

1 - Mr. Belmont
1 - Mr. Rosen
1 - Mr. Sullivan
1 - Mr. Rags (5738)

1 - Mr. Conrad
1 - Mr. Griffith
1 - Mr. Codign

March 18, 1964

By Courier Service

Honorable J. Lee Rankin
General Counsel
The President's Commission
200 Maryland Avenue, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

Dear Mr. Rankin:

Reference is made to your letter of March 12, 1964, concerning the paper bag marked Q-10, identified as brown wrapping paper in the shape of a long bag which was found near the window from which the shots were fired and K-52, a replica paper sack made from paper and tape available in the shipping room of the Texas School Book Depository. Your letter refers to the report of Special Agent Gemberling, January 7, 1964, page 47, and to a supplemental report of this Bureau dated January 13, 1964.

The supplemental report dated January 13, 1964, covers a comparison of the paper bag, Q-10, with a known sample of paper and tape obtained from the first floor of the Texas School Book Depository on November 22, 1963, designated as K-2, and further designated as Exhibit D-1. This particular known specimen of wrapping paper and tape was previously furnished to the Commission on March 10, 1964, and returned to the Laboratory on March 13, 1964.

The report of Special Agent Gemberling on January 7, 1964, refers to specimen K-52, a replica sack made by Agents of this Bureau at the Texas School Book Depository Building on December 1, 1963, from paper and tape available in the shipping room of the Texas School Book Depository.

*Re typed by Mr. Conrad
3/19/64*

JCC:em
(10)

Geneville J. Lee Rankin

Since two different known paper and tape samples, K-7 and K-52, were compared with the Q-10 bag, there is no actual conflict between the report of Special Agent Gemberling on January 7, 1964, and the supplemental report dated January 13, 1964.

In response to the questions set forth on page 2 of your letter of March 12, 1964, you are advised as follows:

1. The brown wrapping paper sack, Q-10, was similar in color to the paper used in the shipping department, referred to above as K-52, but under ultraviolet light fluorescence, both the tape and the paper comprising K-52 were different in appearance.

2. The paper sack, Q-10, did not change appreciably in color when treated for fingerprints by the Dallas Police Department, since a dusting powder was apparently used. After the paper sack, Q-10, was chemically treated for fingerprints by this Bureau, there was an appreciable change in the color of the paper.

3. The paper and Manila tape used to make the paper sack, Q-10, do not contain any watermarks or other significant features which would indicate the source of the paper used. Paper and tape of this kind are widely used for packaging purposes and could undoubtedly be obtained from many wholesale paper dealers.

Sincerely yours,