Dear Mr. Murr,

Many thanks for both of your letters. The Betzner stuff is interesting and, I believe, eccurate, from the current LIFE. The Leavelle-Sharp material is not new. I believe there is something else on it. If you bump into it, please let maknow. The Similar stuff is very interesting.

A friend is continuing my work on the pictures end doing beautifully and what I cannot. I'm sending him a copy of your letter,

Mey a suggest this: Speak to Similar again and tell him that if his pictures have any value, I can introduce them where they might be saleable. He is wrong in thinking he can make a lot of money by selling prints. If he does not believe this, I will put him i touch with Phil Willis, who had better timing and pictures that were in evidence before the Commission. The pictures will not be used without a deal being made with him. As time goes on and more pictures are located, his, assuming they have value, will be worth less.

He can have a lawyer prepare whatever assurance he wants that the pictures will not be used without permission.

If he has pictures, this should at least interest him.

Tell him that I wrote about him in FHOTOGRAPHIC MHITEWASH, playing him straight. Tell him elso I ask him to write a straightforward narrative of what happened, at the Depository and at "uby's, with an exact description of where he was standing, what kinds of pictures he took, whatbthey show, etc.

The FBI went to too much tro ble to make him seem unreal end undependable for me not to suspect there might be something to it. The Telegram did not pay him money for nothing, and they did not fail to respond to your letters for no good reason, either. Before we write him off, let us make a better effort to earn his confidence and see whether he has enything.

Also, please give him my name and address and please give me his address and phone number. I may put others in touch with him after you speak to him again.

Many thanks. I didn't saswer earlier because I was away.

Sincerely,

R.R. # 1, Moffat, Ont. Canada, Nov. 18th, 1967.

Dear Sir,

Good news! I have finally found (I hope not too late) the incident of the arrest of the man in the Dal\*Tex building. It is recorded not in the Police Radio Logs, but rather in a report filed by Officer J.R. Leavelle. It is part of Leavelle Ex. A (20H499ff) the 3rd paragraph being the one containing the info. Even the mans name and address are given! On going to the index, 15H, one will find a reference to a William Sharp namely 7H368. This turns out to be the testimony of William J. Waldman, vice president of Kleins porting odds & The testimony of William J. Waldman, vice president of Kleins porting odds & The testimony of William Sharp attached to C2766 was mounted on the rifle in their gunshop by a gunsmith named William Sharp. Inother one of the "coincidences" that seem to plague this case.

I believe that Leavelle probably accidently entered this in his report. My reason for suspecting this is that in his testimony(7H26Off) Leavelle reiterates almost word for word what he put in his report except that he makes no mention of the arrest of William Tharp in the Dal-Tex building, nor is he asked anything about

it by Ball.

I finally contacted Mr. Norman Similas. I traced him through his former employees to his brother who gave me his unlisted phone number. I talked with Similas for over an hour on the night of Nov. 11. I asked if he'd mind if I took notes or reiterated anything what he said, but he said that it did not matter to him. I will now give you the record of my conversation with him.

At first he appeared quite apprehensive and I could almost sense an air of hostility in his voice. He accused me of not knowing or having my facts straight as they pertained to his case and claimed that he had "over 40 pages of evidence attributed to him in the 'ommissions 26 'olumes." When I asked him to simply quote me the page numbers and 'olume(s) involved, he hummed and hawed and tried to hedge or evade the question. He then claimed that he had the book with this evidence in his basement with others and did not want to go and get it at this time. I then asked him who was confused as to the true facts and he appeared to settle down a bit. He apologized and stated that lately he has become annoyed because at times he has "had over 100 telephone calls or letters a week." This is a fact that I find hard to believe.

Once again one finds Similas' actual testimony to me completely unlike what is written in the FBI report of Sept. 24th 1964. He emphatically stated that he told no one that he was standing "250-300 yards west of the TSBD," in front of the triple underpass "which was behind me." As it turns out, Similas wasn't even on that side of the street! He stated that the best way to indicated where he was standing is to line up with three tire marks which appeared on the pavement directly in front of him. He asked me if I had seen photo's of these marks and I replied no. He stated that photo's do exist as he has seen them. Apparently these marks were left by the motorcade after they excellerated and sped away. I asked him if there was a man standing near him who was taking pictures and he replied that there were inf fact two men in suits taking pictures near him. He again reemphasized that he was standing on the wouth side of Elm street. I asked him what he was wearing and he said a brown suit with a brown vest.

