

May 16, 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. TOLSON
 MR. BOARDMAN
 MR. BELMONT
 MR. NICHOLS

b7c

William O. Olney

On May 9, 1957, I had an extended conference with the Attorney General in his office at which various matters were gone over by the Attorney General and myself pertaining to Departmental and Bureau Operations.

I called to the Attorney General's attention the memorandum which I received from Assistant Attorney General Olney under date of May 3, 1957, and my reply thereto of May 8, 1957. I told the Attorney General that Olney was again embarking upon a paper war and that I had reluctantly answered Olney's memorandum of May 3, not because I had time to waste, nor because I desired to have any more than the most limited dealings with Olney, but because of the paper record that Olney was building up which made it appear that the Bureau had been derelict in the performance of its duties.

I told the Attorney General that the memorandum of Olney was incomprehensible to me, even from a legal view. I stated that I was well aware that Olney would embark upon these brainstorms from time to time, but that his presentation of the law, as it appeared in his memorandum of May 3, was entirely fallacious in that Section 1901 of Title 18 applied to the furnishing of false information to the Bureau in all classes of cases and was not limited solely to information furnished in kidnaping cases. The Attorney General agreed with this point. I said furthermore that the question had become most because Espallat, about whom Olney was indicating such concern, had already returned to the Dominican Republic and did not intend to return to the United States, so far as we could ascertain. I pointed out to the Attorney General that it seemed obvious to me that Olney was still "burning" under the Attorney General's previous ruling, giving to the Director of the Bureau the authority to determine when it should or should not enter into a case as a kidnaping case. The Attorney General shared my views in this matter and said that he would

have been inclined to speak to Mr. Olney again about this matter but for the fact that Mr. Olney was shortly leaving the Department and he believed, therefore, that the situation would be clarified. I expressed my pleasure at the possibility of such an event occurring.

FOR INSTRUCTIONS AS
 TO DISSEMINATION
 SEE FILE 105-59854-38

3 of
 MAY 17 1957

NOT RECORDED
 126 MAY 15 1957

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
 HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
 DATE 10-30-90 BY SP

b7c

COPY

May 16, 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. TOLSON
MR. BOARDMAN
MR. BELMONT
MR. NICHOLS

b7c

William O. Olney

On May 9, 1957, I had an extended conference with the Attorney General in his office at which various matters were gone over by the Attorney General and myself pertaining to Departmental and Bureau Operations.

I called to the Attorney General's attention the memorandum which I received from Assistant Attorney General Olney under date of May 3, 1957, and my reply thereto of May 8, 1957. I told the Attorney General that Olney was again embarking upon a paper war and that I had reluctantly answered Olney's memorandum of May 3, not because I had time to waste, nor because I desired to have any more than the most limited dealings with Olney, but because of the paper record that Olney was building up which made it appear that the Bureau had been derelict in the performance of its duties.

I told the Attorney General that the memorandum of Olney was incomprehensible to me, even from a legal view. I stated that I was well aware that Olney would embark upon these brainstorms from time to time, but that his presentation of the law, as it appeared in his memorandum of May 3, was entirely fallacious in that Section 1001 of Title 18 applied to the furnishing of false information to the Bureau in all classes of cases and was not limited solely to information furnished in kidnaping cases. The Attorney General agreed with this point. I said furthermore that the question had become moot because Espallant, about whom Olney was indicating such concern, had already returned to the Dominican Republic and did not intend to return to the United States, so far as we could ascertain. I pointed out to the Attorney General that it seemed obvious to me that Olney was still "burning" under the Attorney General's previous ruling, giving to the Director of the Bureau the authority to determine when it should or should not enter into a case as a kidnaping case. The Attorney General shared my views in this matter and said that he would

have been inclined to speak to Mr. Olney again about this matter but for the fact that Mr. Olney was shortly leaving the Department and he believed, therefore, that the situation would be clarified. I expressed my pleasure at the possibility of such an event occurring.

FOR INSTRUCTIONS AS
TO DISSEMINATION
SEE FILE 105-59854-38

57 MAY 17 1957

NOT RECORDED
126 MAY 15 1957
ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 10-30-90 BY SP

b7c