

Jarvison

ABC - TV

9/24/67

PAGE ONE, PART I

Sunday, September 24, 1967

WABC-TV

ANNOUNCER: PAGE ONE, Channel 7's weekly news conference with the men and women who shape events in the metropolitan area. On Part I today our guest is New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison. Mr. Garrison will be interviewed by Channel 7 newsmen John Schubeck, Milt Lewis, and John Parsons. Here is your Moderator, Bill Beutel.

BEUTEL: Good afternoon. After the assassination of President John F. Kennedy almost four years ago the Warren Commission concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone, shot and killed President Kennedy, firing three shots from a rifle from a window in the Texas Book Depository Building in Dallas, Texas. This explanation of the assassination of President Kennedy is officially accepted by the Federal Government and by most people. But Jim Garrison, the District Attorney of New Orleans, does not accept this explanation. Mr. Garrison believes there was a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy, that five or six shots were fired at the President by at least four gunmen who were assisted by several other people. Mr. Garrison believes Lee Harvey Oswald was not a part of the conspiracy and did not shoot President Kennedy. Mr. Garrison also says that some of the police in Dallas, Texas, were a part of the conspiracy.

Mr. Garrison has made arrests in connection with his investigation, and he secured an indictment against Clay Shaw of New Orleans for his alleged role in the alleged conspiracy.

Jim Garrison's rather vocal disagreement with the Warren Commission's Report has raised a lot of controversy and that is why he is our guest this afternoon on PAGE ONE.

Welcome to PAGE ONE, Mr. Garrison. We will begin the questioning with John Schubeck.

SCHUBECK: Thank you, Bill. Mr. Garrison, you are in the midst of what could very well be one of the most important investigations in the history of the United States. Are you in New York in connection with this investigation? If not, what are you in the city for?

GARRISON: Well, I'm in New York for several reasons. One of them is in connection with the investigation, to go over some pictures with a film expert who has been working on the case. Another reason is in connection with the recent article in Playboy, because I had an opportunity to try and communicate some of the issues in the case. The third reason is some personal business.

SCHUBECK: Did you receive any payment ~~from~~ for the Playboy article?

GARRISON: No, and I do not accept money, personal money, from any source in connection with the investigation.

SCHUBECK: Do you think you derived any political benefits from this Playboy article?

GARRISON: Political benefit -- I don't think there is any political benefit for a Democrat in the South, trying to show that the Administration's position is entirely wrong in the assassination.

Furthermore, when you come from a southern state like Louisiana, which is a very Conservative state, and you happen to have found out that a number of the individuals involved in the assassination are Minutemen, I do not think there is any political benefit to anyone in the picture. But I might add finally it does not matter because I have no interest in politics.

LEWIS: On the question of finances, which you mentioned a moment ago, sir, ~~are~~ on the occasions you have gone to Las Vegas who picked up the tab?

GARRISON: On the occasions I have gone to Las Vegas they were when I was going in connection with either District Attorneys Conference or business along those lines. On three different occasions when I went to the window and wanted to check out I was told that you are a guest of the Sands. All you have to do is pay the phone bills and valet and other things. And I have learned separately that that is what they do with public officials. Since I do not gamble and have no other business at the Sands I did not regard it as significant, and don't ~~know~~ now.

LEWIS: You do not think it compromises you in any way, sir?

GARRISON: No, I don't think it does because we cleaned up every racket in the city of New Orleans without exception, and I don't have to worry about that. If I had some connection with the mob, as

they say, and had to worry about it I would not go there. But I do not have to worry about it.

LEWIS: Well, on that score, was a Lieutenant of Carlos Marcello, who is by repute the big Mafia boss down there, did he arrange for you to stay out there?

GARRISON: Nobody ever arranged for me to stay at the Sands. The only times I have ever been there are when I just on the spur of the moment decide if I am going to Los Angeles or Phoenix I go by way of Las Vegas ~~and~~ and spend a few days at the Sands. No one has ever invited me. I have never been a guest of the mobs of any kind. I do not know Carlos Marcello, I have never seen him. I have no connection with him. It makes a good news story, but it just does not happen to be the truth.

PARSONS: Mr. Garrison, you said a few moments ago that while you were in New York City you are going over some pictures in connection with the probe. Can you be more specific as to what you are doing here in connection with the probe?

