Senator Richard S. Schweiker U.S.Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Schweiker,

While your letter of the 25, which did not come until today, requires no response, I feel I owe you one.

If it was not explicit enough in my earlier letter let me make it as clear as can now. I know hope you will understand that your interest in this is my interest, too.

One of my purposes was to caution you in several ways. One of these ways is who really is an expert, who really does know what he talks about, who really has done enough work to really know and to be able to informs a Member in a way that will not, now and later politically, kick back on that Member.

One illustration if not the most significant I can anticipate is last night's CBS evening TV news. (There nobody knew what he was talking about.)

My concern for Members in this is not new. It is explicit in a late-April speechs, when the situation was quite different. It is explicit in a position paper I was asked to prepare for Members of the House shortly thereafter.

My concern is increased by the belief that there is no single Member who is in a position to know or who has a staff that is in this position. You can all be at the mercy of those to whom you may listen, including me.

If and when you feel I can be of help I will be if my own work then lets me. If it does not at any parthoular mement it will without the passing of much time. I do not spend my time talking. I do work and I believe it is productive and meaningful.

The FRI has recently found it expedient to assure a federal court that I know more about this subject than anyone in the FRI. If it does not constitute an answer to my documented, really proven, charge of FRI perjury, it is a kind of unique condentials. I think you will find that I am alone in a willingness to face any confrontation on anything I say on this and related subject. And alone in producing proof that is my own work.

Please do be cautious and careful. When the time comes I will be able to deliver close to a complete package, one I think you will also find if not unique the closest private approximation of it.

Minoerely, Harold Weisberg HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., N.J., CHAIRMAN

JEDNINSE RANDOLPH, W. VA. CLAMBORNE PELL, R.I. EDWARD M. REDNEDY, MASS. GAYLOND NELSON, WIS. WALTER F. MORBALE, MINN. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, MO. ALAN CRANSTON, CALIF. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, MAINE JACOB K. JAVITS, N.T. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, PA. ROBERT TAFT, JR., GNO J. GLENN BEALL, JR., MD, ROBERT T. STAFFORD, VT. PAUL LAKALT, NEV.

DONALD ELISEURG, GENERAL COUNSEL MARJORIE M. WHITTAKER, CHIEF CLERK

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

September 26, 1975

Mr. Harold Weisberg Route 12 Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you for your thoughtful letter regarding my efforts to direct the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities to investigate the assassination of former President John F. Kennedy.

I am familiar with your work in this field, and appreciate your taking the trouble to write and to offer your consultation on this issue. As you know, Senator Hart and I have now been designated by the Select Committee to look into certain aspects of the Kennedy assassination investigation, and we will have the power to review classified documents in the Archives, take sworn testimony, and subpoena evidence. I hope this will enable us to resolve the questions surrounding this tragedy.

Again, thank you for your kind offer of assistance. As the inquiry proceeds I may be in touch with you, and I hope you will feel free to contact my office if you have suggestions or advice.

Sincerely,

Richard S. Schweiker United States Senator

RSS:mfh

Senator Richard S. Schweiker U.S.Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Schweiker,

•

While your letter of the 26, which did not come until today, requires no response, I feel I owe you one.

If it was not explicit enough in my earlier letter let me make it as clear ask can now. I know hope you will understand that your interest in this is my interest, too.

One of my purposes was to caution you in several ways. One of these ways is who really is an expert, who really does know what he talks about, who really has done enough work to really know and to be able to informs a Mamber in a way that will not, now and later politically, kick back on that Member.

One illustration if not the most significant I can anticipate is last night's CBS evening TV news. (There nobody knew what he was talking about.)

My concern for Members in this is not new. It is explicit in a late-April speeche, when the situation was quite different. It is explicit in a position paper I was asked to prepare for Members of the House shortly thereafter.

My concern is increased by the belief that there is no single Member who is in a position to know or who has a staff that is in this position. You can all be at the mercy of these to whom you may listen, including me.

If and when you feel I can be of help I will be if my own work then lets me. If it does not at any parthoular moment it will without the passing of much time. I do not spend my time talking. I do work and I believe it is productive and meaningful.

The FBH has recently found it expedient to assure a federal court that I know more about this subject then anyone in the FBH. If it does not constitute an answer to my documented, really proven, charge of FBH perjumy, it is a kind of unique condentials. I think you will find that I am alone in a willingness to face any confrontation on anything I say on this and related subject. And alone in producing proof that is my own work.

Please do be cautious and careful. When the time comes I will be able to daliver close to a complete package, one I think you will also find if not unique the closest private apparamation of it.

Sincerely, Hereld Weisberg