

**31ST DAY**

# Shaw Trial Proceedings

5-1 2/26/69  
Court proceedings in the 31st day of the conspiracy trial of Clay L. Shaw follow:

Charles A. Appel Jr., a Washington, D.C., handwriting expert, was the first witness for the defense today. He was questioned by F. Irvin Dymond about a signature on the guest register in the VIP room at New Orleans International Airport.

Q—Mr. Appel, I show you an exhibit . . . and direct your attention to the signature Clay Bertrand on the date Nov. 12, 1966, and ask you if you have seen a photograph of a signature identical to that?

APPEL examined a photograph and then answered:

A—Yes, I have. This is a

photographic enlargement of the signature (on the guest-book) together with a photograph of other writing by the defendant.

Dymond then showed Appel 11 more exhibits introduced

which are documents signed by Clay Shaw before a notary public.

Dymond then asked Appel if he was familiar with the documents.

Turn to Page 6, Column 1

## Market Summary

THE STOCK MARKET perked up a bit today on reports of progress in Vietnam peace talks. Prices sagged on the Big Board at the start, but gradually improved later with blue chips showing some strength. The edge to the upside was thin at the close, but the Dow Jones industrial average gained 5.97 at 905.77. Volume on the big exchange was off to 9,540,000 shares from 12,320,000 yesterday.

IN COMMODITIES, New York cotton futures were lower. Wheat and rye futures gained in Chicago while corn and oats closed lower and soybeans mixed. New York copper futures rose 65 to 90 points.

Markets on pages 58, 59 and 60.

Continued from Front Page

A—Yes. I examined them. They were submitted to me in connection with the signature appearing on the book that you just showed me.

DYMOND had handed Appel the VIP room guest register to examine just prior to the question.

Q—Did you perform any examination as to the signature of Shaw and the writing on the exhibit (the guest register)?

A—Yes, sir.

At this point Appel went into a long comparison of the handwriting that appeared on the guest register and the handwriting on the document signed by Shaw.

APPEL went to a large blowup that had been taped to an exhibit board and began his explanation.

A—I found in the first place that the defendant writes larger. The proportions of the letter size in one writing is different from another. The 'C' is higher. The proportions are not the same. The slant is not quite the same. And the manner of moving the pen, forming these slopes is different.

The distance between the 'C' and the 'L' is much more narrow. The slanting stroke upward is not of the same angle. The counter-clockwise motion is different. We see a difference in the 'A.' The defendant leaves his A's open at the top.

The writing act is such a delicate movement, coordinating the fingers, arm with the eyes. All of these things have to be the same.

The defendant writes very rapidly in what teachers might call scribbling. The proportion of one letter to the other is different. The top of the Y is larger than the one found in the book.

There is no comparison with the beginning of the B as written by the defendant. The oval of the B made by the defendant is narrow. The bottom oval is a different figure entirely.

APPEL testified that Shaw wrote his whole name in one continuous movement, "whereas the pen is lifted in the questioned entry."

Appel said the R and the T as written by Shaw and in the guest register are also dif-

ferent.

APPEL also made a comparison between "New Orleans" as written in the guest register and the same two words written by Shaw.

He said the whole entry as written by Shaw is higher as a

whole. "The questioned entry is only about half of this height."

He said the W as written by Shaw has an arch in it. "We see no such arch in the questioned entry."

Appel testified that Shaw "writes much more rapidly" than is apparent in the questioned entry in the guest register.

"FOR THESE reasons, . . . I concluded that they were not written by the same person."

Q—Did you confine your examination to this one writing by Mr. Shaw or did you use other writings?

A—I saw a good many others that were submitted, including a signature of Mr. Shaw in 1966 on the same film. I asked that he be requested to submit any other writings that he had made.

Q—Does it reveal they were written by someone other than the writer in the book?

A—The entry in the book was made by some other writer entirely.

AT THIS POINT Dymond showed Appel a number of sheets of paper on which there appeared to be handwriting.

Q—Mr. Appel I show you more exhibits and ask if you used any of these?