GARRISON: There is a man, who presumably will not mind my mentioning his name, who has done pioneer work in connection with gathering pictures, both film and still shots. His name is Richard Sprague. I guess he is the top expert in the country in gathering films in regard to the assassination. I am going to be with him while I am here.

PARSONS: Well, insofar as you have been with him and you have looked over any pictures have you discovered anything new that you can

tell us about now?

GARRISON: Well, I will give you just an example. There are so many things, the most important things that are developed are the structure in the sense that you develop the timing, using the Zapruder films as base. I can give you an ~~xxx~~ example that is rather interesting, for one.

The last time you were here we located a picture taken when the police had just brought the rifle out of the book depository and are holding it up. You see police gathered around a number of civilians and it is a real interesting picture. What makes it so interesting is that the rifle does not have a telescopic sight on it. Of course, Oswald's did. We determined that this rifle had been brought over to the depository approximately five minutes after one, roughly ~~five~~ twenty-five minutes before Oswald's rifle was found, in quotes. But the rifle initially brought over to the depository had no telescopic sight on it at all.

PARSONS: Have you found anything new, anything this time since you have been in New York?

GARRISON: I have not met with him yet.

BEUTEL: The basis of your examination will be the Zapruder film altogether?

GARRISON: No. I have been through the Zapruder film, both live and stills. I did not mean to imply that that is what we are here for. I meant that the Zapruder film has turned out to be particularly valuable because it gives, it is a basic reference with regard to time.

In other words, it gives the time frame within which shots were fired, and from that Sprague has been able to determine almost exactly when other different pictures were taken -- the Muchmore, the Muchmore picture and the Nix and all the others, using the Zapruder films as a base.

BEUTEL: Your most recent charge vis a vis the assassination is that there were members of the Dallas police force involved in the assassination. Now you didn't exactly spell that out to my knowledge. What were they doing in the assassination?

GARRISON: Well, Bill, naturally I must say first of all it is quite clear most of the Dallas Police Force consists of good police officers who are not involved in any way. Having made that point I want to say that it has been apparent for a long time that there were some individuals who were involved in what happened in Dealey Plaza, were connected with what happened to Officer ~~TIPPIT~~ Tippit, particularly with leading the other police cars astray by the use of a police radio in Oak Cliff; and of course with the execution of Oswald by Jack Ruby on Sunday. There are some police individuals involved in these actions, and we have known this for some time, although while we had men working in Dallas it was not exactly wise to bring it out.

BEUTEL: Well, did these police individuals that you refer to, were they in on the conspiracy before the fact of the conspiracy or did they just get in on it and do whatever they did after the conspiracy, after the assassination?

GARRISON: No, no. Before the fact. They are part of the pre-existing structure before the fact. And these particular police officers are individuals connected with the Minutemen Organization.

PARSONS: Have you discussed this conspiracy of yours with these officers? Have you interrogated them? Do you plan to?

GARRISON: You mean have I gone over to Dallas?

PARSONS: Have you sent your man over?

GARRISON: To interrogate them? No.

PARSONS: Do you intend to?

GARRISON: No.

PARSONS: Do you intend to ~~are~~ pull them in?

GARRISON: No.

SCHUBECK: How about your man in Dallas, did he talk to the policemen?

GARRISON: These individual policemen? Certainly not.

PARSONS: Do you intend to arrest them? What do you intend ^{do} to/with them?

GARRISON: I don't intend to do anything at the moment except to try and bring out some of the additional facts so other people interested in the case can have a better understanding of what happened.

LEWIS: Mr. Garrison, let me nail this down. Are ~~these~~ these Dallas policemen still members of the Dallas police force?

GARRISON: Some of them are and some of them are not.

LEWIS: Well now, by you publicizing this don't you think you

are hurting your case by letting John Smith know I have got an eye on you?

GARRISON: There is no question about it. Anything you do in this sort of activity has a plus factor and a minus factor and a calculated risk. But again, I am interested -- I have to wear two hats in this sort of situation because this case is not just of interest to the people of New Orleans. I have to wear one as a prosecutor, so you will find me saying nothing about Mr. Shaw, whom we have to presume is innocent.

On the other hand, because we have learned things and I think the country has a right to know, I try to publicize certain things that will let everybody in America know what happened to the extent that it will not hurt the case. And this is a calculated risk in this case, but I think the point is well made.

