

telling. We have to evaluate all the information that comes through and that generally is the reason we make followup investigation prior to turning in a report. In this particular case we were to turn in our information right on through and let the FBI do it; but as you can see, the FBI would have nothing to go on.

Mr. JENNER. Well, they have got what you reported and we'll see what they turn up.

Mr. BIGGIO. Well, after Mr. Davis, I believe you called the FBI this evening, after you called them, they called me then and I gave them the exact date of the report and what other information we found out and they are going to run it on that.

Mr. JENNER. But you have given me now all the information you gave them?

Mr. BIGGIO. Yes, sir; and from my own viewpoint—this is just my personal viewpoint—I don't think there's much to it. I think it's just some man in a place talking. I think Mr. Chesher was telling the truth, but I don't think the man who said he was a mechanic was. There is no way we have been able to verify that.

Mr. JENNER. Well, Officer Biggio, we very much appreciate your coming in and part of our work is running down these rumors.

Mr. BIGGIO. I know—I don't like to turn in a report like that to start off with.

Mr. JENNER. I appreciate it very much and thanks for coming.

Mr. BIGGIO. Does that take care of me not giving out the lady's name again?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; that's perfectly all right. We don't want to probe into that. You have a right to read your deposition here and sign it if you want or you can waive that.

Mr. BIGGIO. I know exactly what I've said and I'm sure she has taken down the right thing. I have said nothing except the events that happened. I'm afraid there is nothing that will be of any help anyway.

Mr. JENNER. Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF CAPT. GLEN D. KING

The testimony of Capt. Glen D. King was taken at 11:20 a.m., on May 28, 1964, in the office of the U.S. attorney, 301 Post Office Building, Bryan and Ervay Streets, Dallas, Tex., by Mr. Leon D. Hubert, Jr., assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. HUBERT. This is the deposition of Capt. Glen D. King.

Captain King, my name is Leon D. Hubert. I am a member of the advisory staff of the General Counsel of the President's Commission. Under the provisions of Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963, and the joint resolution of Congress No. 137, and the rules of procedure adopted by the President's Commission in conformance with the Executive order and the joint resolution, I have been authorized to take a sworn deposition from you. I state to you now that the general nature of the Commission's inquiry is to ascertain, evaluate, and report upon the facts relevant to the assassination of President Kennedy and the subsequent violent death of Lee Harvey Oswald. In particular, as to you, Mr. King, the nature of the inquiry today is to determine what facts you know about the death of Oswald and the surrounding circumstances, and any other pertinent facts you may know about the general inquiry.

Now, Captain King, I believe that you appear here today by virtue of a general request made to you by Mr. J. Lee Rankin, general counsel of the staff of the President's Commission, addressed to your chief, Mr. Curry, asking that you appear before it. Under the rules adopted by the Commission, you are entitled to a 3-day written notice prior to the taking of this deposition, but such rules also provide that a witness may waive this 3-day notice if he so wishes. Now, I will ask you to state whether or not you are willing to waive the 3-day notice.

Captain KING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Will you stand and raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give in this matter will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Captain KING. I do.

Mr. HUBERT. Will you please state your name?

Captain KING. Glen D. King.

Mr. HUBERT. And your age?

Captain KING. I am 39.

Mr. HUBERT. Your address?

Captain KING. I live at 519 Goldwood, Dallas 32, Tex.

Mr. HUBERT. What is your occupation, sir?

Captain KING. Police officer with the city of Dallas.

Mr. HUBERT. And how long have you been so employed?

Captain KING. I was first employed on August 2, 1948.

Mr. HUBERT. And have you been with the police department continuously since then?

Captain KING. No; I have not. I left the department in, I think it was 1950, and was gone approximately 11 months, and returned in 1951; and I have been with the department continuously since that date.

Mr. HUBERT. Was that a resignation from the department?

Captain KING. It was a resignation from the department and I entered into private business.

Mr. HUBERT. It was voluntary?

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. And did you start at the bottom, as it were?

Captain KING. Yes; as a patrolman.

Mr. HUBERT. I notice that in the report of the proceedings at which you made a speech, I think, in Washington, there was a description of you and your career given and I am going to read it into the record here and ask you if it is correct.