A—in my testimony I referred to an examination I had made of films which were submitted. I just examined this morning other examples of writing that were submitted to me.

Q—Is there any material difference between the signatures 31-40?

A—No difference. They are natural also to 1966 writing—just that of the signature of Clay Shaw.

Q—As a result of your test and examination, did you come to a firm opinion that these exhibits were different from the Clay Bertrand in the state exhibit.

A—Yes, I did.

Q—What is that opinion?

A—The defendant Shaw did not write the entry in the book.

At this point the direct questioning ended and James L. Alcock, assistant district

attorney, began cross-examination of Appel.

Q—in connection with your specialty, were you used any time in the investigation of the death of President Kennedy?

A—No. I was not employed.

I have done no federal investigations since my retirement in 1948.

Q—Do you receive a pension from the federal government?

A—Yes, I do.

Q—Did you make your analysis from photographs or original documents?

A—I made them from photographs. I saw no original documents until I arrived here today.

Q—How many exhibits did you examine?

A—I saw 20 frames on film.

Q—Were these signatures the same size as the original?

A—They were reduced in size on a 35 mm film taken with a Leica camera.

Q—As a general principle isn't it more desirable to have an original document than a photograph?

A—This depends. If you are dealing with a traced signature — a forgery, for instance — you need the original. It is always better to have the original in the case of a forgery. But in this case, I examined additional original writings when I arrived here. The comparatives were furnished me in Washington.

Q—You made your conclusions from the signatures which are shown here on Exhibit 55?

A—Yes, I did.

Q—Would it have been better to have seen the original signatures?

A—It is not necessary at all if the evidence you are dealing with shows the design, speed and movement. In this particular case, there was no problem here. In a forgery, which is a tracing, the forgery has to be done slowly, producing a tremor. More often the pen is lifted, especially if a ball point pen is used.

APPEL THEN explained that sometimes in a forgery a pen is used without ink to get a likeness of the original signature indented on paper. Then the signature is drawn over with ink by the forger

but the indentation in the paper can be photographed.

Appel then told the court that he had asked that the signature of Shaw be made in a normal manner and he is sure that it was.

"I asked that the defendant be seated in a normal manner and that he see no other writings. I asked him to write the signature once and that this signature be removed from his sight and another made the same way.

Q—You say that you asked that Mr. Shaw be seated in a normal writing position; do you know if the person who signed the name of Clay Bertrand in the original book was seated?

A—No, I don't. When you get specimens this way, you do it to gain the most normal writing habits. Most students learn to write in a seated position.

Q—Would there be a difference if he or she were seated than there would if he were standing?

A—Not necessarily. People learn to write seated normally.

Q—If standing, would it vary, in your opinion?

A—Of course it would. But it would still show the design, the speed and the movement which is important. Last week I had occasion to examine writings on a wall.

Q—Did you see anything the defendant wrote except his signatures?

A—Yes, a letter the defendant wrote to Mr. Wegmann in 1966.

Q—Do you have this letter in your possession?

**APPEL RUMMAGED** through his briefcase, produced the letter and handed it to Alcock.

Q—I take it that the only sample you were given that was not limited only to the signature of Clay Shaw or Clay Bertrand was this letter. Do you know the health of the individual at the time of this writing, the circumstance under which it was written?

A—No, I don't.

Q—How did you conclude that this was from a letter written in 1966?

A—I was told it was taken from the files of Mr. Wegmann.

Q—You have nothing to prove that this letter was written in 1966?

A—That's true.

Q—As a matter of a fact,

you don't know if you received writings made in 1966?

A—Yes, I have additional exhibits which bear the date 1966.

Q—Were they signatures or letters?

A—They are signatures on letters postmarked 1966.

Q—Now Mr. Appel, other than these signatures and the letter you have just shown me and state exhibits 30 through 43, were there any other documents which you studied in

this connection?

A—No.

Q—Did you draw any conclusion prior to receiving these documents?