PARSONS: Aren't you really saying, Mr. Garrison, that you ^{think} ~~have~~ that some members of the Dallas police force are involved but you don't have proof? Otherwise you would obviously arrest them.

GARRISON: No. We have proof, but I can't go in Dallas and arrest anybody. I have no arresting authority in Dallas. All I can do with regard to individuals outside the jurisdiction is when it becomes clear, that other involvement, and is timely, I will bring it out so that if the people in that jurisdiction want something done about it they can do it. But I can't arrest anyone in Dallas any more

than I can in New York.

SCHUBECK: You have made attempts in the past to bring people to the Bar of Justice in your area, in your jurisdiction. Why haven't you done this in the case of the Dallas policemen?

GARRISON: Because for two ~~xxx~~ reasons. Aren't you aware that our attempts to bring people back to the Bar of Justice have been unsuccessful? We have never had extradition trouble before, but we have been shown that we can't do it.

Secondly, these individuals that we try to bring back are involved in actions in our jurisdiction. These individuals on the Dallas police force are not active in our jurisdiction. However, we have established their involvement in the assassination, so I raise the point so that if the Dallas people want to look into it they know that there is a--

PARSONS: You say the District Attorney in Dallas would not accept your information?

GARRISON: I don't want to get in a fight with Henry Wade because it accomplishes nothing. I am simply saying that it has been quite clear for a long time that individuals of the Dallas police force who were associated with the Minutemen are involved. And anyone in Dallas, or anyone in the rest of the country that wants to see a specific example/can turn, can go to their library and look at the Warren Commission Exhibits. They can look at the Sawyer Exhibit and watch the activities of Car 223 in the way that Car 223 pulls away from the Church of the Abundant Light where the individual who killed

Tippit ran, ~~pulls~~ pulls him away from the Marsallas Library, pulls him away again when they start to go back. 223, whoever man 223 is, is just one example of the involvement of the Dallas police.

BEUTEL: Have you given Henry Wade the names -- if you know the names and identity of the Dallas police involved in Car 223, or involved in whatever connection they might be involved, according to your information, have you given Henry Wade the names of these people?

GARRISON: Bill, let me save some time and give you the short answer. The Dallas establishment, certain individuals of the Dallas establishment, including some of, a few of the oil rich men who have long control over the Dallas establishment are involved in the assassination of the President, and it would be a waste of time to talk to any individuals in Dallas about it. Obviously there is no interest in their doing anything about it, and I do not propose to get in a fight with any single individual. But it has been perfectly plain for years that they consider the matter closed.

BEUTEL: Did we hear you correctly? Did you say that there were certain oil magnates in Dallas who were part of the assassination plot?

GARRISON: Financed and sponsored, yes.

BEUTEL: You haven't named those people yet.

GARRISON: I don't propose to name any of those people until well after the Shaw trial.

LEWIS: Mr. Garrison, at the outset you said there were at least three people involved. Later on you said at least five people involved. Later on you said at least seven people involved. And now this past week you have brought in members of the Dallas police department.

Number one--

BEUTEL: Today, the oil people.

LEWIS: --how many members of the Dallas police department so far as you suspect are involved in this alleged conspiracy?

GARRISON: I will not answer your question. You see, you are concerned about specifics, and it bothers you that I know more about the case than I knew some months ago. I might learn in the next six months as a result of our investigation that instead of a hundred people, three hundred are involved, if so, I will tell the truth. We don't take a position and hold ourselves to it like concrete.

Furthermore, I do not think you are right in your recitation that it has been a steady progression as it continued. From the outset it had been obvious that there were more than three people involved in the conspiracy. There are more than three people involved in New Orleans alone, and that has been obvious.

LEWIS: You know, one of the great district attorneys of the United States, and I think you will recognize this, is a man by the name of Frank S. Hogan. And he never tells you nothing. How do

expect, sir, by your making these disclosures without naming people, how can you possibly conclude your case successfully?

GARRISON: Because I have a problem, as I said before, of communication. I disclose nothing about my case. With regard to the Shaw case my policy has been the same as Frank Hogan. If you go through my statements to the press you will find from the time I arrested Mr. Shaw I have had nothing to say that would infer that he was guilty. I have said again and again that he is presumed to be innocent. All I am trying to do is get the word out that there is a problem here. The people of the country have not been told the truth. I think it is my duty to do that. I think that Frank Hogan would probably do the same thing. I do not think he has had a parallel case.