You were introduced as follows: That you are an administrative assistant to Chief Curry and that you are a former newspaper man, that you were a police reporter on the Dallas Morning News when you joined the police department in 1948; that you have served in every division of the department until you have risen to the position you now hold; that you had studied journalism in college at the University of Texas and SMU; that you have attended a number of police institutes and lectured at some of them; that you have written in the field of political science and that you are the author of two books and numerous magazine articles; is that all correct, sir?

Captain KING. Sir, this is correct.

Mr. HUBERT. What was your specific assignment on November 22 and for some months or weeks or whatever it was prior to that date, the year being 1963?

Captain KING. As the administrative assistant to the chief, one of my primary responsibilities is press relations and public relations also. On the date of November 22 I was asked to remain in the administrative offices while other members of the administrative staff were going to be absent on their assignments, and I was asked to stay in the administrative offices.

Mr. HUBERT. I would like for you to describe for the record just under normal circumstances just what the functions and duties and responsibilities of your position are.

Captain KING. There are, of course, a lot of rather dissimilar or separated functions of the office.

Mr. HUBERT. I am particularly interested in the ones dealing with press relations and public relations.

Captain KING. As I say, the office—our office is the unit of the department that is charged with the efforts of the department for public relations and it is the office to which the local newsmen know they can come to receive any assistance that they need in their work. It is one in which they can register complaints against the department and procedures of the department and the treatment that they receive, or it is one to which they can come to secure information on things they are investigating.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, there is a setup—a central spot—where every newsman can get the information and information will be gotten for him?

Captain KING. This is true.

Mr. HUBERT. That's your office and you are the head of that?

Captain KING. That's true; yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Prior to November 22, were any standard operating procedures set up for relationships with the press?

Captain KING. Yes; we had a general order in the department which in very brief and very general terms set forth a policy of the department so far as their relations with the press was concerned. We had published prior to that time a memorandum from the chief setting forth what the policy of the department would be. Briefly stated, it was the policy that we would render any possible assistance to the press except that assistance which would seriously interfere with any investigation that we had underway. This policy made it the responsibility of each officer of the department to do this.

My office is the press relations office, but my office is not the only place in the department where a newsman could get information. It was the responsibility of each member of the department to furnish to the press information on incidents in which they, themselves, were involved, except on matters which involved departmental personnel policies of the department, or, as I said, unless it would obviously interfere with an investigation underway.

Mr. HUBERT. In the latter case, if it would interfere with an investigation underway, what was the policy then?

Captain KING. If it would interfere, then it was the policy that the information would be withheld.

Mr. HUBERT. And the press then would simply not be told or be sent away, as it were?

Captain KING. It would be withheld from the press; yes.

Mr. HUBERT. And you say that that was the general policy, not merely with respect to your relations with the press, but with every police officer's relations with the press?

Captain KING. That's correct; yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Was it your duty to enforce that policy in the event you saw it was being disrupted; that is to say, in the event you observed that press relationship was interfering with an investigation?

Captain KING. It would be—probably; yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, did you have any general system of registration of the press—I'm not speaking now of November 22—but of normal conditions whereby identification cards and so forth would be issued?

Captain KING. Yes, sir; we have.

Mr. HUBERT. What was that?

Captain KING. We have an identification card that we have prepared, the department prepared, and newsmen who are employees of regular news gathering agencies in town, upon identification as such or request of their employer actually, are furnished with the press identification.

Mr. HUBERT. I suppose that would be given mostly to local press people, would it not?

Captain KING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, on the occasion of the President's visit, is it fair to state that more outside newsmen sought this accreditation or identification card?

Captain KING. Some did seek it—yes. Very little of it actually was done. We received a call from—at least these are the only ones that I can recall, Mr. Hubert, that we gave the identification to—out-of-State or newsmen who did not normally work here—we received a call from channel 4, KRLD-TV and they said they had some people in here from out of the city, of which I recall there were eight of these. They were identified to us by Eddie Barker who is the news director of KRLD, and they were furnished press cards. These are the only ones I recall.

Mr. HUBERT. That was prior to the assassination?

Captain KING. No, this was subsequent to the assassination. These are the only ones that I can recall that were given for newsmen who came into town to cover this.

Mr. HUBERT. Is it your thought now that the newsmen who were not local, who were not known to you and who did not have individual identification cards

should have not been admitted or spoken to unless they had obtained clearance?
Captain KING. I don't think it would have been possible from a practical point of view—I don't think it could have been done.

Mr. HUBERT. Would you tell us why?

