

ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION

MAY 24, 1967

Carlos Quiroz

ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

PROCEEDINGS OF

- MAY 24, 1967

PRESENT: MR. JIM GARRISON, District Attorney

MESSRS. ALVIN OSER, JAMES ALCOCK, RICHARD BURNES,
ANDREW SCIAMBRA and WILLIAM MARTIN, Assistant
District Attorneys

MEMBERS OF THE ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

WITNESS:

CARLOS QUIROGA

* * * *

Reported By:
Maureen B. Thiel,
Secretary
Orleans Parish Grand Jury

CARLOS QUIROGA, after being duly sworn by the Foreman of The Orleans Parish Grand Jury, was questioned and answered as follows:

MR. ALCOCK:

Q. May I get for the record your name please?

A. My name is Carlos Quiroga.

Q. And where do you live?

A. I live at 3134 Derby Place, New Orleans, La.

I do not understand these proceedings. My father has been in prison in Cuba and he is still over there. I have given voluntary information to Mr. Garrison and members of this staff on many occasions for several months and I have not nothing to hide. And this, to the best of my knowledge, is all I know. I cannot testify here today because I have been threatened by a man in the District Attorney's office with perjury if I would testify. Therefore I do not want to incriminate myself and I will stand on my rights of the Constitution. I have not had time to get a criminal lawyer to represent me. I cannot say anything else. I do not want any publicity because my parents are still in Cuba, and that is all I have to say, gentlemen.

Q. Carlos, I take it you are not represented by an attorney at this time?

A. Not by a criminal law attorney.

Q. You are not represented by a law attorney?

A. No. I do not want to incriminate myself and I would like to stand on my rights of the Constitution.

Q. Well, let me advise you in more legal terms of your rights under the State Constitution and United States Constitution.

Both of these Constitutions give you the right to refuse to answer any questions which tend to incriminate you or tend to show the commission of a crime on your part, or which, in fact, do show the commission of a crime on your part. However, you do not have the right to assert the Fifth Amendment to any question, only those questions which tend to incriminate you or do incriminate you in the commission of a crime. Further, that you do not have a right to answer to falsely/something you know to be true or to answer a question that you know or have reason to believe is false - that is perjury under the laws of the State of Louisiana, do you understand that?

A. Again I would like to say my statement. I cannot testify today because I have been threatened by a man in the District Attorney's office with perjury if I testify. Therefore I do not want to incriminate myself and I will stand on my

Constitutional rights.

Q. Well let me ask you this, Carlos. Are you saying that beyond your name and address you will not testify?

A. If I would testify I would be threatened by a man in the District Attorney's office with perjury if I would testify. I do not want to testify, I will stand on my rights.

Q. Let me say this. You have a rights as I specified, to refuse to answer questions that in any way tend to implicate you or tend to implicate you in the commission of a crime, but the Constitution does not give you the right to refuse to answer any questions - do you understand that?

A. I again I repeat I cannot testify here today because I have been threatened by a man in the District Attorney's office with perjury if I testify. Therefore I do not want to incriminate myself and I will stand on my rights on the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

Q. Who threatened you?

A. I will not state at this time, but I have been threatened.

Q. What is the nature of this threat?

A. I have been threatened with perjury if I testify.

JUROR:

Carlos, do you understand what perjury itself is?

A. Sir, I do not understand these proceedings at all. I

I cannot say anything else because I have been threatened and I have not had time yet to get a criminal lawyer.

Q. Who wrote that for you?

A. I wrote it, sir. It is my own handwriting.

Q. Who dictated it to you?

A. No sir, I made this myself last night - I talk to/my wife -
cousin of

Q. Is she an attorney?

A. Not a good one - just a friend of mine.

Q. Are you an American citizen?

A. No. Cuban.

Q. You are not a naturalized American citizen?

A. No.

MR. ALCOCK:

I would like to get from you today what sort of threat you are talking about?

A. I cannot testify here today because I have been threatened by a man in the District Attorney's Office with perjury if I testify. Therefore I stand on my rights.

Q. Who threatened you?

A. I would stand on my rights.

Q. Do you think you would be incriminating yourself if you named the man who threatened you in the District Attorney's Office?

A. I would not like to state his name.

MR. ALCOCK:

Q. Carlos, was it a situation where he said if you go before the Grand Jury and lie to the Grand Jury you are subject to the laws of perjury, or did he say if you go up there you will be charged with perjury? I don't quite understand.

A. I think I made my point. I cannot testify here today because I have been threatened by a man in the District Attorney's Office with perjury if I would testify.

JUROR:

We don't understand that statement. You don't commit perjury before the Grand Jury unless you lie. If you are going to lie you will be charged with perjury.

MR. GARRISON:

Now let me tell you this, regardless of what any member of my staff may have told you, I now tell you, I am the District Attorney, and I say you will not be charged with perjury if you tell the truth. We only charge people with perjury when they lie under oath. Now I have told you that as District Attorney, and you can disregard this so-called threat you are talking about. Now will you testify and answer our questions?

A. I again do not want to incriminate myself and I stand on my rights.

JUROR:

- Q. Mr. Quiroga, I don't think that you understand that every witness who comes up here is told that he has to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and keep secret the proceedings of this Grand Jury, and then we proceed to ask him questions, and the only thing we caution him about is that if he doesn't tell the truth he can be charged with perjury - anybody, not you, anybody at all. Nobody can come up here and tell what is not true or say I don't know when they do know. That is all we are saying - and the same thing applies to you - that unless you tell lies or contradict yourself, unless you do those things you will never be charged with perjury. Its only when you are not telling thêetruth that you are charged with perjury.
- A. I have been threatened with perjury if I would testify. I do not want to incriminate myself and I stand on my rights.

JUROR:

- Q. Let us clear it up for you now. Nobody can say to you ... its takes 9 men on this Jury , we are all business men and citizens of this community , and it takes 9 of us to charge you with perjury. The District Attorney himself cannot charge you with perjury. And none of us are convinced that you are lieing to us
- A. But I was told that before I came here.

Q. Well if you were told that Mr. Quiroga - and we are not doubting that you were told that - however, here you are before the Grand Jury and what you are being told here is what is true and what is law, and as has been pointed out to you, even if Mr. Garrison told you that it would not hold here. This is the Grand Jury, we are in charge of these proceedings and all we want to do is to ask you questions and all you have to do is tell the truth. Beyond that there is nothing that can be done. Of course, and this is no threat, this is a promise - if you are asked a question and you lie you will be charged with perjury. That is no threat, that is a promise. And all we want to ask you are questions that pertain to a certain matter and you have the right, even in that regard, you have the right to refuse to answer if you are in any way incriminated. So you can't come into a proceeding like this and take a stand that you won't answer any questions, that doesn't stand up because no matter what anyone has told you prior to coming here, you could have talked to a reporter outside who could have told you that you would be shot tomorrow, but that is ridiculous. What we are telling you here today is the law and what we are telling you right now is the truth. All we want is to ask you some questions and all you have to do is answer them, but you can't get by with what you are trying to say, you can't do this.

FOREMAN:

You can't do this, you have to talk to us. You have no choice. If we ask your name, where you live and where you work, you have to tell us. If you don't tell us we can put you in jail for not telling us. You can't come here and refuse to talk to us. You don't have to talk about something that would incriminate you. Now after we ask you questions, and we think you have lied to us, then nobody stays in this room, everybody has to get out of here and this jury deliberates alone, even the District Attorney get s out, no one stays in here. Then after we have deliberated on the answer we call him in and tell him our decision. That is how this Jury works. So you are not being judged by even Mr. Garrison, or his staff, you are being judged by citizens of the community, we are all supposed to be and I think we are, reliable citizens, but we are not going to sit here and let you come in and refuse to talk to us. If we ask you if you are involved in a theft you can refuse to answer us, because that could incriminate you. But there are certain questions that you have to answer, even if you don't want to be cooperative with us.

