it has this advantage: Once they are trained in Presidential protection, if for some reason the White House Detail gets instructions that the President is going to fly to one of the cities, or some hamlet across the country, and we do not have time to get an agent aboard a plane and send him there, or maybe the Air Force has no plane available to transport him there, we pick up the phone and call an agent at the nearest place -- and here is

an agent that has been trained, he knows the mechanics of the operation, and the procedure, and he goes to work, and effectively lays out the arrangements.

Mr. Ford. Mr. Chairman, this Commission Exhibit 1028, which shows the budget and the positions, I think is helpful. But in the submission of the budget by the Secret Service to the Congress they have a greater breakdown of their personnel set-up.

I think it might be wise to include what they submitted to the Congress, or something comparable to it, because I think it is far more complete than this.

Mr. Rowley. That is correct.

Mr. Ford. And I think it might be helpful for the record.

Mr. Rowley. We do not disclose the number of men on Presidential protection.

Mr. Ford. I understand that. But you are familiar with the presentation you submit for your over-all budget, including personnel?

Mr. Rowley. Right.

Mr. Ford. Can that not be submitted for our record, just as it is submitted to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Rowley. It is a matter of public record. But whether or not the tentative one, the '66 can be, before the Budget

Bureau sees it, is something else again.

Mr. Ford. I would not expect that it would.

Mr. Rowley. No. But the others can be.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask leave to secure a copy of that and insert it in the record.

The Chairman. It may be admitted when you obtain it.

Mr. Ford. May I ask one other question, and then I have to leave?

In listening to the testimony, Chief Rowley, sometime ago, I was a little concerned -- more than a little, I should say -- with the process by which the man in charge of a Presidential trip undertakes his relationship with the local law enforcement agencies.

As I recall the testimony, the man in charge has contact with the local police and the sheriff's department and any other local law enforcement agency. But the impression that I gained was that there was no clear delineation of responsibility. They sat around, they talked about what this local law enforcement agency would do and what another one would do.

But it seems to me that a more precise check list, a clear understanding, would be wholesome and better.

What is your reaction on that?

Mr. Rowley. Well, number one, in our revised Manual on Presidential Protection, that is part of the thing.

Now, I would hesitate to prepare a check list for everybody, because you may be embarrassed to find it in the press some day, because of the activity of reporters around the police.

I do not want to downgrade any police department, but this is what happens through no fault of theirs. There are variations anyway in different cities.

Now, I think what you are referring to, Mr. Congressman, is that they complained they did not have a sufficient notice of the route and so forth, so they could make the proper preparations. That is true. Neither did we have sufficient notice. Because they were going back and forth trying to establish -- until they were told they had 45 minutes allotted to them for this route, and first our man had to go, which is a natural operation, to look over the route to see whether or not it could be negotiated within that particular period of time.

Once establishing that it could, and the thing looked safe, then they notified the police and went over it with the police. And then with the police they indicated what they would like done here at intersections and so forth, and other features.

Now, it is true in most cases we ourselves like to get sufficient advance information, we like to send our men out in advance so they do not have to cope with these fast

operations, because when a police department has sufficient notice of the route and so forth, then they have adequate time to get out instructions to their own police department -- whether by precinct or by group commanders, and so forth. And this is what I think in this instance that they are complaining about.

Mr. Ford. As I understand it, however, at the present time, and for the future, there will be a more precise procedure for the relationships of the Secret Service on the one hand and local law enforcement agencies on the other.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ford. That is set forth in your manual as presently revised?

Mr. Rowley. In our present revised manual.

Mr. Ford. So that when your agent in charge goes to city X, he now has the procedures set forth for many to follow on, so there are no uncertainties, if that is possible?

Mr. Rowley. That is right.

And you have to necessarily do that, because you have agents, as I said -- as I cited an example where an agent had been trained in the White House, but you have to utilize his services, because you cannot get a regular White House man out there. He has this information, and he follows it accordingly. It is a check for him as well as for the police.

Mr. Ford. Other countries have protection problems of their chief executive.

I am sure in recent months the French have had considerable problems in this regard.

Do you ever have an exchange of methods with other governments for your benefit or their benefit?

Mr. Rowley. We have been approached, Mr. Congressman, for instructions on security and so forth, but we for reasons -- For national security reasons, I would like to go off the record.

(Off the record.)