Captain KING. "Why" has to include the atmosphere that existed over there, the tremendous pressures that existed, the fact that telephones were ringing constantly, that there were droves of people in there; it would also have to include the fact that the method by which you positively identify someone—it doesn't mean—it's not easy. If someone comes into us with a letter from the New York Times on their letterhead stating that this man is an employee of the New York Times, "Will you please furnish him with identification?", we haven't any way of knowing that actually this letter did come from the New York Times and that it was not on a forged or stolen letterhead.

Mr. HUBERT. Normally you would not issue a card to such an individual without a checkout, as it were?

Captain KING. That's true.

Mr. HUBERT. And your thought was that checkouts were just simply impossible?

Captain KING. They were.

Mr. HUBERT. Was any attempt made to set up a system whereby only positively identified news people would be admitted to the areas near Oswald?

Captain KING. I'm not sure I understand your question, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. After the death of the President, when you say that this atmosphere and this condition developed with the press where there were mobs of people and so forth, was there any effort made by anyone to clear out the place, as it were, and then readmit only those who were known to be accredited or definitely identified?

Captain KING. There were officers assigned to the area there—primarily the third floor where the homicide office is located and where most of the newsmen were, and they did screen the newsmen and other people who came in there. I was not the person who assigned them out there and I don't actually know what instructions they were given and I don't know actually the procedures by which they screened them. I was inside of my office most of the time with telephones ringing.

Mr. HUBERT. Would it normally have been your duty to screen them or to see that they had identification?

Captain KING. No, actually it wouldn't—I think normally it would be the duty of the officer who was working the incident to check the identification.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know if anyone suggested that something should be done to correct the conditions which you have described?

Captain KING. I understand that Chief Batchelor on his arrival at the station ordered some more men assigned up there and tightened up to a certain extent the security that was up there, but I was not present when this was done.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know if anyone suggested that the whole place be cleared out completely and then readmit only those definitely accredited individuals?

Captain KING. I don't know of anything like that.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know of anyone who suggested that at all?

Captain KING. I don't recall anyone having suggested that—no, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. I gather from what you are telling me that the presence of the press and under the conditions that they were present would be considered by you at least as a serious disruption of the normal methods of interrogation of a prisoner?

Captain KING. I would say that nothing really that was going on there at that time was normal.

Mr. HUBERT. Is it your opinion that the presence of the press as they were, particularly on the third floor, when Captain Fritz was interrogating Oswald did interfere with the investigation?

Captain KING. I think it must have—yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Can you give us any examples of how it did?

Captain KING. Well, the hallways were full—actually with men and officers. I was out on occasion in the hallway and officers tried to keep an aisle or pathway cleared in the hall so people who had business in the other bureaus on that end of the floor and people who were working out of the homicide and

robbery bureau could get in and out, and this was a constant battle because of the number of newsmen who were there. They would move back into the aisleway that had been cleared. They interfered with the movement of people who had to be there.

The door from the elevator, the jail elevator—the ones used for the transportation of prisoners—is south of the doorway of the homicide and robbery bureau where the interrogations were conducted, and whenever Oswald was brought down from the jail or taken back from homicide and robbery to the jail, he had to pass through this area. There was noise out there—a considerable amount of noise out there, and I think this must have been a disquieting thing.

Mr. HUBERT. And you mentioned that your general policy about the cooperation of the press had an exception, and that is, when it would interfere with an investigation, and you have, I think, demonstrated now that in your opinion there was interference with the investigation?

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know of any effort made by anyone to invoke the exception to the general rule?

Captain KING. I think no effort was made. I think that the decision was made without ever having been stated, actually, that this was certainly not a normal circumstance; that the newsmen should be allowed to remain in there.

The news cameramen first arrived—I don't recall the time it was—it was a short time after the death of the President or the shooting, and Chief Lunday, as I recall, is our traffic division chief. He was the only chief officer in the department who had returned. We checked—they wanted to bring their cameras up to the third floor, and we checked with Chief Lunday to see if it was permissible, and I was told it would be.

Mr. HUBERT. You did that yourself?

Captain KING. Yes. I am thinking it was Chief Lunday—it was either Chief Lunday or Chief Lumpkin, and did receive permission for them to bring their cables through the windows. Of course, the number of newsmen in the beginning was less than it later became, and more and more came in.