MR. ALCOCK:

Carlos, as the Foreman has just said, you cannot come in

here and refuse to testify to anything, the next procedure would be for us to take you into open Court before Judge Baggers and he will instruct you to testify, then you will be held in contempt of court if you do not testify.

- A. Then you will come ^{with} me.
- Q. You don't want to testify at all. These gentlemen are not members of our staff, they are not doing our bidding, these are citizens of the City, they want to ask you some questions and if you feel that any of them incriminate you, you can refuse to answer. If you don't feel that way, we can take you into open Court and the Judge can decide. If he thinks the question will incriminate you he can say you do not have to answer as the answer will tend to incriminate you. That is the legal way.
- A. I am willing to go to Court.
- Q. But if the Judge rules that you have to answer the question, you will have to answer.

MR. GARRISON:

Carlos, did you know Lee Harvey Oswald in 1963?

- A. I do not want to answer, I stand on my rights.

Q. MR. ALCOCK:

Carlos, are you going to continue in this fashion to every questions that is asked you?

We will attempt to cooperate with you and go into different areas if you prefer, but if you remain this way throughout then we will ask the Foreman to take you before the Court and have you held in contempt.

JUROR:

You will have to answer that question in the Court, the question that was just asked. You will have to answer it.

Why won't you answer it here?

A. Because I have been threatened. I have been threatened by a man here with perjury if I will testify. Whatever I say.

Q. But if we go into open court you will have to answer, so why not answer it here.

Q. Mr. Quiroga, I think you understand English pretty well. But along the lines, I think you misunderstood what was said to you by this man you say was from the District Attorney's Office. Now he didn't say to you, I am sure, that no matter what you said here you would be charged with perjury.

A. Yes, I did.

Q. All right. Now we want to correct that - that is a definite misunderstanding on your part and everybody's else's part because we have many witnesses come here. They are treated with the utmost courtesy. The only time anybody can say to you that you will be charged with perjury is if you lie to

us, that is the only time you can be charged with perjury. Other than that, you will never be charged with perjury. If you tell the truth you will never be charged with perjury. Doesn't that make good sense?

- A. It does make good sense, but I was told if I testify here today I will be charged with perjury by a man in the District Attorney's office.

JUROR:

Now Mr. Quiroga, here are a group of men who are supposed to be very responsible and if we say you will not be charged with perjury if you tell us the truth, do you think it safer to believe us than this one man? And the District Attorney himself tells you that that was an error, if you heard it that way, he is saying it is not true. As the District Attorney he tells you it is not true. We, Grand Jury, tell you it is not true. That the only way you can be charged with perjury is by your lying to us. Now that is fair enough, isn't it? If you tell the truth, then you have to fear nothing, and then all you have to do is answer our questions and you will never be charged with perjury.

- A I have nothing to hide.

Q. We give you our assurance that if you tell the truth you will not be charged with perjury.

JUROR:

Your father is still in Cuba, is that why you don't want to testify?

A. Any publicity

Q. No publicity - this does not go out of this room. There is no publicity here, now if we have to take you into open Court, then there is publicity. You know that you just swore to keep secret the proceedings of this room, Nobody sees this testimony. Everything you say is secret in this room. If you go to court its an open book. Everybody knows what you say, but what you say here is secret. Just we know what you say here, it does not go out of this room. This is the place to testify if you do not want any publicity.

Q. Every week people do come in here and testify and very rarely is anyone charged with perjury. If we think they are telling lies, then we go into open court and see if they are lieing. But if we charged everybody with perjury the attorneys would not permit their people to come up here if we charged everybody with perjury. Its ridiculous. I can't understand how you are an engineer, and I know you are an intelligent man, I can't visualize

how you can believe it.

A. I believe it. I have been told that.

Q. Well, I can tell you that the moon is falling outside and I am certain you wouldn't believe that.

A. I will say this - I was told to get an attorney for if I testify I will be charged with perjury.

JUROR:

Carlos, do you honestly believe that if you testified before us, and we are pretty honest people, do you believe that nine men here, that if you tell the truth, will deliberately charge you with perjury?

A. I was told that, sir, and I believe it.

Q. You believe it and you just heard what the District Attorney told you?

A. I was subpoenaed two weeks ago by these people. Before the Grand Jury. I was brought into Mr. Garrison's office. And I was told that.

MR. GARRISON:

That is true. And I think Mr. Sciambra talked to him.

JUROR:

Now didn't that man say to you that if you lie you will be charged with perjury. Didn't he say that?

A. If I would testify I would be charged with perjury.

Q. Didn't he say if you would testify, and lie, that you

would be charged with perjury. He couldn't say just testify. Testifying doesn't necessarily mean lying. Do you think that anybody who walks in sits in that chair is automatically charged with perjury?

A. That is what I was told.

Q. Well, do you believe it - does it make sense?

A. No.

Q. Let me illustrate it a little further. You have already testified. You testified already. The minute you sat down in that chair and were sworn you testified when you told us your name and address. We could indict you for perjury right now, according to what this fellow told you. You testified - so you might already disregard his instructions.

Q. The District Attorney is not waiting behind a door to trap you. He is sitting right here with us. Nobody wants to hurt you, you say you are not a citizen. Is that right?

A. No sir.

Q. You are here on a visa?

A. Yes. I am a Cuban.

Q. You know some people here? When you came over here? You stayed here?

A. Yes, since 1952.

JUROR:

Do you have anything to fear from telling the truth?

A. No sir.

Q. That is all we want. Just the truth. We will ask you some questions and all we ask for is the truth and you will walk out of here in perfect safety.

A. If you all will give me the guarantee ...

Q. You are guaranteed this - if you will tell the truth, that is all, and the whole truth and nothing but the truth, then you will not be charged with perjury.

Q. What you don't know say you don't know. Anything that might hurt your father say I don't know. You can do that - but you have to answer questions where you work, how many children, married, etc. You have to do that. That is by law.

A. Again I would like to point out if I testify and tell the truth, nothing but the truth,

Q. Mr. Quiroga, if I may interject this, do you know a fellow by the name of Arturo _____, a Cuban refugee. His grandfather was the great yellow fever doctor?

A. ^xYes.

Q. The reason I am asking this - if we ask you if you know someone you should answer - the reason I know Arturo when Arturo came over here I gave him a job in my insurance company and we have been very good friends ever since. I

I have met a number of people I am sure we both know. Arturo brought them to the office and we sold insurance to a lot of them. Now if we ask you if you know someone you say yes if you don't know them you say no. This is not incriminating and this is not perjury. The point I am trying to make is perjury can only take place if you lie. If you did know Arturo and you said to me no, I do not know Arturo, never heard of him, then this would be perjury. This is the point we are trying to make. Only if you deny things of which you are aware, that only would be perjury. Do I make myself clear?

A. Yes. I make myself clear too. I have given all information to Mr. Garrison - all I know. I was threatened with perjury.

Q. You can't be threatened with perjury before this body - this body will not charge you with perjury if you tell the truth.

Q. I understand that you work for a firm by the name of Harris, is that right? Harris Construction Co ?

A. Well, I am Oliver Meyer. I give jobs to Harris. I am coming out there tomorrow. Now all we are trying to do is get some facts. If you know it, fine - if you don't know it, you just don't know it, that's all.

A. I have tried to avoid publicity, my father can be shot.

My mother too. They are in a country where there is no law, and that is why I am afraid. You people have not seen my name anywhere in newspaper except from this indictment. This subpoena.

MR. GARRISON:

Who would shoot your father?