A—No. That is, well, really, yes. Prior to receiving the originals, as I have already explained, I had film copies of many of these documents.

Q—Did you make a determination from a photograph?

A—That's true.

Q—Is this generally the best procedure for examining handwriting?

A—As I have said before, it is a purely practical matter and it depends on the evidence on the documents.

Some are not carefully constructed and others are normal writing. Some are consistent in one part to another.

Q—Would you say that speed is one criteria in handwriting analysis?

A—Yes, speed and the modification of letter forms, as for instance, an R written rapidly may appear as an I. It is by such abbreviations that a person gains speed. In a more normal writing speed, he may make a more formal R without realizing it.

Q—Do you know the speed at which the defendant wrote these examples?

A—I know it was written at a skilled and automatic speed.

Q—What do you mean by skilled?

A—That is the man's normal, or automatic writing, the type of writing he could do in the dark. It is his habitual way of writing.

Q—Now, you told Mr. Dymon on direct examination about differences in the writing. Were these significant differences?

A—There are no two writings exactly alike, although one may have been written right after the other.

**AT THIS POINT** Alcock

asked the court to take a brief recess and the request was granted.

**ALCOCK ASKED** the witness if he had blown up any of the other exhibits.

Appel said he made a negative containing a number of signatures written by Shaw and put it on enlargement paper.

Appel said he did this Monday in Washington. He told the court he examined photographs of the signatures.

Alcock asked the witness if there was any reason he chose defense exhibit 30 for his comparisons.

A—No, sir. I selected it at random.

Q—Did you have a chance to view all of them?

A—Yes.

Q—Did you not feel this one substantiated your position more than the others?

A—No, sir. I just selected it at random.

**ALCOCK** asked Appel if his specialty of analyzing questioned documents is an "exact science."

A—That would depend on what you mean by "exact."

Q—I mean exact . . . such as mathematics is an exact science?

A—No, sir. Mathematics is the only exact science there is. In this case, certainly the comparison of design is most scientific.

**THE WITNESS** then explained that it is necessary to have a minimum number of features before reaching a positive conclusion.

Q—Did you reach a positive conclusion in 1½ hours?

A—No, sir. I didn't.

He said he felt a minimum of two hours is needed in making comparisons and said he spent an entire day studying the film. He said he developed the film himself. He used a microscope with an 18-power enlarger for studying the film, he testified.

Alcock asked if the comparison was based on photographs, rather than the original.

A—Yes.

Q—Are mistakes ever made in your specialty?

A—In any endeavor I've ever heard of where humans are involved there is room for mistakes.

Alcock then questioned him about a case involving a per-

son named Mae Hart.

The witness said he did not recall the case.

Alcock then asked if the verdict in the case substantiated the testimony he had given in that case.

**THE WITNESS** said he has never been proven wrong, although juries might decide in opposition to his testimony.

Appel added the possibility of his being wrong was remote because he had adopted a technique to make sure he was not guessing, that he was proceeding correctly in his analyses.

Alcock then asked the witness if he recalled testifying in New Orleans in the 1950s.

A—Yes, I do recall testifying here.

**ALCOCK** then asked Appel if the testimony regarded a will. Appel said it did. He said he detected in the signature that the decedent was plagued with a disease.

Alcock returned the questioning to the case at hand and asked if the conclusions were based on photographs.

Appel said he saw the original for the first time today in court, but that it did not change his position at all.

**THE CROSS** - examination ended and Dymond began questioning Appel.

Appel said the original confirmed his opinion.

Q—Would the position of a person, standing or sitting, make a difference in the signature?

A—No, sir, it would not.

Q—As an expert, do you feel you had sufficient amounts of material from which you could form a firm opinion?

A—Yes, I did.

Q—Are you being compensated for your testimony here today?

A—No, sir. I felt it a civic duty to offer my services as I have.

**HE EXPLAINED** that as a rule he does not take criminal cases. "I don't like to break down law enforcement."

But he said he felt it his civic duty to testify to "assure that injustice is not done a person."