Mr. HUBERT. At the time you checked the matter with Chief Lunday or perhaps it was Lumpkin, your thought was that at that time the presence of the press would not constitute interference?

Captain KING. We didn't—I didn't have any idea at that time that we would have the number that we had.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, did it occur to you at any later time that the number had increased to the point that something ought to be done about it?

Captain KING. The obvious answer is "yes", but it didn't actually. The newsmen out there, I guess you become accustomed to them out there, or accustomed to the idea of them being out there, once you have decided that they are going to be permitted to be there, and it was the obvious policy of the department at that time that they would be permitted to be there and so far as my ever mentioning to anyone else or recommending to anyone else or suggesting to anyone else that they should be removed—I did not.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you hear anyone else suggest that the situation was getting out of hand, if it was, in fact, sir?

Captain KING. I don't recall having done so.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, of course, a large part of that was due, I take it, to the fact that Oswald was being interrogated on the third floor in Captain Fritz' office, which is the normal place where a person charged with murder would be interrogated?

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. But, do you know if anyone thought of removing Oswald to another place and thus avoid the press in the room?

Captain KING. That, I do not know, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. You had not heard that discussed?

Captain KING. I don't recall having heard it discussed.

Mr. HUBERT. Did it occur to you that that might be one way to get around this situation which you found?

Captain KING. No; actually it did not.

Mr. HUBERT. Were there other places available so it could actually have been done?

Captain KING. I am sure that some place could have been found—I don't know whether a place could have been found that would have solved more problems than it raised or not—I don't know.

Mr. HUBERT. Then, in what way?

Captain KING. Well, because this is the normal—this is the place where these homicide officers are assigned. This is the place where their equipment is, this is the place where they normally work and this is something that had not even occurred to me—moving him to some other location and moving the interrogation or the investigation of him to some other place—this is something again in which I was not involved in and in which I was not in.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, I have read the transcript of the speech that you made before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, which I will introduce into this deposition in a little while.

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. And I gather from it that to a considerable extent the police department was influenced to tolerate this condition to a large extent by the fact that this was an extraordinary case and that any effort to run the press away might be misconstrued in some manner.

Captain KING. I think that it very definitely might have. I think probably that these are things that were put into words after the conditions returned more to normal over there. They were not things that were actually said. We didn't sit down, frankly, we didn't really have much time to sit down to do anything, but we didn't just sit down and say, "We are going to let the press remain here for this reason, for this reason, or for this reason," even if they might have been the reasons that we did in fact.

Mr. HUBERT. There were no staff meetings or anything of that sort to consider and determine that problem—the problems?

Captain KING. No; there were meetings of the administrators of the departments, certainly, but these were informal meetings.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, was this problem discussed at any of those meetings, and by "this problem," I mean the problem of the press conditions?

Captain KING. To my knowledge—that I remember—no; it probably was—it would almost have had to have been mentioned over there about the fact that there were these large number of newsmen there, but any discussion of their removal or any consideration really, of their removal, I don't recall.

Mr. HUBERT. I notice that you mentioned in your speech also that the press were murmuring, I think, or voicing in some ways some possibly discrediting remarks as to the Dallas Police Department, and that that factor influenced somewhat the conditions.

Captain KING. It was my understanding that one of the newsmen—I heard this, but I don't know who he was—and I, of my own knowledge, don't know that this actually occurred, but that one of them had obtained a picture of Oswald, that he had a picture of Oswald, and he held it up before the cameras and said, "This is what the man who assassinated or who shot President Kennedy looks like or at least this is what he did look like." He says, "He has been in the custody of the police department for an hour and I don't know what he looks like now."

Mr. HUBERT. That was heard by you and others—

Captain KING. This was not heard by me. I said I was told this—I did not hear it—I was not a witness to it.

Mr. HUBERT. But you were told that this occurred shortly after, in fact, it had occurred or was supposed to have occurred?

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. That is to say, you heard it on the 22d of November?

Captain KING. I don't remember whether it was on the 22d or the 23d—I don't remember when I heard it.

Mr. HUBERT. But it was before Oswald was shot?

Captain KING. I believe that's correct—yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you remember that on the night of the 22d when Oswald was brought to the assembly room at which he was displayed, as it were, to the press?

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Were you present at that time?

Captain KING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Can you tell us how that occasion came about, what brought about this showing of Oswald to the press in the assembly room?

