Phone call from Rolapp 2/25/70 4:05 p.m.

He began for elopogizing for asking me to suebmit form again, noting that I had. He said they neve none of these things, he just wants to get this off his back, and would I like a letter from the Dep AG so stating. Before, later, giving him the answer that I'd prefer it over the AG's signature to eliminate that step, I asked him if he had consulted other agencies. He said, despite my quotation of Clark's memo on the law, that they had no obligation to but that in any event there were no such agencies of involvement. He said they panel was entirely on its own. I asked him if he had read their report. Negative. I then told him if he would read it and learn of its use in court he would learn that it was officially convoked by his department for official uses and that, contrary to the representation to him, it was assigned certain specific functions. He had Fisher's letter, which is what prompted his call, I told him that despite the statement that none of what I asked for dxists, I had proof, over the signature of one of the men involved, that at least at one time it did. I emphasized that I was not interested in scandal, that my first letter to the AG was calculated to prevent this and to alert them to the possibilities, that all I want is what I believe I am entitled to, not a fat scandal. I asked him for the panel's requests for evidence. No record, he was told. I asked him if he was aware of the detail in the report, which indicated the probability of the existence of such records. He was not. I told him Fisher said they had destroyed the draft (or removed it) and asked him if he understood the use that would be made of this when precisely that having been done with the autopsy report is one of the reasons there was the need for such a panel. I think he understood me on all this destruction of evidence. I pointed out that if any working papers existed, they should have remained with the government, which he disputed, here saying they had no official function and here is where I told him their very report proves otherwise. I suggested that before he freeze this by writing me the letter he suggests, he first look at what I have referred him to, and if he has any question, to ask me again. I tried to make him understand this would give him the chance to avoid embarrassment. I hoped he'd seen the extent of specification, measurement, etc., so he'd know there had to be records remaining, that such a report could not be made without working papers. I also called to his attention the fact that my request covered both panels, including the original autopsy doctors. He apparently was entirely unaware of this, and when he showed such unawareness, I tried to repeat that the new people on the higher levels were in the hands of essentially the same people on the lower levels who had made the initial mistakes and might be interested in shielding themselves. He was clear and I believe repeated the statement the Clark memo is without standing and disputed my statement it was the official guide to all agencies, including his, and I referred to the provision that no unnecessary obstacles be put in my path. I told him I had asked the Archives, that the report itself shows their involvement, that they were also party to the studies, etc. I forgot to tell him Rhoads was respondent in a suit. I told him that while I believe he was telling me the truth as he knew it, he had no personal knowledge, was dependent upon others. I asked him to consider his reaction if the positions were reversed, that this complicated study, with all the technical data in it, was made, and then he was told there is no scrap of paper on it remaining. I got the impression this got through. We left it that he will look into the things I suggested before either writing me or asking me for more information. I told him I'd show him what I referred to, as on its official purposes, etc. I also told him there were different but official representations of the official purposes, but in each case they were explicit. This is a hasty note because I have to leave, but I have no doubt I'll be able to recall more if and when I have to, pretty specifically.

HW