Alcock resumed questioning of Appel and the witness re-

peated that he is not being paid for his participation.

Q—You testified you want to see that justice is done?

A—Yes, sir, that is correct. Ordinarily I will not accept a case against the prosecution, and I have worked with the prosecution on many cases . . . I've testified here before for the state.

He said he felt he was not needed as a general rule in criminal cases, except when "particular circumstances warrant it."

**JUDGE HAGGERTY** stopped the testimony, saying that it was "opinion."

Alcock insisted he had a right to pursue the line of questioning to see if the witness had formed an opinion about justice in this case prior to making the handwriting analysis.

Alcock also said the matter of compensation was raised by the defense.

**APPEL SAID** he did not form an opinion in the case, only that he was needed. He explained that he got into the case following a telephone call from Lloyd Cobb, president of the International Trade Mart.

He said Cobb asked him his fee. "I told him \$250 a day. He told me this man (Shaw) doesn't have such money as that."

Q—When did you receive this telephone call from Mr. Cobb?

A—The fourteenth of this month.

Q—Did you discuss the merits of this case with Mr. Cobb?

**THE WITNESS** said he did not.

Appel said he decided that although the fee could not be met and there was the possibility of an injustice being carried out, he would accept the duty.

Q—Did you know Mr. Cobb was a witness in this case?

A—No, sir, I did not. In fact, I knew nothing about this case.

Q—What? You knew nothing about the case and you were afraid an injustice would be done? No further questions.

**THE DEFENSE** then introduced into evidence a number of handwriting exhibits.

Arthur Jefferson Biddison

was the next witness.

Q—Mr. Biddison, what is your address?

A—1414 Chartres st.

Q—How long have you lived there?

A—Since 1957.

Q—What is your occupation?

A—I'm a real estate man.

Q—How long have you been in real estate?

A—Eight or nine years.

Q—How long have you known the defendant, Clay L. Shaw?

A—About 23 years.

Q—I refer you to the year 1963 and ask if you owned an automobile?

A—Yes I did.

Q—What kind?

A—A 1960 black Cadillac sedan.

**DYMOND SHOWED** to Biddison a picture of a black Cadillac. The state has introduced the picture as evidence and contends that several persons saw Shaw in the car in

Clinton in the summer of 1963.

Q—Is this your automobile?

A—Yes, I think so.

Q—How can you identify this as your automobile?

A—By the house in the picture. It (the house) belongs to the man I sold it to.

Q—Did you know Shaw in 1963?

A—Yes.

Q—Were you a close friend?

A—Yes.

Q—During 1963 did you loan your automobile to Clay Shaw?

A—No.

Q—How are you able to be positive?

A—This car was used by me in my business and Mr. Shaw had one of his own.

Q—What kind?

A—A black Thunderbird.

Q—Did you loan your car to anyone else?

A—No. I used it personally for my company.

Q—Did you loan the car to anyone for a sufficient period for them to take it out of town?

A—Not in 1963.

Q—Did you ever loan it out long enough for a trip out of town?

A—Yes, in the summer of 1967 I loaned it to Shaw to visit his mother and father in Hammond.

Q—Do you know Shaw by any other name?

A—No.  
Q—Do you know Mr. Shaw to use an alias?

A—No.  
Q—Did Mr. Shaw ever use the name of Clay Bertrand, to your knowledge?

A—Never.  
Q—Clem Bertrand?

A—Never.  
Q—Had you ever heard Mr. Shaw use the name of Lee Oswald or Lee Harvey Oswald?

A—No. I never heard the name until the assassination.

Q—Do you know if Shaw knew anyone named Lee Oswald or Lee Harvey Oswald?

A—No.  
Q—Did he ever mention the name?

A—No.  
Q—Do you know David W. Ferrie?

A—No.  
Q—Have you heard Mr. Shaw mention the name?

A—Never.  
**DYMOND SHOWED** the witness a picture of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Q—Have you ever seen this man before in the presence of Mr. Shaw?

A—No. I have never seen this man in person or in the presence of Mr. Shaw.