A. The Communists.

Q. The Communists? I may be able to ease your mind, Carlos, by letting you know that we have developed evidence that anti-Communists are involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, so do you think then that the Communists would shoot your father, if the investigation headed in such a direction?

A. I would answer your questions. As Mr. Garrison knows, I told him, I know Harvey Oswald only as a Communist and because of this investigation (inaudible)

MR. ALCOCK:

Was it Andrew Sciambra that you spoke to?

MR. GARRISON:

Turn around here.

A. I saw him come in.

Q. Did he threaten you?

A. I stand on my rights. I do not want to incriminate myself.

Q. MR. ALCOCK:

Q. Carlos, These gentlemen are citizens of this City and they want to ask you questions and you will not be indicted for perjury unless you tell a lie. You do not want to testify before this body?

A. If I testify - because I know I tell Mr. Garrison the truth in the past, and nothing but the truth in the past on all occasions.....

MR. ALCOCK:

Then you have nothing to worry about.

A. I hve never told them a lie.

Q. Well, let us ask you the same questions and whatever you think is the truth, you tell us.

A. OK. Now can I say something sir?

Q. I have told Mr. Garrison on two occasions that I have met Lee
~~EEEE~~ Oswald when I was 16 years old, in 1963, when I tried to see what his organization was all about and wanted to find out about - he was a Communist I talked to him and I was convinced he was a Communist. I went to the Police Department and asked them if I could in a way be given authority to join this committee because I wanted to find out who was behind the assassination of President Kennedy. I have told to Mr. Garrison and his staff the same thing, and gave the same thing to the FBI and the Secret Service

the day after the assassination. This slip Mr. Oswald had given me, he and I were alone at his house, I was 16 in 1963, he talked to a Communist, he convinced me he was a Communist. And so I left, I found out then that he spoke Russian, one of the things - he was debating after that on WDSU later on - due to the findings that I found out from Mr. Oswald's house, Dr. Bringuier and _____ were able to destroy Mr. Oswald completely. I had given this information to Mr. Garrison. I have also given this information to the FBI and the Secret Service after the President was assassinated. And also as a member of I know Lee Oswald as a Communist and as a member of the Federal Committee - that is the only time in my life I ever met with Lee Oswald.

MR. GARRISON:

There is only one problem, Carlos. You told us those things but when you were asked the same questions in front of the lie detector test, the lie detector indicated you were not telling the truth in regard to all these points. Of course we want the truth, not what you told them.

A. Why don't you tell them the rest of the story about the lie detector test?

Q. I will be glad to. In fact now I will ask you all the questions I asked you . . .

A. No, Mr. Garrison. I think what you should explain to the Grand Jury here is what I was told before I took the lie detector test.

Q. Why don't you tell them?

A. At this time, gentlemen, of what had happened that day again I was threatened. Mr. Jacobs, who gave me the lie detector test, told me that he had talked to Mr. Garrison that afternoon. I had a heated debate with Mr. Jacobs due to the fact that I had requested in this lie detector test that the same question he asked of me and also I could get a copy of the questions, Mr. Garrison had about 35 or 36 questions.

Q. You passed most of them.

A. I was quite upset that day, in fact, I had a big discussion for about 2 hours, I was really upset about it, I went to Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Jacobs came and told me Mr. Garrison had said that I would not take what was promised to me by a man in Mr. Garrison's office. I was to take that home if I wanted to, but anyway that I could not take the questions from the questions that they had and also that the following day I take the lie detector test. I made it clear that first of all - and Mr. Jacobs made me sign that slip, but I told him I would sign it because I could not afford to go to jail. I had a family to maintain and no money to

pay for lawyers.

21.

MR. GARRISON:

So you took the test.

A. (Inaudible)

Q. But you took it? And you passed most of the questions.

Now I want to talk about some of the questions you failed.

We can go into my insistence on your taking the test, and I did insist. But we can go into that later. But let's go

into the questions you failed. You passed many of them.

And you don't seem to have been affected by your nervous

condition then. But certain questions you failed, among them
just

are the key matters which you/describedas having told the

truth. Knowing Oswald, knowing that he was not actually a

Communist, knowing that the Fair Play for Cuba was a cover,

in those areas the lie detector test show that you were lying.

Now, that is what we want to go into today, instead of stalling
and going in other directions

A. I do not want to incriminate myself, and I stand on my rights of
the Fifth Amendment.

MR. GARRISON:

Mr. Quiroga, among the questions you failed on the lie detector
test was the question, do you have any firsthand knowledge

of the conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy, and you

answered no and the lie detector test indicated that there was

deception on your part. What do you want to say about that?

A. Gentlemen, I think that whereby again I read my statement.

MR. ALCOCK:

Now, Carlos, before you do it

A. Now wait a minute - I do not want to incriminate myself and I stand on my rights of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. And if you want me to go to the Courts I will go.

Q. Carlos, you don't want this to get out. If it goes to open court it is going to be public knowledge. Here it's a secret. If you go to court everybody is going to know about it. If you tell us nobody is going to know about it.

A. Well, I am telling you ... I told the truth.

Q. Well, answer the questions now. We don't know what you said. Give us your answers. That is all you have to do.

A. May I say this. That lie detector test, gentlemen, and I wish you would study the lie detector test.

MR. GARRISON:

I have a copy of the results here.

A. Well, you don't have the 36 questions I was asked.

MR. ALCOCK:

Carlos, let me explain something to you.

A. Because they were all shifted. And I do not want to go to ..*

I do not want to incriminate myself and I stand on my rights of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

MR. ALCOCK:

Carlos, let me explain one thing to you.

A. The questions were asked.

Q. There is a possibility in taking a lie detector test that a specific reaction might show where a person was not actually lying, but something associated with the general question that brings about a physiological reaction, if this can be explained away the person isn't necessarily lying, he might make an attempt to explain it away. So these gentlemen are giving you an opportunity to explain it. Maybe you can explain well, maybe this question I was thinking about something else, or this question I was concerned about somebody I had met earlier and that is perhaps why I had a specific reaction. It does not necessarily mean positively that you were lying. You might be able to explain why you had certain reactions. These gentlemen are giving you an opportunity to explain the possibility of any extraneous matters that might have been reflected by a reaction on your part. It does not positively mean that you were lying.

JUROR:

Carlos, maybe this will help.

A. May I say this? I do not know - Mr. Garrison, you have the questions there I am talking about

Q. The ones you failed, right here.

A. No, no. I am not talking about that, I am talking about the ones I gave you a copy of, sir

Q. The questions which you were instructing us to ask you?
I am afraid I didn't pay much attention to your instructions,
no.

MR. ALCOCK:

A. They were incorporated with the paper - I read them, they were more statement than questions. Mr. Jacob, the operator, has to frame the questions to meet the requirements of the test - he can't give you a long paragraph of questions ...

A. I understand - I saw your questions too. According to Mr. Jacobs.

Q. Mr. Jacobs is the operator. He is the one who finally draws the questions to get the response in accordance with the machine.

A. There were 36 questions that he was asking me, they could not be answered yes or no.

Q. That is what we are saying, they could not, and they showed a reaction - so we are giving you an opportunity to explain.

A. The questions that Mr. Garrison's office were asking me are not my questions

Q. We are the ones asking you to take a lie detector test - you are not going to frame your own questions. I know you can grasp that. But this is an opportunity to explain to

to the Jury why perhaps you had a specific reaction and you might not have been lying. Take this opportunity because if we go to Court we can't keep reporters out of the court room, but they cannot come to this room. But they are going to be all over the court room, and it is going to be a sensation, I can assure you of that. So, Carlos, I would take this opportunity. I can't be any plainer than that.

JUROR:

If you do not want publicity, this is the place to say it. We want to help protect your family, we know that your reluctance is from this getting out and your parents suffering, we want to help you and we want to help protect them too.

