J. D. FREDERICKS.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES. Hon. Geo. H. Hutton, Judge. Dept. No. 11.

The People of the State of California, Plaintiff,

vs.

0

Clarence Darrow,

Defendant.

REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT.

VOL. 14

INDEX.

Direct. Cross.

1088

Re-D.

Re-C.

No. 7373.

513 P.

Bert H. Franklin,

J. W. Ford,

Bert H. Franklin (Resumed)

1012

1092

LOS ANGELES COUNTY LAW LIBRARY

B, N. Smith, Official Reporter

scanned by LAUM

V & 14 to 16

Bert H. Franklin Vol. 14 W. J. Ford Vol. 14 Bert H. Franklin Vol. 15 Bert H. Franklin Vol. 16

	JUNE 6, 1912, 9 A. M. 1012
ls 1	Defendant in court with counsel. Jury called; all present.
2	Case resumed.
3	
4	THE COURT. Are you ready to proceed with the cross-
5	examination of Mr. Franklin?
6	MR. ROGERS. Yes, sir. I think I may say, if your Honor
7	please, on looking up the authorities I find that a number
8	of decisions have laid down the rule that we should be per-
9	mitted to recall him from to time in the Court's discre-
.10	tion, if we desire, but 1 will go on as best 1 can.
11	THE COURT. Well, of course, we will cross that bridge when
12	we come to it.
13	MR. RIGERS. I wished to outline my position so there would
14	be no misunderstanding about it.
15	
16	BERT H. FRANKLIN
17	on the stand for further cross-examination.
18	MR. ROGERS. Q Mr. Franklin, when you werebefore you left
19	the United States. District Attorney's office did you make
. 20	any application to Samuel Brown or to any person in the dis-
21	trict attorney's office for employment? A 1 did.
22	Q How long before you left the United States Marshall's
23	office? A Before 1 left there? No, sir, I did not.
24	Q Did you telephone on a number of different occasions
25	from the United States Marshall's office to the district
26	attorney's office before you left there? I am speaking

	1013
1	about immediately before, within two or three weeks?
2	A Well, not in regard to anything of that nature, no, sir.
3	I don't remember any telephone communication of this kind.
4	1 may have telephoned?
5	Q You may have telephoned? A Yes, I may have done in
6	business.
7	Q You remember whether or not you telephoned practically
Ś	daily for the last two or three weeks that you were in the
9	United States Marshall's office to the United States District
10	Attorney's office?
11	MR. FREDERICKS' 1 don't think counsel meant that question.
12	(Last question read by the reporter.)
13	MR. FORD. I don't see what relevancy
14	MR. ROGERS. If I have misspoke the question 1 beg your
15	pardon. From the United States Marshall's office to the
16	State's Attorney's Office. Pardon me if I misspoke myself.
17	A No, Mr. Rogers, I am able to testify with certainty that
18	nothing of that nature occurred.
19	Q If not almost daily did you not frequently? A No, sir,
20	I don't think I telephoned at all.
21	Q How soon after leaving the United States Marshall's office
22	was it that you applied to the district attorney's office
23	or to any member of it or to any person connected with it,
24	for employment? A Now, Mr. Rogers, so the record may be
25	correct, 1 think in your first question to me you said
26	before I left the United States District Attorney's office.

energy and the second second

and the set of the set

A CALENDARY AND AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADD

ALL CONTRACTOR

	1014
1	I think you meant the United States Marshall's office.
2	Q 1 did. Now, what is your answer? (Last question read
3	by the reporter.) A 1 never, Mr. Rogers, made an applica-
4	tion. 1 met Mr. Ford, 1 think, on the street, and told him
5	I would like to secure employment on any line of work that
6	he might have.
7	${\mathbb Q}$ How long was that before you went into the employment
8	of the McNamara defense? A Well, of necessity it could not
9	have been over two weeks.
10	Q To whom did you first apply in the McNamara defense people
11	or those connected with the McNamara defense for employment?
12	A Why, I think I met Mr. LeCompte Davis on the street and
13	spoke to him about it at the corner of First and Spring, if
14	I remember correctly. 1 think he is the first one I mention-
15	ed it to.
16	Q Did you mention it to Mr. Harriman at any time?
17	A Job Harriman, you mean?
18	Q Yes. A 1 think 1 did, yes, sir. I am not positive
19	but 1 am quite sure that 1 did.
20	Q How long after your conversation with Mr. Ford or with
21	any person connected with the district attorney's office,
22	was it, that you spoke to Mr. Harriman about getting a job
23	with the McNamara defense? A Now, read that question.
24	(Last question read by the reporter.) Well, to be absolute-
25	ly correct about it, I don't remember of asking Mr. Harriman
26	or speaking to him about it, but I think that I did, and if