Dymond also showed him a picture of David W. Ferrie and Biddison testified that he had never seen Ferrie in the presence of Shaw.

**DYMOND THEN** showed the witness a picture of Lee Harvey Oswald with a beard and Biddison said he had never seen "that man" personally or in the presence of Shaw.

Q—In the years you have known Mr. Shaw, have you become familiar with his manner of dress?

A—Yes.  
Q—Has he ever worn tight pants?

A—Never.  
Q—Has he ever worn a hat?

A—Never.  
Q—Does he own a hat, other than a military hat?

A—No.  
Q—Do you recall a trip Mr. Shaw took to Europe in 1966?

A—Yes, I do.  
Q—What part did you play in it?

A—I drove Mr. Shaw to lunch and saw him board the ship. I earlier had arranged to lease his home to a Mr. and Mrs. A. Roncotta while

he was to be away.

**BIDDISON PRODUCED** a lease from an attache case.

Q—What is it?  
A—It is a lease for 1313 Dauphine for three months beginning 4 May, 1966, to 3 Aug., 1966.

Q—Was the lease extended?  
A—Yes. For two periods. From 4 Aug. to Sept. 3 and, with the approval of Mr. Shaw, again until Sept. 20, even though Mr. Shaw was returning from Europe.

Q—Have you ever received any mail for Mr. Shaw?  
A—No. Not at my home.

Q—Any place else?  
A—Yes, at my office.

Q—How was it addressed?  
A—Mr. Clay Shaw, in care of my office at 920 Royal st. or in care of Marilyn Tate Realty Co.

Q—What did you do with it?  
A—I opened it all and on two occasions I mailed some to him in Spain and England.

Q—Did you read the mail?  
A—Yes. I opened it all because I had discretion of what I would forward to him.

Q—Have you ever seen the name of Clem Bertrand or Clay Bertrand come to Shaw at your office, at your home

or any place?  
A—Never.

Q—How long have you lived at 1414 Chartres?  
A—Since 1957. I restored the building. It was not a post office address until then.

Q—Could you describe the type of mail box you have?  
A—It's a cast iron box of 1910-1920 vintage and attached to the side of the garage which is the main entrance.

Q—Is it locked?  
A—No.

Q—Who takes out the mail?  
A—I do.

Q—Have you ever taken out a letter addressed to Clem Bertrand?  
A—Never.

Q—Have you ever received mail addressed to a Cliff Boudreaux?  
A—Never.

Dymond then tendered the witness to the state.

Q—Mr. Biddison, does anyone reside with you at 1414 Chartres?  
A—No.

Q—In 1966, did anyone stay with you?  
A—For a short period in

1966, Mr. Shaw stayed there until he could get back into his home.

Q—For what period?  
A—The period, five to 10 days before Sept. 21.

Q—At this time, who is residing at your home besides yourself?  
A—No one.

Q—Has anyone else ever resided with you at that address?  
A—Mr. Fred Tate in 1965.

Q—Anyone else.  
A—Mr. Clayton Gomez.

Q—For what period?  
A—From 1961 to 1964.

Q—Has anyone else resided at the address of 1414 Chartres?  
A—No one. I've had many house guests, but no other person resided there.

Q—Going back to 1963, how often did you see Mr. Shaw?  
A—Very seldom in 1963. I was involved in restoration and he was involved in selling bonds for the new trade mart building.

Q—Then you saw him very seldom in 1963?  
A—Very seldom.

Q—Have you ever loaned your black Cadillac to the defendant?  
A—Yes.

Q—When?  
A—In the fall, 1966.

Q—Did he make an out-of-town trip?  
A—Yes, I believe he did.

Q—Where did he go?  
A—To the best of my recollection, to visit his parents in Hammond.

Q—You received no mail at home for the defendant in the summer of 1966 or the fall of 1966?  
A—No mail was forwarded to him. There may have been letters sent direct to him.

Q—That would have had to be from close friends who would have known of your friendship?  
A—Yes.

