

- 1 - Mr. Belmont
- 1 - Mr. Rosen
- 1 - Mr. Malley
- 1 - Mr. Rogge
- 1 - Mr. McGowan
- 1 - Mr. Hines
- 1 - Mohr
- 1 - DeLoach

Memorandum

TO : A. H. Belmont

DATE: February 26, 1964

FROM : A. Rosen

SUBJECT: THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION
ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT: John F.

W. J. ...
R. ...

While at the offices of the President's Commission on other matters, J. Lee Rankin requested Malley to stop by his office. Mr. Rankin advised that he desired to make it known that the Bureau had been of tremendous help to the President's Commission, that an extremely large volume of work had been produced by the Bureau and that the Bureau had been most cooperative in handling all requests which had been made by the President's Commission.

He commented that recently there had been quite an increase in the number of requests and there was a possibility that there would be many more additional requests. Mr. Rankin stated this was not intended as a criticism of the Bureau's work but instead was the following through of the Commission's desire to complete the Commission's record and leave no unanswered questions.

In this regard, Mr. Rankin went on to say that the Bureau, in conducting its investigation, had an extremely difficult and enormous task to perform and that he as well as other members of the Commission staff were amazed at the amount of detailed information which had been developed by the Bureau in its investigation. He commented that the Commission in performing its tasks was of necessity making a most minute study of the Bureau's work as well as that of other Government agencies with the idea of picking the investigation to pieces to the extreme degree so that wherever it was possible to clarify any item, this could be handled while the Commission was in existence.

Mr. Rankin advised that in connection with the letter which had just recently been transmitted to the Bureau requesting an explanation concerning information relative to Special Agent James P. Hosty's name being omitted from a report prepared in the Dallas Office (report of Special Agent Robert P. Gemberling dated 12/23/63), he wanted the Bureau to know the following:

Enclosure 7-64

- 1 - Mr. Sullivan
- 1 - Mr. Branigan
- 1 - Mr. Conrad
- 1 - Mr. Lenihan

- 1 - 62-109060
- 1 - 105-82335
- 1 - 44-24016

NOT RECORDED
199 MAR 19 1964

5 MAR 19 1964

JRM:REL:mpd:par
(14)

4 MAR 24 1964

Section 47

Memorandum A. Rosen to A. H. Belmont
Re: THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

The Commission had noted in reviewing the notebook in question that Agent Hosty's name appeared in the book along with the office telephone number and a license number. It had been noted that this information did not appear in the Dallas investigative report and members of the Commission wondered why this item did not appear. Mr. Rankin stated that prior to any question being raised concerning this item, the Bureau in one of its letters to the Commission (dated 1/27/64) set forth full information for the Commission's information explaining the appearance of Agent Hosty's name in the Oswald notebook. As a result of this information being furnished by the Bureau, the members of the Commission were fully aware that there had been no effort on the part of the Bureau not to make this information available. Mr. Rankin stated that after some discussion concerning this item, the members of the Commission directed Mr. Rankin to request the Bureau for an explanation so that the record of the Commission would show the exact circumstances by which this item was omitted from the Dallas report of 12/23/63 by Special Agent Gemberling.

ACTION:

Attached is a letter to J. Lee Rankin setting forth the reasons why Agent Hosty's name was omitted from the Dallas report of 12/23/63. We are enclosing for the Commission affidavits from Special Agent Robert P. Gemberling and John T. Kesler wherein they set forth their explanations in handling the Hosty entry in Oswald's address book. Both affidavits are excellent and should satisfy the Commission that our handling of the Hosty entry was sound.

Handwritten notes and signatures:
All done
W.S.J.
V. King
If there had been proper supervision there would have been no such a thing as the omission of the name of Hosty from the Dallas report. A more conscientious and thorough investigation would have been required to determine the reasons for the omission of Hosty's name from the Dallas report. This is a serious matter and should be taken into account in the future.

SHORZ COMINGS