(At this point, Representative Ford left the hearing room.)

The Chairman. Back on the record.

Mr. Dulles. You have referred to the dry runs which you made in Dallas, and you usually make, I understand, to establish a route.

First I think you said you did this yourself, and then with the local police.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dulles. Do you have any reason to believe that those dry runs were observed by the President or known to the President, or received any publicity?

Mr. Rowley. No, they did not receive any publicity.

The Chairman. Chief, you were referring a little while ago to the revised rules.

When did the last revision take place? Has it been since the assassination?

Mr. Rowley. No.

The over-all manual, revision of the Manual of the Secret Service, was undertaken before I took office, and because it was delayed, I took it upon myself to assign a man to sit down seven days a week, to bring this manual up to date. The over-all manual has been completed. Now we have almost completed the revised advance manual of our protective phase of it.

The Chairman. And -- but there has been -- as yet there has been no revision since the assassination?

Mr. Rowley. No, sir. It is in the process.

The Chairman. It is in the process of being done?
Very well.

Senator Cooper. I would like to ask a question.

I think you stated that you took part in the procedures and methods for the protection of President Kennedy when he was -- prior to his visit to Dallas.

Mr. Rowley. No, sir.

Senator Cooper. I thought you said that you participated in a dry run.

Mr. Rowley. Oh, no. I was describing what the

advance agents do.

Senator Cooper. Anyway -- you know what the agents of the Secret Service did in preparing for the visit of President Kennedy to Dallas?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Senator Cooper. And you know what procedures they followed during the actual route of the motorcade on that day?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Senator Cooper. Now, reviewing those, is there any failure that you know about on the part of the Secret Service in those procedures or in the methods which they used on the day of the assassination?

Mr. Rowley. No, sir.

Mr. Rankin. Chief Rowley, would you tell us the salary scale for your agents for the first two years?

Mr. Rowley. Yes.

We recruit an agent at grade GS-7, at \$5795.

Mr. Rankin. How does that compare with the starting salary for the FBI?

Mr. Rowley. I think it is a difference of three grades. As I understand, the lowest FBI grade is GS-10.

Mr. Rankin. \$10,000?

Mr. Rowley. Grade 10.

Mr. Rankin. What salary would that be?

Mr. Rowley. It might be -- for example, GS-11 is \$8410. •

Now, it could be somewhere between \$7500 and \$8000.

Mr. Rankin. Are you able to get at that salary the quality of men that you should for this kind of work?

Mr. Rowley. Yes. We have found to date that we have been able -- we have been selective. And of course the fact is that we have only appropriations for a limited number of men.

For example, today we have well over 40 men waiting to be accepted, with completed investigations, some a year or more. Sometimes when we put in requests for a given number of men, we want to put those men on at the beginning of the fiscal year, so we undertake to recruit them and complete their investigation, so that everything -- the character and the physical is up to date -- and we can put them on, if we get the funds precisely at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. Rankin. You recognize that your starting salary is not favorable in comparison with some police forces, do you not?

Mr. Rowley. I recognize that. But at the same time, we are guided by the Treasury law enforcement examinations, and the Treasury investigative standards. But we are below some of the West Coast police organizations, for example. They are well paid and great organizations.

Mr. Rankin. Now, what kind of a workload do your agents have on an average?

Mr. Rowley. Well, at the present time we have a case load of 110.1 cases per man.

Mr. Rankin. How does that compare with other intelligence agencies?

Mr. Rowley. Well, I think -- a satisfactory case load per man per month is from 14 to 15 cases.

Now, I am quite certain that in other agencies it is a little more than that. But whether or not it is as high as ours at the present time, I have no way of knowing at this time.

Mr. Rankin. Do you think that is a handicap to your operation?

Mr. Rowley. Well, it is a handicap. But I think it is testimony to the dedication and the industry of our men, that we are not complaining. We are conducting ourselves and performing our services for the government to the point that even though we are understaffed, nevertheless we are not quitters, and we are carrying on the work within the responsibility entrusted to us.

Mr. Rankin. Did you write the Commission a letter telling the history of the early development and growth of the Secret Service operation over the years?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. Is Exhibit 1029 that information that you gave us?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

This also included the White House police.

Mr. Rankin. Will you examine Exhibit 1029, and inform us as to whether or not any of that should not be included on the public record in light of the national security problem?