- A. May I say this. The meeting that I had with Lee Harvey Oswald in 1963 I gave full information to the FBI and the Secret Service, and I requested them not to make it public because time and again my father was in prison and could be shot at any time. And they did so, sir. They did not give it to the public because for example, I, myself, and who still have in my possession a slip to join that organization and a crime against Cuba - its a Communist booklet he gave to me to read it so I would instruct myself

in his beliefs, by Carlos DuMont, and I requested because of the grave situation I had this in my possession and as far as I know he was a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which is a Communist front and as you may know....

members

Q. You know how many ~~MEM~~ they had in this Committee?

A. I do not know, sir.

MR. GARRISON:

You don't know?

A. No. I met Oswald one time that day - I went to the Police Department and asked them and the order came

Q. You did not know it was a front committee?

A. Sir?

Q. Did you know where they were meeting?

A. No sir, I did not know.

Q. Where did you meet Lee Oswald?

A. At his house.

Q. Where was he living?

A. Magazine St. I was in Thompson Cafeteria, close by on St. Charles Avenue and at lunch time one of the Cubans told me he came over to the table, he came over and brought this slip. Mr. Ivon called me up, I think it was on the

last day of Shaw's trial, you know, to tell me about the color of the slip, and he brought the slip to me, and I looked at it and of course I had known that Oswald had this fight, not a fight, this engagement with Carlos Bringuirre and two other Cubans, you know, so I rushed over there and he was distributing propaganda so therefore I went by Bringuirre's store and Carlos was not there so I called the FBI immediately. I called the FBI and I told them how come they would allow Oswald to distribute that type of propaganda in the streets of this country here. They told me that there was nothing illegal about it, so I got real mad about it, then that afternoon I told Mr. Rice about it, I used to work for him. So I called Carlos and him and I said well, we can't beat this game here, might as well find out what the hell its about. So that afternoon after work I went to his house and he gave me this slip and also his Crimes Against Cuba and as soon as I got it I went and called Lt. Martel of the Police Department and told him about it. And he told me that he had known about it and so I asked him if I could go ahead and see if I could join this organization, would it be agreement with the Government. And I never saw Oswald again, until I was in my office the day President Kennedy was assassinated and my wife called me and

she had heard and she said could that be Oswald, the same guy who was here in New Orleans. And then I found out it was.

Q. How did you know where Oswald lived?

A. Sir, in the slip he was distributing he had his address of the house. In fact, I made a mistake because my car, I parked in front of his house and I thought it was in front then I ask lady came out and said guy I was looking for lived in back. I went into his house first thing and he put his arms out and I said don't hit me. He said I don't hurt you, I want to talk to you. So he said you are not coming to hit me and I said no, I am not coming to hit you I am coming to see you. But he had to understand one thing, many people who have been here and speak English fluently, they have not all been against Castro so knowing this too I said to myself, well, this is an opportunity when an accident - I am here two years - this is how I went in there. I talked to him, he talked to me and Fidel he talked to me about ~~anti~~-Castro and he convinced me he was a Marxist.

MR. GARRISON:

Is that the only time you saw him?

A. Yes.

Q. Who was with you?

A. Myself.

Q. Just yourself. Riccardo Davis has told us that he went with you one time.

A. No, Riccardo Davis is lying. This, gentlemen, what I am telling you is the truth and nothing but the truth, if Riccardo Davis say anything he so desire. I think Mr. Garrison, Mr. Alcock, came to New Orleans sometime in February.

Q. What is that, Carlos?

A. Riccardo Davis, he told you about it yesterday. He came over here with an assumed name, he had an assumed name with some magazine supposed to pay him - to bring him to camp across the lake.

MR. GARRISON:

Well, let's stick to the point - let's don't start on that long story.

A. Anyway, Mr. Riccardo Davis is lying.

Q. Is lying. OK. David Lewis told us that he saw you with Lee Harvey Oswald on at least four occasions. In fact, he said that he had never seen Lee Oswald without your being with him. Now we gave him the lie detector test on that question and he passed it. And when we gave you the lie detector test on your statement that you only saw Oswald

once, you failed it.

- A. Again gentlemen, I have come here with with good intentions. I am telling you the truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God.

JURORS:

Q. How long did you work for Rice?

A. I worked for Rice until he died, sir.

Q. You started with him when you came here in 1954?
Holy Cross

A. No sir. I went to/High School here, I finished with honors. Then I went to _____ University and studied Engineering, then I went to LSU and I graduated from LSU in the summer of 1961.

Q. You have three Holy Cross alumni right here.

Q. You know Louis Rabel?

A. Yes, I know him.

Q. Louis and I went to college together.

Q. Carlos, when you went to talk to Lee Oswald, was he able to convince you that this organization was a large organization?

A. He did not, no, no, he was telling me that his organization was a small organization and he said it was small now but one day it would overthrow the government, they would then be able to do what they want.

Q. This is the first time you met Lee Oswald?

A. The only time.

Q. What was your impression of him - did he impress you as being a person to be an important man in such an organization?

A. The way he talked and the way he expressed himself to me, so firmly, I believed he was a Marxist by the way he was talking.

Q. Let me ask you, if you knew him/^{to be}so very intelligent and you would go in and talk to him and he is part of the small, and as he indicated to you, Marxist organization, this time small but expects to be large enough to overthrow the government, is it logical that on the first meeting with you, who obviously was a Cuban refugee and had reason to hate communism, that he would adcept you and take you into his confidence and get you as a member of his organiza-
he
tion - seems to me as if/should have feared you.

A. Well, I tried to pass that day as a pro-castroite. And of course he wanted money, I had to say no, I never carry money in my wallet, but I pulled my wallet out and I say well, I can't give you the money now, but of course I know better about giving money to organizations without asking the authorities if I can join the organizations,

which I was not able because maybe then they had other members which I don't know, sir, whether they have other members or not, I cannot say, I only saw Oswald

Q. Carlos

A. And by the way, excuse me sir, the little girl came out and I found out because when he spoke Russian to the little girl I told Carlos Bringuire that we follow up and check Oswald's record. Carlos did, and found out he was a Marxist, he knows him pretty well. He went to the store one day as an anti-Castro. Sir, I know, I think Oswald tried to infiltrate Bringuire, he went over there one day with a book, Marines, Instruction of Marines, a book, I have seen it, he went to the store as an anti-Castro and and then of course they gave him booklets and days later he had big signs and a big

MR. GARRISON:

Have you ever been in 544 Camp Street?

A. In 1961 and early 1962, yes.

Q. Were you a member of an organization which had offices there?

A. Which offices you mean?

Q. The Cuban Democratic Revolutionary Front. Were you associated with them?

A. Sir?

Q. Were you associated with any organization that had offices at 544 Camp Street?

A. Yes, it closed down in 1962, Mr. Ravel closed the office.

Q. Did you ever see Sergio Arcacha Smith there?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever see David Ferrie there?

A. In that office in 1961?

Q. Yes.

A. I - I think so.

Q. Are you aware that the first literature that Lee Harvey Oswald distributed that had FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE on it, are you aware that it gave as the address for FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA, 544 Camp Street?

A. Sir, I

Q. Are you aware of that?

A. I learned that after the FBI talked to me about 3 or 4 times I told them exactly what I knew. The office has been closed since. Mr. Ravel ... I don't know whether you all know it or not, Mr. Arcacha Smith was taken out of it in 1962. Of course we had this Crusade for Cuba movement here in New Orleans and Mr. Ravel took over and Mr. Ravel and the members he had with him in the office at that time, then Mr. Ravel and the members closed the office at 544 Camp St.

MR. GARRISON:

Mr. Quiroga, were you involved in the Crusade for Free Cuba in any way?

