

XXXXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX

Rt. 8, Frederick, MD. 21701

1/12/69

Dear Bud,

As I told you Thursday, the Ward and Paul file of varuous records of the Commission court reporting, including covering letters from the local U.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 Bringuer, Philpi Gerace III and Vence Blelock. And it is in this testimony, all adduced by Bringuer, that I have discovered substantive changes.

In other cases, there 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 Barefoot Senders of March 30, which is on eight Dallas Parkland-medical witnesses.

If it is not a simple error that accounts for the absence of a letter of transmittal, 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 alone, 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 Bringquier's.

In this file there is a handwritten note, apparently by Wayne Birdsell, on his memopaper, 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 presence 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 sequence, and this one carries the number 43-1400, with the possibility there is something before 43, this copy having not been carried to the left-hand edge) there are two TOP SECRET jobs listed 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 Date Shipped is 7/10, meaning the

take was of July 9, exactly the date of this note. It was packed by HH and shipped via WB, 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, same 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 entry 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 bears on what I asked of you Thursday, a copy of every receipt. I would not suggest inquiry of Jewse, 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 crossroads, but with the dirty work already known to have taken place, it is also unwise 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 whether 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 out 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 and 59 are New Orleans Volumes, as 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 dated 7/9, whereas 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 want to visit the Thomas Co., and if I do I think it would be wise 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.