Q—Did Shaw execute a change of address form in 1966?  
A—Not to my recollection.

Q—Mr. Biddison, have you ever executed a change of address form with the post office.  
A—Have I? Yes.

Q—Are you familiar with the form?  
A—I can't say I am.

Q—I'm going to show you a state exhibit and ask if you are familiar with it.  
A—(Looking at the exhibit)

Yes, I'm familiar with this form.

Q—Are you familiar with this particular form?

A—No.

Q—But, you are familiar with the form?

A—Yes, I've had them in the office for myself and my clients.

Q—What does the form you are holding show?

A—A change of address for Clay L. Shaw, canceling the previous change from 1414 Chartres to 1313 Dauphine.

Q—Do you know your postman?

A—Yes.

Q—Do you know his name?

A—I know it now.

Q—What is his name?

A—James Hardiman.

Q—For how long has he been your postman?

A—For as long as I can remember.

Q—Have you had any trouble with him?

A—No.

Q—Did you have occasion to talk to him about his testimony?

A—Yes.

Q—After his testimony?

A—No, prior to it.

Q—How did you know of his testimony prior to his appearance in court?

A—From Mr. Garrison's opening statement.

Q—Was he mentioned in the opening statement?

A—No, I was named and my address.

Q—Do you know any reason why Mr. Hardiman should testify incorrectly about the mail delivered to your address?

**DYMOND OBJECTED** and Judge Haggerty sustained the objection.

Q—Do you know Mr. Hardiman to be a truthful person?

Dymond objected that Biddison is not a character witness for the mailman. Judge Haggerty sustained the objection.

Q—Do you recall how much mail came to your office for the defendant while he was in Europe?

A—What comes to mind is tons of it.

Q—Tons?

A—I received a great deal of mail for Mr. Shaw.

Q—Have you and Mr. Shaw resided together prior to

September, 1966?

A—Yes, we resided at 637 Barracks from 1946 to 1948 and at 1906 Esplanade from 1948 to 1950.

Q—Have you since resided with Mr. Shaw?

A—No, sir.

Q—Are you from New Orleans?

A—No, sir.

Q—Where are you from?

A—Tulsa.

Q—Are you a close social friend of Mr. Shaw?

A—I am a close business and social friend of Mr. Shaw.

Q—Was anyone else residing at 1414 Chartres at the time the defendant was in Europe?

A—No.

Q—Have you gotten other mail at 1414 Chartres for other persons?

A—For approximately three months last summer for Mr. C. C. Bunker, who was my house guest. For three months last winter for Mr. Sherman Schroeder, who was my house guest.

Q—Have you received mail for other persons since 1963?

A—For my invalided mother and my deceased father. I received monthly Social Security checks for my mother. Other names escape me, although there are others.

Q—Now, the mail you received at home for the defendant. Was it forwarded from home or sent directly to the office?

A—It was sent directly and brought to my office by the tenant.

Q—Did you actually receive letters from the post office forwarded to your office?

A—No, to my knowledge, no.

Q—Just mail brought to you by the tenant?

A—Yes.

Q—And there were tons of it?

A—Not tons of that. No.

Q—How much mail did the tenant bring to the office?

A—Perhaps two or three letters a day. They brought them irregularly to us.

Q—Do you still own the black Cadillac?

A—No, I was negotiating in the fall and spring of 1966 and sold it to Mr. Ray Hyde, my maintenance man, who still owns it.

Q—And the way you recognize the car in the photograph is by the house in the back-

ground?

A—Yes.

Q—Do you remember lending it to any other of your house guests?

A—No.

Q—1414 Chartres became a mailing address in 1957, is that correct?

A—Yes.

Q—Were you subpoenaed to appear here today?

A—No.

Q—You came of your own free will because of your friendship with Mr. Shaw?

A—Yes, sir.

Q—No further questions.

Biddison was excused.

Q—Did you say that Mr. Shaw was a salesman for you?

A—Yes, he was a licensed salesman for me after his retirement from the Trade Mart.