A. Yes. I ... I ..

Q. Just answer the question?

A. Yes. I was and gave you an album that my wife has kept on January 21 of this year an album of that. My wife has kept for me on the Crusade for Cuba, all that I gave to Mr. Garrison.

Q. Well, you answer the question. We don't know that, so you answer so we will know. Its OK.

A. I like to explain Crusade For Cuba ended when I think they collect about \$1200.00 - no CPA collected about \$4 00.00 Ravel would know about that, Crusade for Cuba, but anyway Mr. Garrison has all the files, and I would show you they were ended around February 1962, is that correct?

Q. That is not the question. I want to ask you if you had any association with the Crusade for Free Cuba, did you?

A. In 1961 it ended Feb. 1962.

Q. You had an association with it?

A. They had my picture in the paper ...

Q. These gentlemen of the jury don't know, Mr. Quiroga, please try to answer the question directly and don't run off in other directions.

A. Ok, Ok.

Q. All right. Are you aware that the Crusade for Free Cuba also included 544 Camp St. as one of the addresses to which contributions could be made?

A. Yes, Ronnie Care was the man who headed, the publicity man so to speak. He told Mr. Arcacha, who was then the head of the office, you know and send it over there now that is, by the way, Mr. Ronnie Care

Q. Why did they use 544 Camp Street, do you know?

A. To the best of my knowledge I think Mr. Arcacha used to go over there, the owner of the building, I don't know his name, but ...

Q. Balter?

A. No, no. Balter Building is something else. I don't know. I don't think so. He gave office to Mr. Arcacha, in fact, Mr. Arcacha could not pay the rent and when Ravel closed the office I think Feb. 1962, I think they - the delagation - not Arcacha, but the delagation - owed about \$250.00 - it is in the Warren Commission Report.

Q. Mr. Quiroga, let me explain something to you. You have a perfect right to amplify the question or explain it, we do not take the position that all questions must be yes or no. On the other hand, I want to call to your attention that you are following the same tactic that you have followed with us

repeatedly. You have told the Jury you would cooperate with us and as a matter of fact you have not cooperated with us at all. Whenever we ask you a simple question, whenever a question that involves a date or a name, a simple thing like that, we have received an endless smoke-screen which resulted in your heading down another street. Now I want to tell you that you have a perfect right to explain an answer, but you don't have a perfect right to change the subject and heading down a side street.

Do you understand that?

A. Yes. Then I will have to go back and tell you the truth ...

Q. That's all we want.

A. And if I don't explain this way, sir, then I stand on my rights:

Q. Are you telling me that I cannot ask you questions, and these gentlemen cannot ask you questions, that you are going to decide what you are going to say?

A. Mr. Garrison, I don't know - I don't know who made out that story, those stories, but I am telling you, I think I - I think Mr. LaBiche is asking me a question right now.

Q. See, you are changing the subject again. Are you telling

us that I cannot ask you questions and these gentlemen cannot ask you questions, you are going to decide what you are going to say.

A. No, he is telling me that I can't explain to you people.

Q. Mr. Quiroga, if you would just confine your remarks to what he asks you, we would appreciate it too. We don't want to listen to all this irrelevant stuff.

FOREMAN:

Mr. Quiroga, I am getting a little bit tired of all of all this-- stuff too. Now when he asks you a question, answer it and cut out all this irrelevant stuff.

A. All right. I am sorry, gentlemen, if I

Q. Fine.

MR. GARRISON:

Now while we have Mr. Schiambra here and since you have indicated that you were threatened - do you see Mr. Sciambra? Do you recognize him?

A. Yes.

Q. Now you have said that you were threatened by a member of my staff. Is he the member of my staff who threatened you?

A. I do not want to incriminate myself - and I stand on my rights

JUROR:

This jury would like to know if the District Attorney's

Office has threatened you. This has nothing to do with involving you in any criminal action, all we want to know is identify the man who made the statement you think he did?

- A. Yes, he did. When you people subpoena me to appear in front of you, he took/^{me}to his office and he told me that Mr. Garrison had told him that if I would not change the statement on the lie detector test, in other words, I would have to lie I guess, I am telling you the truth, he says that unless I change my mind and get me a lawyer and get my lawyer to change my mind, to get a lawyer, that I would be indicted if I would testify.

JUROR:

Now before you said that he threatened you if you testified that you would be charged with perjury.

- A. Yes, I again will say that he threatened me that if I would testify
- Q. Now, that is quite different to what you are trying to explain now.
- A. He told me to go get a lawyer.
- Q. That is beside the point. We are trying to clarify this. Your first statement was that a member of the District Attorney's staff said if you would testify you would be

charged with perjury. Now is that true?

A. Yes, that is true, yes sir.

Q. And you say that this is the man, Mr. Sciambra, is the man who made that threat to you that if you testified you would be charged with perjury?

A. If I would testify, yes.

Q. That is all, he didn't clarify it, he didn't explain it?

A. He explained perjury, sir. He explained to me, Mr. Sciambra explained to me that perjury means.

Q. Well, didn't he qualify it and explain to you and convey to you the understanding that if you lie you would be charged with perjury. Isn't that what Mr. Sciambra said to you?

A. Mr. Sciambra told me that unless I would change my statement and I told him I could not change my statement, because I was telling nothing but the truth, I would be indicted for perjury. Now, that is why I have sat here.

Q. May I ask you a question? What is your interpretation of perjury? You said he explained it to you.

A. He read to me, sir, the law about perjury.

Q. Mr. Quiroga, you said that Mr. Sciambra told you that unless you changed your statement you would be charged with perjury.

Is that what he told you?

A. Huh?

Q. Didn't you say that Mr. Sciambra said that if you didn't change your answer to this lie detector, you would be charged with perjury? Is that what he told you?

A. No, he went over the same questions, he said I had failed, I said I could not have failed because I told the truth, and he said if you do not change that you will be charged with perjury.

Q. Now why don't you let Mr. Garrison ask you the same question over and you tell us the truth? Let him ask you these same questions and you tell us the truth?

A. I was telling only the truth, as I am telling you right now.

Q. But you have to realize that if you lie to us it's different ...

A. I am not going to lie to you because

Q. Let me explain something to you, when you took that lie detector test, that didn't mean anything. But when you tell us the same answers and its not the truth, and we find out, then that is not right. Do you understand?

A. Sir, I am perfectly well aware of it.

Q. Let him ask you the same questions now, you are under oath, and then you can answer the questions to us? OK?

A. Let me say this. I will answer the questions . . .

Q. Just tell the truth.

- A. And I also will request that you people make a very deep investigation of these other people
these people who have told things to Mr. Garrison
- Q. We are investigating all areas. Now let Mr. Garrison ask the questions, and you just answer, OK?

MR. GARRISON:

Mr. Sciambra is here, could we have him to testify a few points, is that all right?

MR. SCIAMBRA:

Gentlemen, I want to tell you exactly what I said and did to Carlos in my office, and Carlos, if you don't agree with anything I am saying, stop me, and we will discuss it, because I am sure none of us have anything to hide. Approximately 2 weeks ago Carlos was called before the Grand Jury to testify, the same week that Mark Lane was here. Mr. Garrison told me it would be a big day for the Grand Jury, and we probably would not be able to get to Quiroga, and he said I want you to talk to Quiroga and let him know exactly what ~~xxxxxx~~ we want to question him about before the Jury. Mr. Garrison gave me a copy of the lie detector test that he took from Roy Jacobs, and said let him know that we are very

concerned about the areas and the questions that he failed on the lie detector test, and let him know that we are going to call him back to testify before the Grand Jury at a later date, probably next week, and let him know that we do not believe him. I called Carlos in my office and we sat down and we talked. I said, Carlos, I want to let you know exactly how we feel about you at this point, so there won't be any misunderstanding or any misgiving about what we are interested in. I pulled out a copy of the lie detector test and I said, Carlos, this is what we are concerned with. I said you took a lie detector test from Roy Jacobs, and he said Yes, I did, and I said well, you failed approximately so many questions on the lie detector test. I said these areas we are very concerned about - is this all right, so far, Carlos? - any discrepancies?

