SAC, NEW ORLEANS (89-69) 5/18/67

SA, REGIS L. KENNEDY

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY
DALLAS, TEXAS
11/22/63
MISCELLANEOUS -
INFORMATION CONCERNING

The purpose of this memorandum is to set forth the instructions I received from United States Attorney, LOUIS C. LaCOUR, and his assistants, JOHN C. CIOLINO and FRITZ VETERS, concerning my testimony before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury inquiry into District Attorney JIM GARRISON's investigation of parties involved in the conspiracy to assassinate President KENNEDY. In this memorandum I am setting forth to the best of my recollection the general areas of questions put to me during my appearances before the Grand Jury by District Attorney GARRISON and his assistants, JAMES ALCOCK, ANDREW SCIAMBRA and ALVIN OSER.

United States Attorney LaCOUR initially instructed me, after I was subpoenaed, to invoke the privilege on all questions put to me and to only answer as to my name, the fact that I am an agent and assigned to the New Orleans Office of the FBI.

On the date of the receipt of the subpoena and until May 17, 1967, and at the hearing before Judge BERNARD J. BAGERT of the Criminal District Court of Orleans Parish, New Orleans, Louisiana, I stood mute at all proceedings relating to this matter pursuant to instructions of the United States Attorney.

On the morning of May 17, 1967, Criminal District Judge BAGERT denied the United States Attorney's motion to quash the subpoena which I received and ordered me to appear before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury at 2:00 PM, on that date.

Assistant United States Attorneys CIOLINO and VETERS were with me at all of my appearances in Criminal

4 - NEW ORLEANS
RLK/dbb
(4)

District Court before Judge BAGERT and were representing the Federal Government in this matter. These assistants anticipated an adverse ruling by Judge BAGERT on the Government's motion to quash on May 17, 1967. After the hearing on the morning of May 17, 1967, when the Government's motion to quash the subpoena was denied and prior to my appearance before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury, Assistant United States Attorneys CIOLINO and VETERS tempered LaCOUR's instructions to the extent that it would be necessary for me to justify invoking the privilege as it would be subject to judicial review. They told me to use my own judgement in invoking the privilege and that I should answer questions of my own personal knowledge. Along these lines in discussing with CIOLINO and VETERS as to what questions should and should not be answered by me, I had anticipated that District Attorney GARRISON might possibly ask me the question, did I see DAVID FERRIE on November 22, 1963, in United States District Court (during trial of CARLOS MARCELLO on Fraud Against the Government charges). They indicated to me that I should answer in the affirmative as this was a matter of my own personal knowledge because FERRIE was, in fact, present in the Courtroom on that date.

I went before the Grand Jury at approximately 4:50 PM. In the Grand Jury room, along with the jurors were GARRISON and his three assistants mentioned above. GARRISON asked most of the questions. During the first half of the interrogation GARRISON prefaced each question with a "speech" stating as declarations of fact that OSWALD was an employee of the CIA and was associated with the Cubans in the New Orleans area and did I know this. I felt that all of GARRISON's statements of alleged fact prefacing his questions put to me before the Grand Jury were self-serving.

In regard to the above question relating to OSWALD's association with Cubans in the New Orleans area and LEE HARVEY OSWALD's employment by the CIA, I had no knowledge concerning this matter and replied that I did not know.

of questions
Another series/involving the identity of a heavy set Cuban who was "Shepherding" OSWALD around New Orleans was propounded to me by District Attorney GARRISON in the same manner. I had no knowledge of any such individual

and replied that I did not know.

After the first two or three questions, GARRISON asked me whether the files of the FBI contained information concerning OSWALD's Mexican activities. At this point I invoked the privilege and read to GARRISON and the jurors the instructions I received from the Attorney General. Throughout my appearance before the Jury, whenever a question was asked concerning what our files showed or what I did in an investigative capacity, I invoked the privilege in each instance.

District Attorney GARRISON asked a series of questions regarding the identity of the names-I estimate to number approximately twenty from a list in his possession-and asked if I knew these individuals. The names seemed to be Cuban or Spanish names and meant nothing whatsoever to me and I replied that I did not know any of these individuals. From the very inception of my appearance and interspersed throughout, District Attorney GARRISON propounded numerous questions to me concerning my knowledge of the relationship between CLAY SHAW and LEE HARVEY OSWALD. Whenever the questions involved my personal knowledge I answered the question I do not know. However, when the question related to official records or investigative operations I invoked the privilege.

From the questions propounded to me by District Attorney GARRISON and members of his staff the matter of greatest importance, which was referred to on several occasions during the course of my appearance was what investigation was conducted by the FBI to clear CLAY SHAW in the assassination of President KENNEDY. During these questions, GARRISON and members of his staff referred a number of times to the Attorney General's statement in this regard. On one occasion Assistant District Attorney ALCOCK gave a long dissertation on Attorney General CLARK's statement which was quoted in the New York Times and at times read from article which had appeared in this newspaper. In regard to the question regarding investigation conducted to clear CLAY SHAW, I invoked the privilege. In regard to the New York Times article I answered I did not know anything about it. At some time during the questioning, I was asked by District Attorney GARRISON if I knew CLAY BERTRAND to which I answered no. Additional questions were asked of me by GARRISON involving

whether the FBI had investigated CLAY SHAW as CLAY BERTRAND and I invoked the privilege on each occasion.

A number of questions were asked regarding my knowledge of the actions of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and of DAVID FERRIE's connection with this group. I answered these questions I do not know. I was also asked whether I knew SERGIO ARCACHA SMITH and I replied that I had seen ARCACHA but was not acquainted with him.