LEWIS: I beg to differ with you, but go ahead.

GARRISON: Well, I don't know Frank Hogan. I do not think he has had a parallel case.

BEUTEL: Mr. Garrison, I think growing out of Milt Lewis's question is this question: Wouldn't it have been wiser in terms of evidence, et cetera, and publicity, to have waited until you had a full package in the case to come up with any ~~thing~~ ^{of it} rather than come up with it piece by piece and run into obstacles all along the way that prevents you from--

GARRISON: It would be much wiser. It would be infinitely wiser if we lived in a dream ~~work~~ world in the best of all possible worlds. But this day would never have arisen.

BEUTEL: Well the point that Milt was making I think is that this is what the DA's that we in New York know would have done. Frank Hogan would, for example, have a package and he would present it to a Grand Jury, get an indictment--

GARRISON: No one in this case would have survived to get such a package. No one in the world. By the time it was known you were working^{on}/it you would have been interrupted. We have had every kind of obstacle conceivable. But because we burst into the spotlight before it was too late to stop us and let the public know what we were doing, it is difficult now for a major witness to be killed. It is difficult now for them to kill Shaw, and it is going to be kind of difficult for them to kill me.

BEUTEL: You are ~~saying~~^{saying} then that your case has become easier to prosecute, to get information on since you have put it in the bath of publicity.

GARRISON: Bill, again let me distinguish. There are two things. There is a case against Shaw about which I make no public statements; there is the assassination as a whole, which I think is, has to be publicized, the true facts in a general way, so that the people of this country will understand that a fraud has been ~~perpetrated~~^{perpetrated} on them. I cannot keep silent when I know this. So those aspects of what I regard as a fraud I am trying to communicate. And one of the things I hope to accomplish by doing this is to get the Federal government interested so it will again reexamine it.

I found that we get no help at all from them, but if we can get enough of the people interested perhaps we can get the Federal government to have a new investigation.

PARSONS: Mr. Garrison, speaking of obstacles, you said earlier this week that you felt Senator Robert Kennedy -- I want to quote you, to see if this is accurate -- "Has done everything he could to ~~obstruct~~ obstruct the investigation." Are those your words?

GARRISON: No, but in essence it is true. Let me say precisely what I said, John.

What I said was -- I was asked if any individuals were obstructing our investigation. I said that we had had quite a bit of trouble from Senator Robert Kennedy because Walter Sheridan, who is close to him, made a real effort to get witnesses to leave the jurisdiction, and has caused all kinds of interference. So I said I have to conclude that Senator Robert Kennedy has made a real effort to stop the investigation. I am not quibbling. I am just trying to say I am not sure it is all he could have done, because instead of sending one man down he could have sent ten.

PARSONS: Why do you feel he has not been helping?

GARRISON: I don't know. For example, I have nothing ~~but~~ but high regard for the Kennedy family. I admired Jack Kennedy, and feel strongly about him. And I think that Robert Kennedy is a competent person. But again, when I am asked if I have had anybody making any attempts to obstruct the investigation I have to tell the ~~truth~~ truth.

Now, in this case Walter Sheridan made a real effort, in one instance offered a man, a major witness, money to move to California before the trial, and guaranteed there would be no extradition.

And after he was charged properly enough for this, Senator Robert Kennedy came out with a statement which in effect was testimony for the Defendant.

PARSONS: You are also quoted as saying that the Senator can "perhaps explain better than I why his political career is so important." Do you think it is his political career that is causing him to be not helpful?

GARRISON: Again, I do not know the Senator so there is no way for me to tell. All I can say is, as a matter of logic, it appears to me ~~that~~ ^{that} he must have some problem resulting ~~in~~ from the fact that he was attorney general of the United States at the time the Warren Commission reached this untrue conclusion. I do not know why it would bother him, but I do not see what~~ex~~ else it would be other than politics.

PARSONS: In the murder of his brother, do you think he would allow politics to stand in the way of ~~find~~ finding a resolution to that question?

GARRISON: Well, let me answer by saying that without any question of a doubt he is interfering with the investigation of the murder of his brother, the first valid, objective, competent investigation they have ever had. One which has been successful, which is

not going to be a failure in any way; one which is going to produce convictions with regard to the assassination of the President of the United States; one which is already known to us, ~~and~~ and you will know in time, as a successful investigation. And he has made a real effort to stop it. Now, I let you be the judge.