- A. Well, he is saying the way he wants to say it.
- Q. Well, up to this point?
- A. Let him tell the whole story. Now listen to him very carefully about what he says about bunk (phonetically) - its very, very interesting.
- Q. He said I have nothing to lie about, I have nothing to

hide, in fact I have cooperated with Mr. Garrison every chance that I have been asked to. I have been up to the office and talked to Mr. Garrison and his staff many times and I have cooperated to the best of my ability. I said Carlos, I don't want to discuss that, all I have been told to do is tell you how we feel about your answers to some of the questions, I am going to read to you the questions you failed on the test, the lie detector test - and he said I couldn't fail the test because I was telling the truth - I said I am not going to argue with you about it as to whether you are lying or telling the truth, but I will read the questions which you failed and he said OK. I went right down the line and read every question on the lie detector test that he failed and I said like this: the question is, isn't it a fact that the Fair Play for Cuba was merely a cover, Carlos, your answer was no and the lie detector test said that you showed deception. I said that's one question. And I went right down every question like this and after I finished the questions, I said Carlos, I want you know exactly how we feel about it, we do not believe that you are telling us everything that you know, we think that you have more to tell us that you are not telling us. I

said its a very serious matter and we intend to call you before the Grand Jury and I said I would advise you to contact an attorney and talk to him about this as it is a very serious matter. And he said I have got nothing to hide. I said whether you have anything to hide or not, I would advise you to contact an attorney because we are going to call you before the Grand Jury and we are again going to question you along these lines with the questions you failed on the test. And he said I have nothing to hide, and I said very well, contact your attorney. I also said, now let me tell you this, Carlos, you may not think this is a serious matter, but it is a serious matter because if you go before the Grand Jury and you lie, I said you can be indicted under the law of perjury. I read the perjury statute to him and said, we have already charged Dean Andrews and Layton Martens for lying before the Grand Jury and I said if you lie before the Grand Jury we have the option of indicting you for perjury also. He said OK, I understand, and that was the extent of my conversation. Now, is there anything that I have said that is not correct?

MR. GARRISON:

Before you reply I want to remind you that you are under

oath. You have to give us the truth about this too.

- A. He is saying that and I think that he failed to say that Mr. Garrison told you this?

MR. SCIAMBRA:

No. I said that we don't believe you, I let you know explicitly that we do not believe you and that we are very concerned - my exact words with you. I said, Carlos, you can realize that any time you ask a person did he see any of the guns that assassinated John F. Kennedy, and he says no, and the lie detector test showed deception, I said you can understand that this is a great area for concern, I said that is why we are concerned with you. And that is exactly what I told him. Now, at no time did I say that I wanted him to change anything, at no time in my whole conversation. I said we do not believe you in these areas and we feel that you are not telling us everything that you know, and you should contact your attorney because this is a serious matter and he said my attorney is Gasper Schiro. I gave him Gasper's phone number, I said I am a friend of Gasper's, contact him and let him know exactly how we feel about you. Schiro contacted me the next day and I repeated to him verbatim just what I told you, I said we are going to call Quiroga back because we don't believe him. Its a

very simple matter, we just don't believe him.

We don't believe his story. Now, is anything I have just told you right now, just repeated, wrong?

- A. Yes. Almost you said everything you said. Except that I think that you told me at the time that I will be indicted for perjury if I would testify.

JUROR:

He told you these questions were wrong and if you testify to them you probably would be indicted for perjury. I have heard him say that, there is nothing wrong with that.' That is true. That is correct.

- A. Strangely enough, the thing ... I think I have tried to cooperate with Mr. Garrison on a long time basis - now . . .

MR. GARRISON:

Let's get back to the point.

MR. SCIAMBRA:

Let me make one further point. Evidently Carlos did go back and he did contact his friend, attorney Gasper Schiro, and Gasper Schiro contacted me a couple of days later and he said will you please tell me what Quiroga is talking about because I can't understand or make heads or tails of it. Evidently he was under the misapprehension that he would go before the Grand Jury read the lie detector test

results to him and we would charge him with perjury. And I told Gasper you know better than that, I said evidently Carlos did not understand or doesn't understand the results of the test or his testimony before the Grand Jury. But evidently he told Gasper that we would read him the results of the lie detector test and charge him with perjury.

JUROR:

That is the impression he got that was wrong. You got the wrong impression. We understand it now. It was all a misunderstanding on your part. Now if we ask you the same questions here, Mr. Quiroga, and you give the same answers and then if we prove at a later point those answers are wrong, then you are guilty of perjury. Do you follow me? But this lie detector test in itself does not convict you of perjury. Or indict you for perjury.

A. Well, again, I will tell the Grand Jury the truth, and nothing but the truth if I am asked the same questions.

Q. You are at liberty to change any of those questions.

To us. Just tell the truth on each question. That is all we ask of you. This is the only time you are under oath.

A. OK. I think we are clear on that, now Mr. Garrison will ask you questions..

MR. GARRISON:

Q. Do you have any pertinent or first hand knowledge of a conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy? Your answer was no, and the lie detector showed that this answer is indicative of deception. Would you like to explain why you think that happened?

A. I have never had any first hand knowledge of . . .

Q. Not at all?

A. Not at all. Of what Mr. Garrison is talking about. Let me explain this, Mr. Garrison had told me that on Jan. 24 what his theory was - the 24 of Jan. my wife and I were . . .

MR. GARRISON:

It's stick to the point.

A. OK. And the only thing I can say is, as you well know, we think that Castro had something to do with this because Oswald was a communist and the only thing I can think of - Oswald is a communist. He was a Marxist and Fidel Castro was behind this. You know Castro, months before, I mean days before

MR. GARRISON:

What does that have to do with your having a specific reaction when asked if you had knowledge of a conspiracy to kill Mr. Kennedy. What is the connection?

A. Mr. Garrison, the lie detector test too - you have to understand that two hours Mr. Jacobs and I had a big

argument, because of the 36 questions, I think there were 36 - Mr. Jacobs told me I had to take them - and 38 names - and there were two copies sent. Mr. Louis Ivon I was in his office that afternoon when I went to take it, my wife - and I asked Mr. Ivon if I could have a copy of the 36 questions and he said yes, I could have it so he gave Mr. Jacobs two copies of the questions and when I went over there I tell you right now I am a nervous person I have been having a spastic stomach and I got in big, big argument. Mr. Ivon told me I could have it, but I never received it - my wife and I - and I never receive 2 copies of the lie detector test so we - I don't know how long it was but it was a long time then Mr. Garrison came up with that, I was quite upset.

JUROR:

- Q. You answered that because you were upset, or did your answer come out wrong because you were upset?
- A. I tell you, I thought the test really was a hundred because I told the truth

MR. GARRISON:

You were not conscious of feeling particularly upset and you thought you had passed the test?

A. Excuse me.

Q. You thought you had passed the test?

A. Sure because I told the truth.

Q. But you had no consciousness of being unduly nervous so as to fail the test?

A. But I was very upset, very upset, Mr. Garrison. Especially when you tell Mr. Jacobs there - that's what Mr. Jacobs said in front of my wife - that he said I could not take that home and secondly that unless I take the test I go to jail.

Q. Then you were very upset?

A. Well sure I was upset.

Q. Do you think you failed the test because you were upset?

A. Yes, I think so. I don't know.

Q. You just said

A. Mr. Garrison, I will say this, I don't know what the test could prove in this case here, because I was telling Mr. Jacobs the truth and nothing but the truth . . .