District Attorney GARRISON asked a series of questions regarding the seizure of explosives across Lake Pontchartrain in the Slidell area and a series of questions regarding alleged training camps for Cubans in that general area. I advised the Jury that I was not familiar with either of these matters. The questions regarding the above two matters appeared to me to be designed to develop information regarding Government policy relating to Cubans as well as the reason why the individuals involved were not prosecuted.

I was also asked if I had any knowledge of the burglary of ammunition bunker at Houma, Louisiana, to which I replied I did not know.

District Attorney GARRISON asked if I knew W. GUY BANNISTER, and I told him yes. He then asked if I had ever visited BANNISTER's office and the identity of anyone I observed there. I answered that I had been in GUY BANNISTER's office and that the only person I could recall observing while there was JACK MARTIN and two women, whose names I could not recall. I was also asked of my knowledge of the relationship between BANNISTER, ARCACHA SMITH and OSWALD. I answered that I did not know.

Throughout my appearance various questions were interspersed involving my knowledge of JACK RUBY, the purpose of his visit to New Orleans and whether I had any knowledge of the identity of persons RUBY contacted in New Orleans. I answered the questions of my own personal knowledge that I did not know. Questions along these lines which involved the records of the Government, I invoked the privilege.

NO 89-69
RLK:jam

In a question put to me concerning DAVID FERRIE, GARRISON recountered to the Grand Jury how his office had arrested FERRIE in 1963. He asked me if I had interviewed FERRIE at that time. I told him I did not.

GARRISON then asked a series of other questions as to my interviews with FERRIE and each time I invoked the privilege.

At one point, GARRISON asked a number of questions about my knowledge of the buying of equipment, such as trucks and other items, by the Cubans in New Orleans, to which I replied that I did not know.

A series of questions were asked regarding WILLIAM WAYNE DALZELL and if I was familiar with him. I acknowledged that I knew him. The question was then asked as to whether I had any information of DALZELL being employed by CIA and I answered I did not know.

I was then asked if the records of the FBI contained any information concerning the identity of the organizers of the Free Voice of Latin America and I invoked the privilege.

I was asked a series of questions concerning Special Agent WARREN C. deBRUEYS. I was asked if I knew him and I replied yes. I was asked if he was still an FBI Agent and I replied yes. I was asked if he was in New Orlnns on November 22, 1963 and I replied I did not know. I was asked where he is now located and I replied Washington, D.C. Prior to my appearance before the Grand Jury, I was advised by AUSA VETERS that District Attorney GARRISON knew that SA deBRUEYS was in Washington, D.C. and I did not feel that this was a disclosure of any information not already known by GARRISON. GARRISON, in his comments to the Grand Jury, indicated that he had knowledge of the fact that SA deBRUEYS handled security matters while in New Orleans and asked for the identity of Agents working security matters. I replied that the only one I could recall was SA deBRUEYS.

NO 89-69
RLK:jam

I was asked if I knew DEAN ANDREWS and I acknowledged that I did. I was asked if DEAN ANDREWS worked for any agency of the Federal Government. I answered I did not know except that ANDREWS might have worked years ago as an employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. During the questioning concerning ANDREWS I was asked by a member of the jury whether I had investigated DEAN ANDREWS and I replied that my contacts with DEAN ANDREWS were set forth in the Warren Commission report.

I want to point out that throughout GARRISON's questioning of me there was no continuity in the sequence of questions or subject matter. Many of the questions were phrased as statements of alleged fact designed to elicit an agreement from me to the facts as stated by him. GARRISON got no such agreement from me.

NO 89-69
RLK/dbb

District Court before Judge BAGERT and were representing the Federal Government in this matter. These assistants anticipated an adverse ruling by Judge BAGERT on the Government's motion to quash on May 17, 1967. After the hearing on the morning of May 17, 1967, when the Government's motion to quash the subpoena was denied and prior to my appearance before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury, Assistant United States Attorneys CIOLINO and VETERS tempered LaCOUR's instructions to the extent that it would be necessary for me to justify invoking the privilege as it would be subject to judicial review. They told me to use my own judgement in invoking the privilege and that I should answer questions of my own personal knowledge, and if I was in doubt on any question I could come out and ask them about it.

Along these lines in discussing with CIOLINO and VETERS as to what questions should and should not be answered by me, I had anticipated that District Attorney GARRISON might possibly ask me the question, did I see DAVID FERRIE on November 22, 1963, in United States District Court (during trial of CARLOS MARCELLO on Fraud Against the Government charges). They indicated to me that I should answer in the affirmative as this was a matter of my own personal knowledge because FERRIE was, in fact, present in the Courtroom on that date.

I went before the Grand Jury at approximately 4:50 PM. In the Grand Jury room, along with the jurors were GARRISON and his three assistants mentioned above. GARRISON asked most of the questions. During the first half of the interrogation GARRISON prefaced each question with a "speech" stating as declarations of fact that OSWALD was an employee of the CIA and was associated with the Cubans in the New Orleans area and did I know this. I felt that all of GARRISON's statements of alleged fact prefacing his questions put to me before the Grand Jury were self-serving.

In regard to the above question relating to OSWALD's association with Cubans in the New Orleans area and LEE HARVEY OSWALD's employment by the CIA, I had no knowledge concerning this matter and replied that I did not know.

Another series of questions involving the identity of a heavy set Cuban who was "Shepherding" OSWALD around New Orleans was propounded to me by District Attorney GARRISON in the same manner. I had no knowledge of any such individual