He stated that he heard only 3 shots exact origin unknown. ( a point again on which he appeared to hedge or hesitate on). When I asked him in which direction the President moved he after the shots he replied "the man moved in all directions." When I asked him to explain what he meant he stated that at first the President appeared to move forwards and the definately backwards and finally to his left towards Similas. He stated that he still has in his possession or "private collection" 48 prints which he took before, during, and after the assasination. This was excluding the negatives which he gave the Telegram which he said to this day had not been returned to him. When I asked him if he was satisfied with the Telegrams explaanation of them being "lost" he said no. He stated that he used to work for the Telegram and that these "accidental loses" just don't occur. He said that even down to the most minor accidents that all prints and negatives are catalogued and recorded, for future references. Again on this point there is contradiction with the FBI report. Similar stated that he phoned the Telegram twice not onee on Mon. Nov. 25ht, asking for the return of his negatives. The first time they appeared to be hedging to him, and told him that they were still involved in the processing them. The second time he spoke directly with the photo-editor who inquired if he wanted them for the Toronto Star paper. Similas stated that not only the Star, but other Toronto, Canadian and American papers appeared interested in his negatives. He became annoyed with the Telegram and asked if they did not return them to him that he would send someone down for them. They told him not to do that and said that they would look after the matter. It was the next day, not "the following Wednesday" that the apologetic letter and the check for \$50.00 came. Similas stated that it was his opinion that the Telegram adopted this "lost" attitude in a successful bid to squelch the Toronto Star and other papers from "getting in on a piece of the action" so to speak. He also stated that from talking with various feeple over the last couple of years that the negatives have gone from the Telegram to the R.C.M.P. and hence on to the FBI. However he was not positive on this point. When I stated that I had written the Telegram three times without reply, has he stated that he would have expedted as much. He did not appear to want to press the Telegram on the issue of the "lost" negatives.

When I asked if I could privately view his prints and negavitives he told me to contact him again in a year. When a sked to explain, he stated that if interest was still high in a years time that he was considering a copyright on his prints and possibly even a book. In his own words, "if I sold copies at \$1.00 per print,"

I don't think I would have to work another day in my life."

He stated that the A,P. in Chicago had developed all his film and had returned it to him with marginal notations as to where and when he had taken his pictures. He also stated that if one didn't want to wait a year that perhaps contact with A.P. in Chicago might prove fruitful as he believes the A,P. will have a record of and copies of all his prints.

One other minor point which I found rather odd. Similas said that oneeit was known that he was travelling from Dallas, he was searched and questioned everytime he got on or off a bus or airplane. This was long after Oswald was in custody and

had been declared thelone gunman!

Personnaly, I believe from having this long conversation with him, I think that he (Similas) is a fraud. I have thoroughly chedked the Zapruder film and cannot find Similas in it anywhere. In picture 7 of the Oct. 2nd issue of Life (1964) Altgens appears plus another man with a camera. However this man has a dark suit on, not brown with a vest. I believe that Similas should have been very close to them "not more than 7 feet". Also there is nothing to suggest his appearance in the Nix or Muchmore films. Willis' 7th slide shows a number of men on or near the edge of the rend, but none appear to have brown suits on. There is a man with a brown suit on in Willis' 8th slide, back to the camera. However when compared withe pictures of Similas that appeared in the Telegram, it is not, I believe, Similas. I have been

tempted to call Similas back and call his bluff on the entire matter, but I would like your advise on this. Also if you have any suggestions or questions you would

like me to ask him, please let me know.

I do hope you received my letter concerning Hugh Betzner Jr. and were satisfied with it. I am presently at work( on the midwnight shift) and am just about finished my second reading of Oswald In New Orleans. I don't know what to say other than it is again a magnificent piece of work, highly informative and enlightning. I know it won't be the last word.

Do you know what is presently going on in the Garrison investigation? The last word I have on it is an article in the New YOrk Times of about mid Ectober stating that he was faced with either a change of venu state or a 6 month delay. What has

Mr. Garrison decided to do?

I do hope I am not interupting your work too much and am proving to be of some assistance.

Yours truly

Gary Murr