Q. Did you think you had failed the test or passed it?

A. I told Mr. Jacobs that I thought I had passed it. I thought I passed it a hundred per cent because I was lying at all.

Q. You didn't think that you had failed it at all?

A. Huh?

Q. You did not think that you had failed it?

A. How could I fail it if I am telling the truth?

Q. You didn't think that your nervousness caused you to fail?

A. I was never

Q. You didn't feel that your nerves caused you to fail?

I am asking you about at the time. What was your feeling at the time?

A. Well, I don't know, Mr. Garrison. The first thing I knew about it

Q. Are you aware that you passed most of the questions with no problem at all?

A. No, I thought I passed the whole thing with hundred per cent.

Q. Well, you passed most of the questions with no trouble at all.

A. You told me the other day - I thought - I don't know how it works because I never took one - but I was upset -

Q. Did not the operator explain at the outset how it worked - he does with all of the other people - very carefully - didn't he explain it to you? How the lie detector works?

A. He told me - he says that you can find out when a person is lying or not - and I told him I can pass it 100 because I am going to tell you the truth that is 100% - now he comes up with his thinkings of it and = something else.

Q. This man is a professional and we have found the results to be very reliable in the past and naturally when we find that approximately 10 questions, more or less, you have indications of deception, we have to ask you about it. But

if you are saying your nervous condition at the time caused you to pass these particular questions, that when you were asked other questions that didn't relate to this matter you showed no reaction at all, none at all.

A. Now, Mr. Garrison, now I don't know, I don't know - of course I have to explain to - cause I am not trying to say anything about this - because, I don't think to me it means anything at all. I will go to court and I will say these things and I am going to tell the Grand Jury this - and I am going to make it very clear right now - what I am telling you people is the truth, nothing but the truth, and now or later if I change my mind I will be lying. If I would say something else I will be lying and I die if I lie.

Q. Good. Now let's get on with the questions. One question that was asked you was according to your own knowledge did David Ferrie know Sergio Arcacha Smith? Your answer said no and the test indicated deception.

A. Now wait a minute. Let's go into that. I told Mr. Jacobs and I warn Mr. Jacobs that because that was a something that was put out to me before he put the lie detector test on me. Yes, I am going to go through those questions, Mr. Garrison, because

Q. Could you go to them a little more directly?

- A. Yes. If I know that Ferrie and Arcacha know one another? Of course I knew that Arcacha and Ferrie know one another because I used to see them together. In 1961. Then he started telling me, he say no we want to know about 1963 and this is where he did not have a date, as you can see. He said 1963, well I have never, never saw Mr. Arcacha again, nor have I ever seen Mr. Ferrie, the only time I ever saw Mr. Ferrie I saw him in 1962 to the best of my knowledge was one time I used to work with Mr. Rice's office on Canal Street and I saw him in Walgreen's eating lunch and I used to go eat lunch
- Q. What did you have for lunch?
- A. Huh?
- Q. What did you have for lunch? You want to go into that too.
- A. No, but I just stopped to explain that after that I never saw Arcacha again and I never saw Ferrie in 1963 again.
- Q. Are you aware that this question has no date in it: according to your own knowledge, did David Ferrie know Sergio Arcacha, and your answer was no.
- A. Yes. But you think the 36 questions you had not the same questions there, you know I was not asked the same questions. As you prepared for the lie detector test, you know that?

- Q. You understand that there is no date in that question?
- A. Yes, but you have to go in before what he wanted to know.
- Q. Your answer is yes. Correct? You thought it was a trap question?
- A. No, excuse me, sir. No, what I am saying is this. Mr' Garrison knew, because I had told Mr. Garrison, I had told him and it was the way he wanted me to answer it. He told me to answer it because he said Carlos what I want you to say is this: and Mr. Garrison is very well aware Mr. Jacobs told me before he put in the lie detector test he went over the 36 questions . . .
- Q. Did he tell you what answers he wanted you to give?
- A. He told me what you were interest of, Mr. Garrison.
- Q. Did he tell you that I wanted to hear certain answers?
- A. That he wanted to know whether I knew Ferrie and Arcacha saw each other in 1963 and I told him no. I never - that I know of -
- Q. But you understand that this particular question here has no date, the date was not mentioned.
- A. No the date is not mentioned, but the way I was told to answer, before the lie detector test

Q. Let's go on to another question.

A. You see, gentlemen, but I

Q. Let's go on and answer another.

Q. According to your knowledge, did David Ferrie know Guy Banister? Your answer was no and the indication was deception.

A. Again, gentlemen, the same thing - He was telling me because Mr. Garrison you know very well that I talked to you about Mr. Guy Banister and about Mr. Ferrie - right? Now wait a minute. Then Mr. Jacobs again comes up and comes out with the same thing, you see, what Mr. Garrison wanted to know was I knew Ferrie and Mr. Banister knew one another, have seen one another in 19.....

JUROR:

To your knowledge, did they know one another?

A. In 19..... no sir - excuse me, sir

Q. To your knowledge did they know one another?

A. Wait a minute.

Q. Did they know each other?

A. Now wait a minute. Mr. Ferrie used to go to Guy Banister's office.

Q. That is what we wanted to know.

A. Yes, but the way the question was asked to me and gentlemen, I never was in Guy Banister's office in 1963.

Q. Well, its a good thing we are asking these questions because we are clearing up a lot of misunderstandings. Aren't we?

A. Yes. Also - but again you see this is why I was telling Mr. Sciambra this too, that the way the questions were asked, sir,

Q. But the significance you just have to answer.

A. OK. Well, I answered

Q. Let's go on.

MR. GARRISON:

Q. You were asked this question, in the summer of 1963 - now for the first time we have a question with a date in it - did you see Lee Oswald with any subjects of Latin descent. The answer was no, the indication with specific reaction indicated deception.

A. Gentlemen, I am telling you right now - you can check with the Warren Report - I never met Lee Oswald but one time and he was alone in his house - and I have never seen him to the best of my knowledge I only saw Oswald once in my whole life.

Q. You did not see him passing things out in front of the Trade

Mart?

A. No, because when I got there he was gone. I tell you if I had seen him over there I also would have been in the Warren Commission and beat the hell out of him.

Q. Isn't it a fact that you knew Fair Play for Cuba activities of Lee Oswald were merely a cover - let me put it the way it was asked. Isn't it a fact that you knew that the Fair Play for Cuba activities were merely a cover, and you answered no and you gave specific reaction which indicated deception.

A. I am telling you, the only thing I know about Fair Play for Cuba and Oswald - was a communist organization.

Q. How many members in this organization?

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't know now?

A. Huh?

Q. You don't know now?

A. After reading the Warren Commission -

Q. Never mind the Warren Commission, they did not have this in the Warren Commission. Now we want you, you, to tell us exactly what he asked? He just asked you a question.

A. To my best knowledge I don't know anybody who was in that

Fair Play for Cuba - I only met Oswald - that is all I can tell you right now.

Q. What is your answer to the question: is it not a fact that the Fair Play for Cuba activities were merely a cover?

A. A cover for what?

Q. For anything.

A. To cover up. No. I tell the truth, how could it be covered when the man is working for the Fair Play for Cuba.

Q. Your answer is no.

A. Yes, it has to be.

Q. That means it has to be no. Your answer is no.

A. Will you read me the question again?

Q. Is it not a fact that you knew the Fair Play for Cuba activities were merely a cover?

A. No.

Q. Right. Was Oswald part of an anti-Castro operation, your answer was no, you gave specific reactions which indicated deception.

A. Now again, I will say this, Mr. Garrison, as you know you told me on Jan. 21 and also on Jan. 24, you - in front of my wife - about that you had discovered that Oswald was anti-communist - I only knew Lee Harvey Oswald as a communist - that is the answer there.