PARSONS: Well, what you are saying then is that Senator Kennedy by not cooperating is in effect letting the murderers of his brother walk the streets.

GARRISON: Well, yes. That is a fair statement, yes.

LEWIS: Well, Mr. Garrison, has Senator Kennedy or any of his aides directly or circuitously ever said to you, Jim Garrison, why don't you lay off?

GARRISON: They have done more than that. They have tried to torpedo the case. They did not have to say that to me. When Sheridan came down to New Orleans, among other things he said that he was sent down there by Robert Kennedy and he said one of his objectives was to see that Shaw never came to trial. So it does not matter what he says to me.

LEWIS: Did you ever check that out, Mr. Garrison? As a lawyer, an investigator? Did you ever try to check that out with Senator Kennedy himself?

GARRISON: I don't have to check it out. I am telling you facts I know. You know, you bother me. I do not think you are a very objective questioner. Of course I have checked it out with facts down

there. Do you think I come up here and make statements like that off the top of my head if I do not know what I am talking about?

PARSONS: Well, why don't you just -- since you are involved in such a sensitive area, merely pick up the phone and try to talk with Senator Kennedy?

GARRISON: I am not interested in talking to anybody who interferes with an investigation which is an obviously effective one into the death of his brother.

PARSONS: You are known to ~~be~~ be a very tough, hardboiled DA. It is not unusual for you to pick up the phone and to call somebody you want to talk to, is it?

GARRISON: Yes, but I am just not inclined to pick up the phone to talk to anybody who has tried to torpedo the investigation. I'm sorry, that's the way I am.

SCHUBECK: Have you ever talked to Robert Kennedy?

GARRISON: No, I haven't.

LEWIS: Incidentally, mentioning politics as such a moment ago, do you put any credence in some reports that you might run on a Vice Presidential ticket, number two to George Wallace?

GARRISON: I wouldn't run on the Vice Presidential ticket with anyone. I wouldn't run for the United States Senate. I am not interested in politics of any kind. I am interested in building the best District Attorney's office I possibly can, and then I am going back to private practice. I have no interest in politics at all beyond

my office.

BEUTEL: Mr. Garrison, a few moments ago in response to a question from Milt Lewis you said that he was too worried about specifics of the case. I have forgotten just what the subject was that he was driving at.

LEWIS: About getting in touch with Senator Kennedy.

BEUTEL: No, no, no. That was not it. It was a different area all together. But just today I talked with somebody and they said, gee, I would like to believe Jim Garrison's case because I find certain holes in the Warren Commission's report. But Jim Garrison has not been able to come up with anything to really convince me.

Well now, these are the kind of specifics that people are really asking for. And the fact is you have not yet come up with ~~specific~~ specifics, you have hinted all along that specifics are just around the corner.

GARRISON: Would you like to know why?

BEUTEL: Yes, sir.

GARRISON: Because if I come up with specifics Mr. Shaw will have his case reversed because I brought out specifics before the trial.

One of my problems in trying to communicate about the case is that I cannot in fairness talk about the evidence before the trial. So I have a problem. I want to say the Warren Commission is wrong,¹ it is not even close, but I cannot talk about the Shaw case.

I will give you an example, though, if you want something you can find in the Warren Commission itself. For example, if you go to Volume 16, Commission Exhibit #38. Look at Lee Oswald's notebook and you will find towards the end, you will find a phone number which begins with PE, a Fort Worth phone number. As a matter of fact, everybody in this country can do that because they can go to their library where they have the Warren Commission reports and if they look in volume 16, Exhibit 38 and look at the PE phone number, which is a Fort Worth phone number, and then if they go to another volume, which is the Armstrong Exhibits, the Armstrong Exhibits, they can find that volume because on the outside it says Alan DeFuqua. If they go in the Armstrong Exhibits and go through the notebook of Jack Ruby, if they go through the phone calls of Jack Ruby, rather -- I'm sorry, it is another volume. If they go through the phone calls of Jack Ruby, on June 6, they will find that Jack Ruby made two phone calls to that number that is in Lee Oswald's notebook. And we can go on and on with examples like this. The structure itself takes an hour to tell about it. But I can give you more examples if you want.