Captain KING. Actually, I was not a part of the discussions to bring him down there, nor a part of the decision to bring him down there and I don't know. I was told—I was directed to go to the assembly room and I don't remember exactly what time it was—it was a short time before he was brought down there.

Mr. HUBERT. Who directed you?

Captain KING. Chief Curry, I believe.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he say what the purpose was?

Captain KING. He said that Oswald was going to be brought down to the assembly room and the newsmen were going to be down there and he wanted a policeman down there to maintain order.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he consult with you as to whether or not this was the proper thing to do?

Captain KING. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Would it have been normal for him to consult with you in your position as public relations officer?

Captain KING. Probably not—no.

Mr. HUBERT. You did not offer any objection to this proposal?

Captain KING. I did not.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know if anyone else did?

Captain KING. No, sir; I don't—I don't know.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know if there had been any release made by anyone in the police department to the press that Oswald had not confessed?

Captain KING. No, I don't. I don't know whether there was or not—that he had not confessed?

Mr. HUBERT. Yes.

Captain KING. I think it probably was—I think it was mentioned that there had not been a statement—I think it was mentioned too, that he denied knowledge of the murder, so I'm sure the statement along this line was made to the press.

Mr. HUBERT. Perhaps by inference and implication you have already answered the following question but I want to ask it now—is it your thought that in this particular case more information was given to the press and more latitude was given than would normally be given in a murder case which did not involve the President of the United States?

Captain KING. Probably—probably more, certainly there were more people there that were more involved in it than there would have been, I think, under any other circumstances.

Mr. HUBERT. I would think, then, that this would be considered to be a wholly abnormal situation, that is to say, physical conditions and the mass of people—the importance of the case and so forth?

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. What was the relationship between the police department and the district attorney's office in handling the press, was there any coordination of effort?

Captain KING. Mr. Wade was at the police department most of the time, or quite a lot of the time. I think Mr. Alexander was there some. There was discussion made of what would be released to the press whether there was any discussion with him on the actual physical handling of the press and permission for them to be there or not, I don't recall.

Mr. HUBERT. Who discussed with Mr. Wade or any other member of the district attorney's office, what would be released to the press?

Captain KING. I did on one occasion, or at least I was present on one occasion when a discussion was had with Mr. Wade, and this was the only occasion that I can recall.

Mr. HUBERT. Can you tell us about it, please, sir?

Captain KING. I think it was—I'm not sure which night it was, whether it was on Saturday night or on Sunday night—I don't remember whether it was before

or after Oswald was killed—Chief Curry was not there, but he had said to the press in my presence, and said to me that there were elements of evidence that he was not going to comment on, and he told me that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had requested that we not comment on some of the evidence and that it was not his intention to do so.

In Chief Curry's absence there was a meeting in the chief's office at which I was present, Captain Fritz was there and Chief Stevenson was there and I think Chief Lumpkin was there and Chief Batchelor was there, and there was a discussion with Mr. Wade on the release of certain information, and I don't exactly remember what the evidence was, but there was some evidence that Mr. Wade wanted to release to the press.

Mr. HUBERT. Was it in relation to the prosecution of Oswald or the prosecution of Ruby?

Captain KING. I don't know whether—I don't recall whether it was in relation to the prosecution of anyone or not, or whether it was just evidence—general evidence in the case. I don't remember what the item of the evidence was.

Mr. HUBERT. I asked that question in order to assist in fixing the date.

Captain KING. The date—yes; I know, but I do recall that we opposed the release of the evidence or a statement on the evidence and that Mr. Wade then sometime thereafter appeared before the newsmen and made some comment regarding the evidence.

Mr. HUBERT. Then, it was at night, you say?

Captain KING. It was at night—yes.

Mr. HUBERT. It could have been either the night of the 23d or the night of the 24th?

Captain KING. It could have been and I don't recall.

Mr. HUBERT. Could it have been the night of the 22d, too?

Captain KING. I don't think it was, because I think Chief Curry was at the police station until late on the night of the 22d. I'm thinking it was the night of the 24th, which was Sunday night, wasn't it?

Mr. HUBERT. Yes.

Captain KING. I'm thinking it was that night, because I know he was not there and I think he was there until the small hours of the morning on actually both Friday and Saturday, and I think that this was Sunday night, but I can't say definitely that it was.

Mr. HUBERT. But in any case it was the police department's opinion that the evidence should not be released?

