While I've not yet had time to go over what I brought back, we did not discuss the filed interrpgatories and I may not have them.

Grandually other things are coming to mind.

We must get a sworn statement that there were not "results" in the sense I used this description. They told us there were none.

We must also get Frazier under oath in this. The opportunity exists and the need from many cases is apparent.

It is my belief that his volume 5 testimony and that in the Shaw case do have him saying there were such results.

I think that at the right time we'll both have to reread that testigony with case. I would early love to be able to lay a case of perjury or misrepresentation before a federal judge.

There is also the question did Frazier, who specified he was the wrong witness, give all that testimony and be prepared for even more, what he gave being so inadequate, without any notes of his own?

I was right. I m too sleepy to complete but negin with 5H67, top, and then stop where I have. Gallagher "He submitted his report to me and I repared the formal report pf the entire examination."

At least Gallagher did prepare a single report he could submit, meaning in writing only and Frazier "prepared the formal report of the entire examination."

This can't be what they gace the Commission in the form of Hoover letters because of what follows: He testfies that both reports are "part of the permanent record of the FEI," the words of Specter's question to which he agrees.

This related to all spectro examinations.

I'v stopped at three this point. We'll have to pick up here. This I remembered and I think there is more.

I think I went into this in WW.