Q—In 1966, when Shaw was in Europe, did you say you never received a letter to a Clay or a Clem Bertrand?

A—No. Never.

THE WITNESS then was excused and the defense called James R. Phelan, a free lance writer from Long Beach, Calif.

Phelan said he was working for the Saturday Evening Post in 1963. He said he has 15 years' experience on newspapers.

Q—Did you come to New Orleans in 1967?

A—Yes. I was on assignment for the Saturday Evening Post.

Q—When did you come?

A—Probably late February of 1967.

Q—What was your purpose?

A—I wanted to interview Mr. Garrison.

Q—Did you?

A—Yes. After I was here four or five days.

Q—Did you meet him before?

A—Yes. About four years earlier when I did another article.

Q—When did you see Garrison first here in 1967?

A—First in his office here. Later at his home. And four or five days later in Las Vegas.

Q—Who suggested these meetings?

A—Mr. Garrison.

Q—Were they pre-arranged?

A—Yes.

Q—Do you know Mr. Sciam-

bra?

A—Yes.

Q—When did you first meet?

A—After I returned from Vegas and after Mr. Shaw's preliminary hearing.

Q—Do you remember the date you went to Las Vegas?

A—Yes. I went out March 4 and I met Mr. Garrison at the airport on the fifth when he flew in from New Orleans and when he registered at the hotel under the name of W. O. Robertson.

Q—Who registered under the name W. O. Robertson?

A—Mr. Garrison.

Q—Have you anything to show the dates of that trip?

A—I have my own hotel bill. I stayed at the Dunes.

PHELAN PRODUCED the bill showing the room he occupied March 4-7, 1967.

Q—Did Mr. Garrison give you anything?

A—He gave me two documents but not until after several meetings and probably the day after he arrived. We had a series of conferences before.

Phelan produced the documents.

Q—Do you know what these contain?

A—Yes. I read the two documents and I re-read them and I re-read them.

Q—How many times did you read them?

A—At least six times.

Q—Why?

A—Because there was a wide discrepancy . . .

AT THIS POINT Alcock objected that the witness could not answer without expressing a personal opinion. Judge Haggerty sustained the objection.

Q—What did you do with them?

A—I Xeroxed them. And returned the originals to Mr. Garrison.

Q—Did you tell him anything?

A—No.

Q—Was that the last time you saw him in Las Vegas?

A—No. I talked to him four or five times later before he left.

Q—Where did you go after the Las Vegas meeting?

A—I went to my home in Long Beach. Then I returned to New Orleans to cover Shaw's preliminary hearing for the Saturday Evening

Post.

Q—Did you hear the testimony?

A—Yes.

Q—Then what did you do?

A—The next day I called Garrison and told him I was tremendously disturbed by the testimony of Perry Raymond Russo.

ALCOCK OBJECTED again on the grounds that he was making an opinion. This time he was overruled.

Q—Then what did you do?

A—Shortly after the 'phone call, it wasn't the next day, but it couldn't have been more than two days after, I went to Garrison's home. It was in the evening about 6 or 7.

Q—Who did you meet upon arriving?

A—Garrison, his wife and their children.

Q—What did you tell him?

A—I pointed out the wide discrepancy between what Mr. Russo had said in the Sciambra memo and what he said on the stand.

Q—And what did Mr. Garrison do?

A—His jaw dropped a little bit.

Q—And after he picked up his jaw, what happened?

A—He made a 'phone call and shortly afterward, Mr. Sciambra came in.

Q—Was he accompanied by anyone?

A—No. But before he arrived, Mr. William Gurvich came to the house.

Q—What did you tell Sciambra?

A—I told him in his report on his meeting with Mr. Russo in Baton Rouge there was no information about an assassination plot. The memo never said Shaw knew Oswald or that Russo knew Shaw or that Russo knew Shaw by Clay or Clem Bertrand.

TESTIMONY WAS interrupted when Alcock objected, saying the judge was allowing the witness to discredit Sciambra. Alcock said Sciambra was not allowed earlier to testify about this conversation in Garrison's home.