Captain KING. It was the opinion of those members who were there that it should not be released—yes.

Mr. HUBERT. And that prevailed?

Captain KING. So far as we were concerned in our release of it—so far as that was concerned—yes, sir; but the district attorney did make some comment to the press regarding it.

Mr. HUBERT. And that was over your objection?

Captain KING. Well, actually, I don't know.

Mr. HUBERT. Let me put it this way: You had decided not to do it?

Captain KING. That's correct—we did not do it.

Mr. HUBERT. And you expressed your view to him that it should not be done?

Captain KING. We expressed to him the statement of the chief that the department was not going to do it. I think the chief had indicated to the FBI we would not, or at least, this was what he told us at any rate.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know if any studies have been made or policies changed since this incident in the police department with reference to relations with the press?

Captain KING. There has not been any change in our written policy, only I know the chief has said—I heard him say on more than one occasion that if we were faced with the same circumstances again, he would certainly restrict the presence of the newsmen there and we would act differently from the manner in which we did this time, but so far as any change having been made in the written policy of the department, I don't know anything about it.

Mr. HUBERT. Of course, it is always easier in retrospect to know what is the best thing to do, but part of a study after all is to see what is the best thing to do.

Captain KING. Oh, yes; I think you could probably get an excellent argument with a lot of points on both sides right now on a discussion of what the proper treatment of the newsmen would be.

Mr. HUBERT. Given this same situation?

Captain KING. Given this same situation—yes; with the benefit of hindsight and with the benefit of the experience you had—I think you could raise many points—good points on both sides.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, I have handed you previously two statements of interviews with you by the FBI. I am marking a statement which is dated January 25, 1964, by putting in the right margin the following: "May 28, 1964, Dallas, Tex., Exhibit No. 1, deposition of Capt. Glen D. King, Leon D. Hubert, Jr., and then my signature, and I ask you if you have read that report of the interview of you by FBI Agents Clements and Sayres, and if you consider that to be a correct and proper report of the interview?"

Captain KING. Yes; sir.

Mr. HUBERT. I have also marked for identification an earlier interview of you by FBI Agent Leo Robertson on December 9 and December 10, 1963, and for the purpose of identification, I have marked that document as follows: "May 28, 1964, Dallas, Tex., Exhibit No. 2, deposition of Capt. Glen D. King," and I have signed my name, and since it consists of 2 pages, I have put my initials in the lower right-hand corner. I think you have read that document, and I ask you if it is a correct and fair statement of your interview with FBI Agent Robertson?

Captain KING. I think there is nothing in that that is incorrect. I believe I told Agent Robertson at that time that I had in my memory seen Jack Ruby one time prior. I had known him since 1955 or 1956, I believe, and I think my statement to him was that I had first met him at that time when I was in the vice squad, and I had seen him one time since then and I had heard the name.

Mr. HUBERT. You did not see him at any time in the Dallas Police Department building from November 22 until the shooting?

Captain KING. Not until the shooting—no, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Then, there is a third document which is a letter dated December 2, 1963, addressed to Chief Curry and apparently the original was signed by you, and I have marked it for identification as follows: to wit: "Dallas, Tex., May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 3, deposition of Capt. Glen D. King," and I have signed my name under that, all of which appears in the right hand margin of the first page, and since that document contains 2 pages, I have put my initials at the bottom on the right hand corner of the first page, and I ask you if that is a correct statement of the facts as you saw them and as you reported them?

Capain KING. Yes; sir.

Mr. HUBERT. With reference to the letter addressed to Chief Curry, dated December 2, which I have just marked for identification as Exhibit No. 3, with reference to the second paragraph, I invite your attention to this paragraph and ask you if you know why the press had congregated in the basement?

Captain KING. Yes; sir. On the evening of November 23, I don't recall the time, but on the evening of November 23, Chief Curry had appeared before the newsmen and had told the newsmen—they had asked him something about—I think—if they might be able to leave and get something to eat or get some rest and not miss anything that was there, and Chief Curry had told them that the transfer would not be made prior to 10 o'clock the next morning—that was Sunday morning.

Mr. HUBERT. But was any announcement made as to what route would be used to take him out of the building?

Captain KING. Not to my knowledge—no.

Mr. HUBERT. In fact, there were several other routes by which he could be taken?

Captain KING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Have you heard whether anyone told them that the route would be via the basement?