1 I did it was sometime, I should say, between the 14th of 2 June and the 29th of June.

3 Q That is not quite the question. Mr. Franklin. Will you 4 be kind enough to 19sten to the question. Either 1 don't 5 understand your answer or my question is not understood 6 by you. A 1 will try to answer the best 1 can. 7 Q All right, read it again. (rast question read by the 8 reporter.) A 1 can't answer that question for the reason 9 that 1 don't remember having any conversation, at this time, 10 with Mr. Harriman, but my impress on is that 1 did. I want 11 to be fair about it but I don't remember the particular 12 occurrence, Mr. Rogers.

13 Q When did you speak to Mr. Ford about employment with the 14 State's Attorney's office? A Why, I think it was the day 15 that 1 quit the United States Marshall's office, but I am 16 not sure.

Q What day was that?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

	- 1016
1	A I think the 14th of June. I could tell by looking at a
2	memorandum that I have in my pocket.
3	Q Did you ever speak to Mr Scott about employment?
4	A I did.
5	Q In the McNamara case? A Yes sir.
6	Q I refer to Mr Joseph Scott, one of the attorneys.
7	A Yes sir, I did.
8	Q When was that compared with the time you spoke to Mr \pm
9	Ford? A I couldn't tell you, but if you allow me to look
10	at a letter I have in my book
11	9. You may look at the letter for the purpose of refresh-
12	ing your recollection.
13	A June 27.
14	Q June 27? A Yes sir.
15	Q Did you speak to Mr Scott about getting into the McNamara
16	defense before or after you spoke to Davis? A After
17	Q Referring again to the matter of telephoning, I want you
18	to understand what I mean by it, so that there will be no
19	possibility of misunderstanding about it. I understand you
20	to say that you did not telephone a number of times from the
21	United States Marshal's office, to the State's attorney's '
22	office immediately before you left the United States Marshal's
23	office, that is, within a short time, ten days or two weeks?
24	A Tam absolutely sure of that. I do not wish to be under-
25	stood as saying that T did not telephone at all, but I have
26	no recollection of phoning at any time. I may have done it.

Pardon me just a minute. Will your Honor have those shades lowered?

THE COURT: Mr Bailiff, will you lower those shades.

1

 $\mathbf{2}$

3

4

5

6

 $\overline{7}$

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR ROGERS: Did you ever speak to sam Browne about employment in the District Attorney's office, or in connection with it. A When do you mean? Q At any time.

A Well at any time, you will have to fix the time.
Q About the time of your leaving the United States Marshal's office, or thereabouts, around there? A I did not, no sir.
Q Did you ever speak to him since you left the United States Marshal's office, about employment connected with the District Attorney's office? A In his department, no sir, or any other department. No sir, I did not.

Q Under any circumstances, at any time, or under any conditions? A Under any circumstances, or any time or any conditions whatsoever you may name, I did not at any time speak to Sam Brows, in regard to a job, no sir, for myself. Q Or anybody else? A Not that I remember at this time --I think I did, yes sir, at one time.

Q Who was that? A Mr Starkey. Fred Starkey, and I think he obtained employment or work there for a short time. Q When was that? A About a year or a year and a half before I left the United States Marshal's office.

