Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701

1/12/69

Dear Bud.

As I told you Thursday, the Mard and Paul file of varuous records of the Commission court reporting, including covering letters from the local US.S Attorneys, is missing some items.

In the case of New Orleans, this allows fascinating conjectures. What is lacking there is a letter transmitting the transcripts of testimony of Carlos Bringuier, Philpi Garace III and Vance Blalcek. And it is in this testimony, all adduced by Bringuier, that I have discovered substantive change.

In other cases, the seems to be no isolation of testimony by subject. What is transmitted seems to be what is available and can be.

One possible exception is in the covering letter of Barefost Sanders of March 30, which is on eight Dallas Parkland-medical witnesses.

Many, if not all (and I am not taking the time to check) the
New Orleans transcripts of the April 7 and 8 depositions are identified in
the printed versions as having been taken both days. Exception and the other available records, this error was unnecessary. Intimitation of
the available records, this error was unnecessary. Intimitation of
the state of the second of the list of "Depositions of" (also incomplete, numbering
but 169 and ending August 34) the depositions are so indicated, as having the en
taken both days. I am not now taking the time to check, but I find myself wondering if these of which this is true were all Liebeler's. Of course, say
proper transcripts and the original notes permit no such confusion, which makes
me wonder again about the confiscation and destruction of the notes.

If it is not a simple error that accounts for the absence of a letter of transmittel, then there may be significance in its absence and in the strange bracketing of these three depositions. Whether or not there is error, if it is these three slone, I believe there is a significance I would like to determine. My personal investigations increasingly focus attention on this testimony, its deficiencies, omissions, known perjury and alteration by Liebeler to protect the known perjury, which was Bringuier's.

In this file there is a handwritten note, apparently by Wayne Mirdsell, on his memompaper, anyway, reading, "President's Commission July 9 Does not carry % a Vol. No. It was a meeting of members of the staff Page numbers to be left as they are. Next meeting will follow this day - will be Vol. 58".

This fascinates me. What were the members of the staff doing having a private meeting that required the presences of a court reporter? No such transcript was printed, of course. Now if we examine the bookkeeping records, we find that on the appropriate sheet (they are not numbered, but they are in sequenc, and this one carries the number 43-1400, with the possibility there is something before 45, this copy having not been carried to the left-hand edge) there are two rep SECRET jobs lined through and indicated as "no pages" having been supplied. The first, Vol 57, is alone in that volume as "Comm" rather than "Deposition". Ten copies had originally been indicated. The first following listing is not legible, but the word "staff" is clear, the Data Shirman is 7/10, making the

take was of July 9, exactly the date of this mote. It was packed by EH and shipped via HB, indicating, I think, that Wayne made the delivery. This is covered by Receipt No. 3414 (and the previous entry, of "No Pages", by No. 3388.

Similarly, Vol. 59, sams bookkeeping sheet, next to bottom entry, also "Comm", then lined through and "No Pages" indicated, is covered by Receipt No. 3512. While most of the items in this nentry with are not filled in, it does indicate a shipment 8/25, mix copies, Shipped By" BK, Receipt No. 3535.

You know what I have discovered in the other "No Pages" items.

I would appreciate it if these could be checked out. This also beers on what I asked of you Thursday, a copy of every receipt. I would not suggest inquiry of Jesse, Wayne or others for their recollections, at least not at this point.

Perhaps it is not a warranted suspicion to wonder what was happening at the crossraods, but with the dirty work already known to have taken place, it is also unwine to assume there was but a single case.

I would like to know what members of the staff, for example, if there is an extant record. Or whetzher others than staff members also were present, whether or not witnesses.

Except for me, everybody gets paid in some way. Therefore, the billings should indicate something, at least the compromise worked cut to compensate the company and the reporter. Again, you know what I found in one case.

If you made copies for yourself, please check to see if you have any duplicates. I ask this because I have two, and these could be for a second set. I have segregated, if you need.

With further reference to 7/9, I note what I cannot explain. Here there is reference to Vol. No. 58, possibly. Now this end 59 are New Orleans Volumes, es the tabulations show. In fact, 52 through 60 are.(In this area, beginning with 41, only 6 are not. 37 is also N.O., 78-82, 100,115,132 too.) So, we have what also would appear to be a chronological conflict, with Vol. No. 58 ( or 57) having untyped content fated 7/9, whereare everything else in that sequence is April 7-8.

I do believe this is worth following carefully, hope you can find the time, and that you can make me two copies of everything so I can more safely take one to N.O. with me. I may also went to visit the Thomas Co., and if I do I think it would be wide to have everything relevant with me.

Whatever these people do and do not do, can and cannot, they can count. Ward and Paul can and does keep straight records, at least in the normal course of events.

Perhaps the attached letter to Bud will interest you. He and I have both had considerable experience with Ward & Paul, court reporters. They are exceedingly competent and are popular in Congressional quarters because they dow very good word and exceedingly expeditiously. In my day on the Hill, they were one of the two firms of best repute. My opinion, from that day and from my knowledge of the pertners, is that they do nothing q uestionable unless it is asked or expected of them. They always gave me overnight service, which was important to me.

His relationship with them is current, therefore, I asked him, when he offered, to get from their files rather than those of the Commission certain things I wented. He had told me that he was going to a New Years party that Jesse Ward would also attend. I asked him to stay away from certain areas, told him what I already had, etc. They were quite cooperative with him. It turned out he did not have time to talk to Ward, but did gozx to their offices the next day.

But went through and copied the files himself. He told me Thursday that he did copy everything relating to N.O. The significance of this is in the letter to him. If either of you has a list of the N.O. witnesses, I'd like a copy to compare. LaCusr's letters of 4/10 cover Marilyn Murret, Adrian Alba, Mrs Jesse Gerner; Mildred Sawyer, Charles LeBlanc. 4/13: Lilliam Murret, Edward Pic, Viola Peterman, Anne Buudreeux, Francis Martello, Bennierata Smith, William Wulf, Francis S. O'Sullivan, John Murret. 4/20, Edward Voebel, Julian Evans, both Sharles Steeles, Charles Murett. I keep expectingnto find a desposed witness for whom there is no transcript!

To the degree I now can, with the extra pressures, I will try and follow this down. If either of you has a theory of why there should have been this single staff meeting that required the presence of a court reporter, yet for which there was no transcript, and at that time, I'd like to hear it. I do not isolate July 9 and a day or time of special significance. A few things do suggest themselves, but I find no persuasive reason for believe they could account for this unusual thing. Ferhaps the missing papers, which I believe Bud can find and I think I can at the Archives may tell me more, or enough. He had indicated he might come up today, but he hasn't, nor has he called. I will phone him soon if he hasn't called me. He was out yesterday when I called him. I may go to New York with him Wednesday, each for different reasons. If I do gom I will come back that night or the next day, in time to meet Nouma Bertel, who will argue the pix-X-rays case, at the sirport about 3:30. I will be in DC all the next day, with him, at court, and, presumeably, taking him to the sirport.

Harold