

(Sprague) The CIA has stated that they picked up a - wire-tapp~~e~~, a conversation between Oswald and the Russians ~~at~~ the Russian Embassy while Oswald was in the Cuban Embassy. Now the CIA has explained that it does not have the tape, saying that it reuses its wiretap tapes after the conversation that has been wiretapped is transcribed, and they have stated that they reused the Oswald tape [sic] before the assassination of President Kennedy, therefore they no longer had it at the time of the assassination or thereafter. We have just recently uncovered [!] a document by the FBI, by J. Edgar Hoover, indicating that FBI agents listened to that tape that the CIA had of Oswald, after the assassination of President Kennedy, and that the FBI agents stated that the voice on that tape was not Oswald. Well, that raises an awful lot of questions. If that tape was in existence after the assassination of President Kennedy, why in the world would it have been destroyed, if it was destroyed? So right there is a - an awfully broad area that has arisen, and certainly merits a full investigation.

(Rather) Can you name another?

(Sprague) There has been uncovered a person who was present at Parkland Hospital who apparently was in a position to observe and to know whereof she speaks, indicating that enough fragments of the bullet that went into Governor Connally were removed from Governor Connally to prove pretty conclusively that the bullet in Governor Connally could not have been the same bullet that went through President Kennedy.

(Rather) Almost from the moment of the Kennedy assassination, there has been dispute that the same bullet hit both Kennedy and Connally. If it was not the same bullet, the argument goes, then Oswald could not have been the lone assassin. Sprague spoke of a hospital witness with potentially significant information on that point.

(Sprague) This is a person who has ~~been~~ a responsible position at the Parkland Hospital, who was there at the time of the assassination, who was never interviewed, not only by the Warren Commission, but ~~was~~ never interviewed by any law-enforcement agency, up until now. (sic)

(Rather) If that person is ever interviewed by the Assassinations Committee, if any of those leads are followed up, Sprague won't be the man asking the questions. He's out of Washington now, and he carries with him serious doubts that the Committee will ever go after the truth about the Kennedy assassination. ^{really}

(Sprague) I do not think that the Congress, one, really is committed to a thorough, impartial, in-depth investigation of these two assassinations, and, secondly, I do not think that the Congress, the House of Representatives, because it is such a political 'cat', is capable of having the kind of investigation that is called for in investigating these two assassinations.

(Rather) A couple of questions. First of all, when you talk about the Congress not really wanting the kind of professional investigation you have in mind, are you suggesting, or are you, that there are forces in the Congress that want to cover this up because they are afraid the truth will be found out, or is it a matter of simply the Congress just wants to put it all behind us?

(Sprague) Well, I think that there are some whose attitude is that they just want to put it behind us; I don't think that they have any ulterior purpose. But I do think that there are some members of Congress who are either friendly with other agencies of government who might be embarrassed if this investigation