Q I am speaking, of course, about the time you left and afterwards. A Well, Mr Rogers, nothing of that kind.
Q Now, have you been employed by the county of late, or by

	1018
1	any office of the county or any county officer.
2	A In this county?
3	Q Yes. A In an official capacity I presume you mean
4	Q In any capacity? A No sir, I have not.
5	Q Coming now to the time you spoke to Mr Ford, you say
6	you think that was approximately the day you left the United
7	States Marshal's office, which was the 27th day of June?
8	A I think - I did not leave the United States service the
9	27th day of June.
10.	Q When did you leave it? A The 14th.
11	Q Well, it was apportimately the 14th of June? A I think
12	it was the same day I left. I am not sure. Yes sir.
13	Q I believe you said, going to another matter for a moment,
14	I believe you said you knew George Wood? A Yes sir,very
15	well, intimately for years.
16	Q Did you meet George Mood at the Court of Forresters in
17	this city, at approximately the time that you were fined in
18	the adjoining department here, that \$4000? A What do you
19	mean by "approximately"?
20	Q The ordinary use of the term, I mean, in that vicinity
21	or close to it. A Within a week?
22	Q Well, a nswer it if you please, you may make your own
23	approximation. A Yes sir, but I want you to specify the
24	time. I am not going to do it.
25	Q Do you remember having a conversation with him close to
26	the time that you were fined that \$4000 in the adjoining
	department? A No sir, I did not. I did have a conversation with George Hood, though. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

N

gelas County Law Library Do you remember when that was? A Well, I think I do.

1019

but I am not sure. I think it was the 15th day of June, 1911. 3 Monday night, the 15th day of -- no. not June, the 15th day of 4 January, 1912.

ete 1

 $\mathbf{2}$

0

5Q. Where was it? A I think it was within a half a block 6 of the Walker Theater building where our lodge meets.

Do you remember a conversation with him the night before 7 ହ 8 you plead guilty in the adjoining department and got that socalled fine of \$4,000? A I do not, and I am not sure about 9 10 this time, remember, but I think that time when I had a conversation with Mr Hood. In fact. I am quite sure that I did. 11 12 [Q] At the conversation which you had with Mr Hood, yourself and he talking together, no other persons being immediately 13 14 present, did you say this to Mr Hood, as follows: that is, 15 did this conversation occur as I will give it to you: did 16 he say to you, "Bert, you are a damn fool. Why didn't you take that money and put it down in your jeans and just simply 17 tell it was all fixed and not take a chance of going behind 18 the bars." Did you reply to him: "My God, George. I couldn't; 19 20 they were watching me too close." Then, did he ask you "Where did you get that money?" Then did you reply to George 21 22 Hood, "The man that I got the money from, or who fixed up the 23 proposition -- "Using one of those two terms, either the one "Who fixed up the proposition", or the one "The man I got the 24 25 money from was a stranger to me, I never saw him before, he 26 was standing within thirty feet when the money was passed and

he just disappeared and I have never seen him since"; didn't 1 George say to you, "Couldn't you locate him?" And didn't 2 you say to him, "I don't know whether I could or not"; that 3 you had been waiting, hoping to hear from him; that if you 4 had the resources of the District Attorney's office behind 5 you you might locate him, but as it was then, you didn't 6 know whether you could or not. Did you further say to him 7 it was your impression it was a San Francisco man and he 8 might have been an eastern man, he was a stranger in Los 9 Angeles, you were sure of that? 10 Now, your Honor, if Mr Rogers will ask me those \mathtt{Sm} A 11 questions seriatim I will answer them the best I can "yes" 12 or "no". 13 I have given the conversation. Did you have that con-Q 14 versation, then we will take it up seriatim? 15 I can't answer that question "yes" or "no". A 16 MR FORD: I suggest the witness have the reporter read the 17 question to him. 18 I'd like to have the question read and asked seriatim, A 19 and I will answer it. 20MR ROGERS: I have not finished. I will finish it. Then, 21 in that same conversation, was Darrow's name mentioned by 22 one or the other off you, either by your or Hood, and did 23 you not say then that Mr Darrow is a friend, speaking to 24 Hood -- saying to George Hood, "George, you never can know 25what that man has done for me", or words to that effect or 26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1	substance? A Now, if the question will be asked
2	one at a time I will try and answer them. Your Honor,
3	I know what he has stated in his question, but I am not
4	able to answer all at one time. I can answer them as he
5	asked them one at a time, simply because if I said yes to
6	one part of it, it would be a lie to the other part. I did
7	have part of that conversation with Mr Hood; I am willing
8	to tell what part I had.
9	Q What part did you have, and what part did you not
10	have?
11	MR FORD: I want to make a suggestion that the reporter
12	can read the question right along and let him answer it,
13	and just keep on answering it.
14	THE COURT: I think we can get it.
15	MR ROGERS: Did you say this part, and Hood say this part
16	to you: "You are a damn fool. Why didn't you take that
17	money and put it down in your heans and just simply tell
18	it was all fixed, and not take chances of going behind the
19	bars"? A No.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