Mr. Rowley. No, I have no objections, because in the years past -- this is part of the public record. So I would not see any objection at this time.

(At this point, Senator Cooper left the hearing room.)

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chairman, I offer in evidence Exhibit No. 1029.

The Chairman. It may be admitted.

(The document was marked for identification as Commission Exhibit No. 1029, and received in evidence.)

Mr. Rankin. Chief Rowley, did you write us a letter with regard to proposed legislation, dated June 11?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. And is Exhibit 1030 that letter that you wrote us with an attachment telling about possible legislative changes that you thought might be desirable.

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

(The document was marked for identification as Commission Exhibit No. 1030.)

Mr. Rankin. I offer in evidence Exhibit 1030.

The Chairman. It may be admitted.

(Commission Exhibit No. 1030 was received in evidence.)

Mr. Rankin. Can you briefly state the contents of that attachment to that exhibit, Chief Rowley?

You recall that it is a commentary on the suggestion of legislation about the assassination of the President?

Mr. Rowley. Yes. It is a recommendation on the bills being proposed, that the assassination of a President or Vice President or possible successors to the Presidency be made a federal crime.

(At this point, Senator Cooper re-entered the hearing room.)

Mr. Rowley. Currently there is such a law whereby when people of lesser rank in the government are murdered, that is investigated by federal agencies.

Mr. Rankin. Would you tell the Commission briefly what your idea is as to whether or not it would be helpful to have such a statute?

Mr. Rowley. I think today it would be helpful because it would be a continuation of present law and it would be under

federal jurisdiction -- because this is a federal employee. And I think it properly should be under federal statute. There would then be an opportunity particularly today in the case of the President or Vice President, for the investigation to be pursued immediately and the assassin or groups of defendants to be interrogated as promptly as possible to develop and ascertain whether or not there is a conspiracy, and not wait as we have to do under the present law because of the state statute.

Mr. Rankin. Do you have any suggestions in your proposal about who would have jurisdiction to investigate and report in regard to any violation of that law?

Mr. Rowley. Currently the federal enforcement agencies -- namely, the FBI -- have the responsibility of conducting investigations, on most of the federal laws in the country, and therefore it might properly be their responsibility in a situation like this.

However, we do have a reservation with respect to an attempt or threat on the President, because we would like to work out an agreement whereby we would jointly conduct an investigation because the threat phase of it has been under our jurisdiction under 3056, for many years. It ties in with our responsibility for protection of the President.

Mr. Rankin. In connection with the investigation of

the assassination of President Kennedy, have you personally participated in working with regard to that, in supervision of that investigation?

Mr. Rowley. In the early stages when we assigned our men to inquire into the background of Oswald and all. But then eventually, when the President authorized the FBI to conduct the investigation, we pulled out and only continued and finished up those reports that we initiated.

Mr. Rankin. And since that time, after the FBI was given the authority to proceed with the investigation, you have cooperated with the Commission through the staff, your staff, in helping with various information from time to time. Is that right?

Mr. Rowley. That is correct.

Mr. Rankin. Now, do you have any information of a credible nature that would suggest to you that Oswald was or could have been an agent or informant of any federal agency?

Mr. Rowley. I have no credible information of that kind; no, sir.

Mr. Rankin. Was he an agent or informant or directly or indirectly connected with the Secret Service in any way?

Mr. Rowley. Not in any way. We did not know of him until the event.

Mr. Rankin. From the way that the Secret Service employment is arranged, and the records are kept, and the payments

are made, if he had ever been placed in any such capacity with the Secret Service, would it have come to your attention?

Mr. Rowley. It would; yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. And you are certain that he never was hired directly or indirectly or acted in that capacity?

Mr. Rowley. He was never hired directly or indirectly in any capacity.

Mr. Rankin. Do you have any credible information that would cause you to believe that Lee Harvey Oswald was an agent of any foreign country?

Mr. Rowley. I have no such credible information.

Mr. Rankin. Do you have any credible information to cause you to believe that he was involved in any conspiracy in connection with the assassination, either domestic or foreign?

Mr. Rowley. I have no credible information on any of those.

Mr. Rankin. Are there any areas of the investigation of the Commission that you would suggest that further work should be done, as far as you know the work of the Commission?

Mr. Rowley. I do not.

Mr. Rankin. From your knowledge of the investigation, do you have any opinion as to whether Lee Harvey Oswald was

involved in the killing of the President?