Captain KING. I don't know whether anyone—I don't recall whether anyone did or not.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know why they all assembled there instead of in some other spot?

Captain KING. No—in my thinking on it: and I don't even know why I thought it was going to be from the basement, but this was the only thing that had occurred to me. There might have been something that I heard and don't recall, but my impression was that it was going to be from the basement and out, and maybe because this is our normal method of transfer, our normal way we transfer. We bring them down into the jail office and out through the jail office and this might be why I was thinking this about it, but this was the way I thought about it.

Mr. HUBERT. In this second paragraph of Exhibit No. 3 you say you went to the basement because of the number of newsmen who were assembled there. Do you mean by that that that was a matter of some concern to you?

Captain KING. Actually no—not a matter particularly of concern—there was not anything happening there that I thought was unusual or anything that I was particularly concerned about. There were more newsmen going down in there than there were up on the third floor and I went down there actually to be available more than anything else.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, the way that the letter reads—the way that sentence reads—the fact that newsmen were there was what motivated you to go there?

Captain KING. That's correct.

Mr. HUBERT. Because otherwise you had no connection with the transfer?

Captain KING. That's correct.

Mr. HUBERT. And you thought it was your duty to be there since you were the press man?

Captain KING. That's correct.

Mr. HUBERT. And where the press was, you would be?

Captain KING. That's correct.

Mr. HUBERT. I notice in the fourth paragraph you state that you talked briefly with Captain Jones, Captain Talbert, and Captain Arnett—do you recall the nature of the conversation?

Captain KING. I don't recall what was said only we spoke briefly, and I don't remember actually what any of us said. I remembered having seen them down there. I don't know whether it was anything more than a greeting or not.

Mr. HUBERT. Would you say that the conditions you have described concerning the press, that is to say, the number of them, the noise, the commotion, the cameras and so forth, continued to be as bad after Oswald was shot, as those conditions had been prior to the shooting? You see, heretofore, you have described the conditions really on the 22d and the 23d.

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. And for the morning of the 24th. Then came the shooting of Oswald, and what would you have to say about the conditions with relation to the press after that incident as a comparison?

Captain KING. I don't recall any noticeable change.

Mr. HUBERT. Ruby was not ever on the third floor, as I recall it, was he?

Captain KING. I don't know—I don't remember ever having seen him on the third floor—I don't know whether he was there or not.

Mr. HUBERT. I have also shown you previously what appears to be a galley proof of the purported publication of a speech made by you before the meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and I have marked this document for identification as follows: "Dallas, Texas, May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 4, deposition of Capt. Glen D. King," and I have signed my name in the right-hand margin.

The pages that I have shown you are marked with blue ink—this is page 7 and it is on that page that I have marked the identification data which I have just dictated.

On page 8, marked in blue ink, I have put my name in the bottom right-hand corner, the same with page 9, and the same with page 10, and the same with page 11, where your speech ends at the top of page 11, and also I have marked my name on the bottom of page 17, because there is a comment by you there on that page, and the same with pages 18, 19, and 20.

Now, I think you have read this galley proof?

Captain KING. I have—yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Addressing ourselves now to pages 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, which is the body of your speech, would you say that this is a correct report of what you said?

Captain KING. I'm sure it is—yes—as I said, I did not read this. I had a prepared text there that I actually didn't particularly follow. I spoke more extemporaneously then, and I can't remember exactly my wordage on it, but there is nothing in there I think that I did not say. There is nothing incorrect there.

Mr. HUBERT. Turning to page 17, it appears that a Mr. Black asked you to comment on a point, and there is printed on this galley proof on page 17 what purports to be your comment, and I think that you told me that you wanted to make some correction as to that comment?

Captain KING. Only in one word only. My answer as listed on this—

Mr. HUBERT. On page 17?

Captain KING. On page 17—it is written here, "I think it probably would be improper for me to comment on this even before the other members of the panel," and I think what I said there, and certainly what I would have intended to say, is, "I think it probable that it probably would be improper for me to comment on this even more than the other members of the panel."

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, your thought was that nobody should comment on it, and you least of all?

Captain KING. Me least of all—yes.

Mr. HUBERT. On other pages there are comments that appeared by you and I understand from what you tell me that these—this galley proof fairly represents what is correct as to what you said, as far as you can remember?