- Q. That is your way of saying no. Do you know of any other person who knew Oswald in 1963? Other than by chance encounters, your answer was no, you showed specific reaction which indicated deception.
- A. Again, the only thing I knew about Lee Harvey Oswald in 1963 was because he had that thing in Canal Street and also that Oswald had an encounter with Carlos Bringuier and also I had known that Mr. Oswald tried to join Mr. Bringuier's organization.
- Q. Now let's make sure you understand clearly that you have named the other names.
- A. Carlos Bringuier - is one of the key ones - I don't know the others - I think one is Hernandez . . .
- Q. And Miguel Cruz?
- A. Yes.
- Q. So now we have reached the end. This is the end of the other people that you knew of that knew Oswald in 1963. That is all you knew of?
- A. That's right.
- Q. Now that's in the record. We can count on it.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Prior to the assassination did you ever see any of the guns

which were used in his assassination. You answered this question no, and despite the smile on your face you showed a specific reaction which indicated deception, and I would not think that a smiling matter.

A. Mr. Garrison, I never saw any arms at all. I would have reported immediately to the authorities.

Q. Your answer is no. Right?

A. Sure.

Q. Now why do you think you should a specific reaction indicative of deception?

A. Mr. Garrison, Again, I think what you told me again that day, and again, gentlemen, I want you to know that I was pretty upset too, but anyway you told me, Mr. Garrison, that you knew - and this back in January - 24, in front of my wife - that you knew, at the time, you thought Lee Oswald didn't kill the President. And that they was named, I think, Garcia, or something - he had been seen behind the bushes and Oswald did not, but somebody else killed the President.

Q. What on earth does that have to do with

A Mr. Garrison, I don't care what reaction I am taking - look, I have pains in my stomach right now - I try to

tell the truth in here and you are asking me this question, I am telling the people the truth here and it looks like you don't believe me.

Q. Are you telling me that these same questions which caused you to show indications of specific reactions indicative of deception to the lie detector are in this room giving you pains in the stomach.

A. No sir. What I am telling you - this Grand Jury - is the truth, for example, I have been waiting all day long, I feel my stomach is spastic, I have been upset for weeks now.

Q. Why should ^{you} be upset when you have been ^{re-}assured by these men that all we want is the truth. Why should you have pains in your stomach and be upset?

Q. Did you ever have any ulcers, sir?

Q. Never - I have no reason to have any.

A. I been having them for over a year now - spasm, not a ulcer. I have been treated by doctors

Q. Do you have trouble with ulcers when people ask you to tell the truth - because that is all we want, we don't want anything else.

A. All right.

Q. You were asked, according to your knowledge or information, did any of the following persons have knowledge of Lee

Oswald's activities prior to the assassination - according to your knowledge or information did any of the following persons have any knowledge or information of Lee Oswald's activities before the assassination? Then the name of Zelso Hernandez was asked you, you answered no, and you showed specific reaction indicative of deception.

A. Now again, the only thing I know about Zelso Hernandez was when he was on Canal Street - Zelso was on Canal St with Bringuire and this other fellow, I said no because my answer again he was one of the questions there when you ask him something and the way he told me these questions I could very easily know those questions and I wish now I would go back and have the Grand Jury go in the questions you submit with very details on it

Q. Is there anything else you would have us do?

The conclusion of the examiner was, after careful analysis, of this subject's polygraph it is the opinion ~~of~~ that this subject did not tell the complete truth during the examination or interrogation. Now, what do you think of that?

A. Well, that is his opinion.

Q. Yes, Now what do you have to say about that?

A. I am telling you the truth and nothing but the truth that I answer all of those questions to the best of my ability.

- Q. What about the fact that other individuals have seen you with Lee Oswald and at least one - let me finish - at least one case, the man was given a lie detector test and passed it - he saw you with Lee Harvey Oswald on at least four occasions.
- A. What?
- Q. At least 4 occasions.
- A. You had better bring him to court, he will have to testify under oath and he will be charged with perjury because that is a lie. I tell you this, too, Carlos Bringuier has given articles to different newspapers after assassination of President Kennedy about my only appointments with Oswald the only acquaintance I had with Oswald on August 16 - and after that I never to the best of my knowledge I never met Oswald again. And I think that this man should I think Mr. Garrison that one of my questions that I asked was those people who have said such things should be brought into court and charged because they are lying. I am not lying.
- Q. I see. You were asked another question which involved the full description of an individual and he was described as follows: very heavysset, powerful individual, Latin individual, with a very thick neck, unusually powerful, and you were

asked if you knew who that was, and you answered no, and the lie detector test machine showed indications of deception. Would you like to comment on that?

A. What was that?

Q. Let me put it in a current way so I can simplify it. Forget the lie detector machine. Have you ever seen a Latin individual who was unusually strong, had an unusually thick neck, black hair, dark complexion, and he had a distinct scar on his left eyebrow. Have you ever seen anybody who looked like that? Now be sure and think before you answer because this man was very active in this City from 1961 through 1963.

A. Cuban?

Q. He is a Latin, any Latin race, make any selection you want.

A. Well, I told you . . .

Q. The truth is what we want.

A. OK. I tell you the truth, the truth is when I work for Sergio Arcacha in 1961, sir, as you find out through your investigation, that was nobody but Mr. Arcacha and myself, we were working in this movement and of course Ferrie and Ferrie was helping Arcacha too, and that I remember a person like that I don't in 1961.

Q. Never mind the year, any time.

A. After 1963 I got disgusted about this whole thing, you can

see from your record ... I don't know who he is talking about, I tell you the truth I don't know who this man is

JUROR:

Q. You never heard of such a man, or saw such a man?

A. No, I have

Q. Did you ever see such a man in any year fit such a description? In the last 25 years?

A. No

Q. Did you ever see a man who would fit that description in the company of Lee Harvey Oswald?

A. No.

Q. On Canal Street?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever see such a man with Sergio Arcacha Smith?

A. No, I tell you, Arcacha was a person and he did not have many friends here, very few friends in fact, and when I got here in New Orleans well I was starting LSU and I finish up in August, 1961 I got my degree in August, the time I met Arcacha Smith until the time I - to the best of my knowledge I never

Q. Did you ever hear that man described before?

A. I think that the first time he described by that man Jacobs in the lie detector test.

MR. GARRISON:

Your answer was no with specific reaction indicative of deception. Why do you think you would have such a reaction if you never saw the man?

A. That is his opinion. I am just telling you people ...

Q. Why do you think you would have such a reaction there if you never saw the man?

A. Because I think Mr. Jacobs told me, Mr. Jacobs was telling me and he showing me pictures of different people and he was saying for example, he says, you know who is the one Embassy in the picture with the Cuban/in Mexico, and I said no I don't know anything about that - he says - he showed me a picture of Sergio Arcacha and he said man, that is not big enough, it is not strong enough, really, you know, he showed me a picture of Arcacha and I said, man, that can't be, because Arcacha - well, he was fat

Q. Do you think all of this has anything to do with the question that I asked?

A. No, Mr. Garrison, but again you ask me why I should . . . why I should show reaction ...

Q. Well, what are you talking about?

A. No, I am not saying - Mr. Garrison - to the best of my knowledge I never met that man.

Q. Why do you think that that question caused you to have a specific reaction indicative of deception?

A. Deception what? I am telling you the truth.

MR. GARRISON:

Will you wait outside the door.

A. Why?

Mr. Quiroga, please go and wait outside the door.

A. OK.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I certify that the preceding transcript is a true and
and correct copy of the testimony given, under oath,
before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury, on the 24th day
of May, 1967, and reduced to typewriting by me.

Maureen B. Thiel