Sayers

Q. Sir, let's go to the Dernehl toxicology report that you thought accurately reflected the data you had accumulated in 1967. Which one is that?

MR. WILL: Object to the form of the question. He testified with respect to one particular item of his report.

Q. In other words, all of the concerns of your report aren't accurately reflected. Is that what I'm hearing?

MR. WILL: I object to the form of the question.

MR. LANIER: Which is it?

MR. WILL: You need to ask the witness those questions, not me.

MR. LANIER: Well, then don't object.

MR. WILL: Then don't misstate his prior testimony.

MR. LANIER: If I did, then fix it and tell me how I misstated it. Does it or doesn't it?

MR. WILL: What he said was -- he was asked about one topic, paragraph 4.4.1. He said he thought that accurately reflected

Sayers

his comments. He was not asked about anything in the remainder of the report. If you want to ask him about that, go ahead, but please don't give a speech.

MR. LANIER: You've got the -- I'm going to move on, just because she charges for each page and we don't have a lot of money. But I don't agree with what you said.

MR. WILL: I'll switch with you.

MR. LANIER: When I said "we." I meant my client.

Q. If you look at -- which one of these -- oh, I didn't find it. Show me the toxicology report that you thought accurately reflected your mesothelioma concerns and data. You got it?

A. Exhibit 6, yes.

Q. Now, your testimony, if I wrote it down right, is that this is basically an identical reflection of what your review of the literature had shown; is that right?

A. That particular section, yes.

Q. Okay. Turn to 4.4.1 in your book.

Sayers

A. Yes.

Q. I'm seeing there: "Some authorities even believe a single brief exposure might be sufficient" when it comes to causing mesothelioma. Do you see that?

A. I do.

Q. Show me where that's reflected in this asbestos toxicology report y'all were handing out.

A. It doesn't appear to be there.

Q. It may not be identical to 4.4.1, then, huh?

A. The answer to the question posed --

Q. Now, the lawyer is not allowed to point to you little parts to do. That's also unethical.

MR. WILL: No, I was looking at the document.

MR. LANIER: Oh, you were not. I saw you. You were sitting there going like that and pointing. You did it twice, and I let it go the first time.

MR. WILL: Do you have a copy of this for me? You took my copy. Go ahead.

MR. LANIER: No, I didn't take your copy. This is the copy the young lady

Sayers

handed me.

I'm just telling you that's unethical. I saw what you did. You live with your conscience. It doesn't matter to me. It's not going to make any difference, because what it says it says. It's just a question of what kind of lawyer you want to be.

Q. Sir, show me on this exhibit where it says that some authorities, authorities, believe a single brief exposure might be sufficient. Where does it say that?

A. It doesn't appear in that document.

Q. So that's not a "identical" representation of what your review of the literature showed, is it?

A. But my affirmation was only in respect of another portion of Exhibit 6 relative to my report.

MR. LANIER: Objection, non-responsive.

Q. In other words, no one should be misled. You're not telling the jury that the toxicology report identically carried forth the warnings that you brought forth in your 1967 internal memo; right?