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, I would like the record to show that this galley proof shows some corrections made apparently by some editorial process, and at other places there are some apparent typewriter corrections and some words changed or added by pen and ink and that these various changes and comments were not made by me or by Captain King but are in the same condition as were received by me from the American Association of Newspaper Editors in this way, that by letter dated May 26, 1964. Mr. Gene Giancarlo, G-i-a-n-c-a-r-l-o [spelling], addressed a letter to Mr. Barefoot Sanders, U.S. attorney, enclosing this galley proof, and that Mr. Sanders handed this to me this morning.

Captain KING. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. All of these comments being relative to Exhibit No. 4. Captain King, is there anything you would like to add to what has been said?

Captain KING. I think not.

Mr. HUBERT. Immediately prior to the beginning of this deposition, I had a short conversation with you in which I showed you the various documents that were introduced. The rules of the Commission require that I now ask you if there was any discussion between us concerning those documents or anything else that is not covered in the deposition?

Captain KING. I recall nothing that was said before that was not covered after the deposition was begun.

Mr. HUBERT. And there is nothing inconsistent between what we spoke of before and what was covered in the deposition?

Captain KING. No inconsistencies.

Mr. HUBERT. Thank you very much, Captain.

Captain KING. Thank you. This is not of any particular value—this that I have here—but this is what I had prepared.

Mr. HUBERT. Let's get this in the record, Captain, that you have referred to a prepared speech that you went to the American Society of Newspapers conference with, as to what you have already testified, that you used this as a basis but actually spoke largely extemporaneously.

Captain KING. That's correct, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. You have also indicated to me that I may introduce this prepared copy of the text for whatever it is worth?

Captain KING. Yes; sir.

Mr. HUBERT. And I will do that and mark it for identification as follows, to

wit: I am placing in the right-hand margin the words, "Dallas, Texas, the date May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 5, deposition of Capt. Glen D. King," and I am signing my name below that and I am initialing the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh and the eighth pages by placing my initials in the lower right-hand corner.

I have not read this Exhibit No. 5—do you know if there is anything in it that was omitted from the speech?

Captain KING. Not from the speech proper. Actually, I think there are no inconsistencies between this and the speech. There might have been some things said in the prepared text that I didn't say there, and I think there was, or vice versa, but I think there are no inconsistencies.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, in any case, the contents of Exhibit No. 5, whether or not spoken by you at the time you made your speech, represents your views in any case?

Captain KING. That's correct.

Mr. HUBERT. All right, sir, I think that is all. Thank you very much, Captain, and we appreciate it.

Captain KING. Thank you—I appreciate this opportunity to speak with you.

TESTIMONY OF C. RAY HALL

The testimony of C. Ray Hall was taken at 2 p.m., on May 28, 1964, in the office of the U.S. attorney, 301 Post Office Building, Byran and Ervay Streets, Dallas, Tex., by Mr. Leon D. Hubert, Jr., assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. HUBERT. This is the deposition of Mr. C. Ray Hall.

Mr. Hall, my name is Leon D. Hubert. I am a member of the advisory staff of the general counsel of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy. Under the provisions of Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963, issued by President Johnson, and the joint resolution of Congress No. 137, and the rules of procedure adopted by the President's Commission in conformity with the Executive order and the joint resolution, I have been authorized to take a sworn deposition from you. I state to you now that the general nature of the Commission's inquiry is to ascertain, evaluate, and report upon the facts relevant to the assassination of President Kennedy and the subsequent violent death of Lee Harvey Oswald. In particular, as to you, Mr. Hall, our inquiry today is to determine what facts you know about the death of Oswald, the interviews of Ruby, and any other pertinent facts that you may know about the general inquiry.

Mr. Hall, you appear today, I think, by virtue of a request made by Mr. J. Lee Rankin, General Counsel of the staff of the President's Commission to Mr. Hoover, and I suppose through Mr. Shanklin that you appear before me to take a deposition.

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Under the rules adopted by the Commission, all witnesses are entitled to 3 days' written notice prior to the taking of their deposition, but the rules also provide that a witness may waive that 3-day written notice if he wishes to do so, and I ask you now—do you desire to waive that 3-day written notice?

Mr. HALL. I will consent to waive the 3-day written notice for appearance before the Commission's representative.

Mr. HUBERT. Will you rise, please, so that I may administer the oath?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give here will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HALL. I do.

Mr. HUBERT. Will you state your full name?

Mr. HALL. C. Ray Hall.