Mr. Rowley. From the reports I have read, I would say that he was involved in the killing of the President, but I do not have complete knowledge of it.

Mr. Rankin. Do you have any opinion from your knowledge of the investigation as to whether Mr. Ruby was associated with anyone else directly or indirectly in the killing of Lee Harvey Oswald?

Mr. Rowley. I have incomplete knowledge with respect to Ruby. Consequently, I could not say, other than what I saw on television or read in the newspapers, whether he had any connection.

Mr. Rankin. Is there anything in connection with the work of the Commission or what you know about our inquiry here that you would like to add to or suggest that the Commission do beyond what you know of it?

Mr. Rowley. No, sir.

Senator Cooper. May I ask a question?

Mr. Rankin asked you several questions. He asked you if you had credible information, which I think was a proper question. But may I ask if you have any information based upon any facts that you know or any -- based upon any information given to you by persons who claim to have personal knowledge -- that there were persons engaged in a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy?

Mr. Rowley. I have no such facts, sir.

Senator Cooper. I address the same question as to whether you have any information that the killing of President Kennedy was -- had any connection with any foreign power?

Mr. Rowley. I have no such information.

The Chairman. Mr. Dulles, any questions?

Mr. Dulles. Yes, sir. I have one general question.

From the testimony, and from my own study, it would seem to me that it was likely that there would be a parallel, somewhat parallel structures to develop the investigative capabilities with regard to possible suspects in the area of Presidential assassination. Any my question is as to whether, in order to avoid that undue expense, you think there would be any advantage in putting the responsibility of that within the FBI, who would then be responsible for advising you as to potential suspects and possibly following up on that, rather than putting that responsibility now to a certain extent on the Secret Service -- whether there is not a division of responsibility in this field which is unfortunate, and may possibly lead to greater expense, personnel doing somewhat duplicative work?

Mr. Rowley. As it applies to this law now?

Mr. Dulles. As it applies to the situation today, without the law which is recommended in your memorandum, and might apply also after that, because the investigation would be required in either case to turn up possible suspects.

My question is, where should that responsibility be primarily centered in order to avoid undue duplication and expense, and yet accomplish our objective.

Mr. Rowley. Well, when you mention duplication, I do not think there has been much duplication in this case, when the President directed the FBI to conduct the investigation to determine whether or not there was a conspiracy.

Mr. Dulles. I am not talking about now. I am talking about investigation prior to, say, the President's visit to city X in the United States.

Mr. Rowley. I see.

Mr. Dulles. Or abroad -- where you have the problem of the Secret Service and the CIA.

Mr. Rowley. Well, I think you want to keep the concept of Presidential protection by a small closely knit group, because of the intimate relationship. But if you want to expand it and give it to another group, to take the long-range view, you do not know what may develop from something like that -- whether a police organization could lead to

a police state or a military state -- if you want to delegate it to some organization like that.

The Chairman. I suppose also, Chief Rowley, that if your people were not doing the spadework on this thing, and keeping their minds steeped in this protection matter, but were obliged to rely on the written records of someone else presented to you, that they would not be in the proper state of mind, would they, to alert -- to be alert to it?

Mr. Rowley. That is right. There would be a tendency to relax and say John Jones is taking care of it. This is always the possibility that you might encounter in something like that.

The Chairman. And in law enforcement, you have to have the feel of the situation, do you not?

You have to do the spadework in order to be aware of every possibility that might develop?

Mr. Rowley. That is true. Because you see in this, Mr. Dulles, on the Presidential Detail, it is a unique Detail. This is something that they think 24 hours a day. They do it 24 hours a day. They are not otherwise involved. For example, they have the principle of screening the President and being always ready to make a quick exit. They do not have to stop to investigate or identify any person, whoever the assailant might be. Their responsibility is only to protect the President at all times.

Mr. Dulles. But they have to know against whom to protect him.

Mr. Rowley. That is right. But they are ready for anything under the present close screening.

But, if I understand your question, Mr. Dulles, you also want to know whether or not in the screening or the investigation of certain groups, like the Communist group and so forth, since it is their responsibility and not ours because they have the internal security of the United States, this is something that we have to develop.

Mr. Dulles. Is "they" the FBI?

Mr. Rowley. The FBI.