PARSONS: Mr. Garrison, were they planning, was this the beginning of the conspiracy, in June?

GARRISON: No. The beginning of the conspiracy was much earlier, John, and was at a higher level, involving people with much more important things.

PARSONS: I raise that only because the details of the motorcade and the planning of the trip were not worked out until after September. And you are talking about a complicated--

GARRISON: That is not a problem at all. The essential structure for the assassination was developed long before the specific site was developed, and it adapted itself to the site, is what happened. In other words, it was an alternate sort of thing. It could have happened in another town. Ultimately there would have been a parade in Houston or Fort Worth or something like that. And when it was finally set, the apparatus was set up.

SCHUBECK: Mr. Garrison, many people have charged you with being paranoid. What do you think about that?

GARRISON: I do not think too many people have. But I have, once in a while when someone takes a position which we regard as utterly ridiculous, as the Warren Commission has taken, perhaps I flare back more than I should. But I do not think that the press has been greatly unfair to me in balance. I wish that the press had been more curious about digging below the surface of the Warren Commission in the assassination. But I do not think that ~~anyone~~ anybody is picking on me. I think that there is a genuine effort to interfere with the investigation, and I think that in time it will become obvious to anybody. And I suppose when occasionally I describe that it does sound like it.

BEUTEL: Do you think Milt Lewis was picking on you?

GARRISON: No. I think he's being a good newsman, but I just want to let him know once in a while he is pressing too hard in an irrelevant area.

LEWIS: Can I push a little bit more, Mr. Garrison?

GARRISON: I'm sure you can. And you don't mind if I push back.

LEWIS: Oh, by all means. Now, the President of the New Orleans Metropolitan Crime Commission has urged that you be barred from the Grand Jury investigation of organized crime. Why?

GARRISON: We have had trouble with the organized, with the metropolitan crime commission for several years. As a matter of fact, the metropolitan crime commission is composed of really pretty good people and sincere people. It is dominated by a managing director who is a man whom I do not consider sincere and who has recently got into trouble by making false accusations against one of the finest members of our city council.

Whenever they have made these periodic accusations we have insisted on proof. We have called them before the Grand Jury and again and again it turns out he has no evidence, and nothing to say. Then later on there is another great announcement.

So, as a result, since I am not a diplomat I do not even answer letters from the crime commission. So I do not have the warmest relations with the crime commission, although I am conscious of the fact that most of the men are good men. I understand his doing this.

I think he is probably influenced by Mr. Cohen. But let me say this now about our investigation into organized crime, which we are doing now.

LEWIS: Is it very big down there, by the way?

GARRISON: Not too big because they know me down there and they know that we have cleaned up every racket. But let me say this, and I have not had a chance to say this before. What we did was to explain to the jury the Louisiana law which requires that a Grand Jury adviser be a member of the District Attorney's staff. But we said nevertheless you pick whomever you want. And we will appoint them to our staff. And they can be your adviser. Anyone you name. And they voted on it and decided they wanted us to represent them. So, in other words, that matter is over with.

PARSONS: Are there any more arrests in connection with your alleged conspiracy due in the very near future?

GARRISON: John, not in the immediate future, but there will be in time in New Orleans. I have had -- well, some of the education I have acquired in this case is that good defense lawyers can sure complicate things, as they probably should, but we have been tremendously involved and most of our time has been consumed with answering pleadings in the Shaw case, and we just cannot handle another parallel situation.

When we had the Shaw pleadings and Dean Andrews, and Andrews trial for example, we only had one or two people investigating. So

there will not be any other arrests prior to the Shaw case. After the trial there will be others.

BEUTEL: One more question --- we are running out of time. I would like to ask this question; are you still absolutely convinced that you are going to blow wide open the Warren Commission Report and show that it is absolutely false when you get your case all put together?

GARRISON: We have already -- it is already as dead as Humpty Dumpty, and there is no way for it to survive. We do have the picture of how the President was killed. We do know the names of the individuals involved, and we will not lose any cases.

BEUTEL: That is the answer I wanted to hear, anyway.

Gentlemen, I am sorry to interrupt but our time is up. Our thanks then to Jim Garrison, the District Attorney of New Orleans for being our guest today on Part I of PAGE ONE.

David Ross, the New York City Council Majority Leader, is our guest on the second half of PAGE ONE right after station identification.