That is something that we have to have a formal arrangement about because it enters the realm of internal security. We do not want to conflict. That is uppermost in our mind. We have been most correct about that, in any of the agencies, as you know.

Mr. Dulles. How much larger staff do you think you are going to have to have to cover that situation in the future?

Mr. Rowley. Well, I would not know until we see the volume of reports that we get that we have to refer to the field for investigation. Since we are processing them now, we have to wait to make that determination.

Mr. Dulles. Should you do field investigations as contrasted with the FBI -- the FBI have a large number of people in a large number of cities throughout the United States. You do not have that?

Mr. Rowley. No. But on the basis of this criteria we discussed earlier, the FBI would give us the information, and if in our evaluation we determined that it should be referred to the field for investigation, particularly in the case of individuals, we would conduct our investigation, to determine whether this individual is a high risk to the President.

Now, when it comes to the group, this is something for the FBI to do, because it ties in with their responsibility for internal security.

Now, if there is a close connection between the two, then we would have to have a formal agreement. But because of our responsibility, and the fact that this is part of the work that we have to undertake, then we would conduct our own investigation, because we know what we are looking for.

Mr. Dulles. If the name of Lee Harvey Oswald had been submitted to you by the FBI, what would you, in the normal course, have done?

Would you have referred that back to them for investigation, or would you have carried on an independent investigation?

I am talking now if that name had been referred to you when you knew you were going to go to Dallas.

Mr. Rowley. If we knew we were going to go to Dallas and we had this present criteria, then we would investigate him.

Mr. Dulles. You would carry on the investigation?

Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dulles. Thank you.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chief Justice, I am through with Chief Rowley now -- except I would like to ask him to supply this copy of the information about their appropriation act, and insert it after Exhibit 1028. But we do have Mr. Carswell here.

As you recall, there was some difficulty about the testimony about what the Secret Service was doing at one meeting in regard to the Vice President. And while he is here, I would like to straighten that record out.

The Chairman. Very well.

Mr. Rankin. It will be very brief.

The Chairman. Chief, I want to take this opportunity to thank you and the members of your Secret Service for the cooperation you have given to this Commission. They have been very diligent, very helpful, as you personally have been. And we appreciate it.

Mr. Rowley. Thank you, sir.

The Chairman. Mr. Carswell, you have been sworn, have you not?

Mr. Carswell. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Very well. You may proceed.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chief Justice, if the Commission will bear with me just a minute, I would like to tell about my own conversation with the Vice President about this matter prior to his answering in regard to correction of the record. Excuse me -- the Speaker.

The Chairman. Very well. You may proceed.

Mr. Rankin. After the matter came up before the Commission before, I was asked by one of the Commissioners to see the Speaker, Mr. McCormack, and I did that at his office. And he informed me that the Secret Service and also the FBI had undertaken to try to give him protection because of his position in the line of succession, and that because of the interference that he felt and his wife felt with their relationships over the years in being alone and together in their family life, that he did not like to have that interference, and he asked them not to participate any more in furnishing that protection for him. He said it was his own responsibility in taking that action, and he wanted that to be clear, and that he thought that as far as

any protection he needed, he had plenty of protection with the kind of protection that the Congress had around him in the performance of his duty.

It came to our -- Mr. Carswell's attention, right immediately after he had testified, that his statements in that regard were inaccurate because of the change that had occurred that had not come to his attention. He called me and he said he would like to correct the record.

Mr. Carswell, will you tell us now what the facts are as you have learned?

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT CARSWELL

Mr. Carswell. When I testified before I was asked, I believe, what protection the Secret Service was providing the Speaker. I said that we were providing protection comparable to that previously provided to the Vice President. I did that on the basis of checking with Chief Rowley, immediately after the assassination of President Kennedy, and he told me at that time such protection was being provided to the Speaker.

I understood that that was the case the next day -- because at that time we were not certain what was going on. I had not heard anything about it after that. And I assumed that the situation continued as it was immediately after the assassination. But that was not the case.

As Mr. Rankin has stated, the Speaker requested the Secret

Service to discontinue assigning agents to him for protection, and we concurred -- we did what he requested. That is the present situation.

Mr. Rankin. That is all I have.

The Chairman. Very well.

Thank you, Mr. Carswell.

Well, gentlemen, I think that will be all today. The Commission will adjourn now.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 pm, the Commission adjourned.)