•

1021

1	
1	Q Did you say to him, "By God, George, 1 couldn't, for
2	they were watching me too close?" A No.
3	Q And then did he ask you where you got the money, or in
4	some form or other, not being able to give the exact words?
5	A Mr. Rogers, 1 think it was the 15th day of January, 1912,
6	I had a conversation with Mr. Hood at the corner of Seventh
7	and Grand Avenue in this city, at the northeast corner.
8	When you asked me the other day in regard to it I had for-
9	gotten it. Mr. Hood called my attention to it yesterday
10	and I then remembered the conversation. I remember it now,
11	and 1 wish to tell you as near as possible what occurred.
12	Q Be kind enough to answer the question. A Yes. When 1
13	get to it so I can. Now, what is it you want to know .?
14	Read the question. (Last question read by the reporter.)
15	He did not; no, sir •
16	Q Then did you say to him, "The man you got the money from"
17	or who fixed up the proposition, one or the other of those
18	questions, was a stranger to you and you never saw him before,
19	that he was standing within thirty feet of you when the money \sim
20	was passed; that he just disappeared when the crack came
21	and you had never seen him since? A No, part of that con-
22	versation is true and part not true.
23	Q Which part is not true and which part is true? A 1 told
24	Mr. Hood at that time that the man, if there was one man, if
25	that/1 could find him, that 1 could clear myself, 1 thought
26	that the man that was instrumental in getting me in that

•

.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1022

	1023
1	trouble was near me when I was arrested, and, by the way,
2	I didn't at that time mean Mr. Darrow. I will be frank with
3	you about it. It was in pursuance to a conversation we had
4	an agreement the day before as to what I was to say. That
5	was on the 14th day of January.
6	Q Did you say in that conversation that he just disappeared
7	and that you had never seen him since? A 1 don't remember
8	saying that, no, sir.
9	Q Did Hood ask you then, "Couldn't you locate him?" And
10	didn't you say, you didn't know whether you could or not,
11	you had been waiting hoping to hear from him? A I think
12	I did say that, yes, sir .
13	Q Did you further say, "If you had the resources of the dis-
14	trict attorney's office behind you you might locate him?
15	A Yes, sir, 1 think 1 did.
16	Q But as it was youdidn't know whether you could or not?
17	A 1 think I said something to that effect, in substance
18	that.
19	Q Did youfurther say it was your impression he was a San
20	Francisco man or possibly an eastern man? A I think I did,
21	yes, sir.
22	Q Did you say in that conversation or at any time to Mr.
23	Hood, I believe that conversation, though, is the way 1
24	prefer the questionupon Darrow's name being mentioned in
25	some form or other, that Darrow was a press
26	remember correctly, Mr. Hood asked me what kind of a man

Darrow was; that he had heard so much about him and I said to Mr. Hood that Clarence Darrow was a prince, perhaps, or words to that effect--if I thought it I said it, and if I remember it correctly, I spoke of Mr. Darrow in the highest terms, yes, sir, and he is not the only wne I spoke that way to.

Q You said if you thought it you said it; Will you kindly explain that? I don,t quite get your idea there. A Well, perhaps that was not as plain as it might have been. If I had any conversation in regard to Mr. Darrow it was to praise him at that conversation, and I think he asked me what kind of a man he was.

Q You said you started keeping a memorandum book on the 14th? A Yes, sir.

Q Does Mr. Hood's name appear in that memorandum book? A 1 don,t think so. The fact that 1 was at lodge appeared in the memorandum book, though.

Q Well, did Mr. Hood's name appear in it as one of the persons you talked to? A I don,t think so. I didn't put down the name of every person I talked to. Some of them I did; depended entirely on who it was.

Q Now, when 1 was talking to you about the cashing of that check of a thousand dollars at the bank, the First National Bank, I asked you if you knew were the Merchants & Manufacturers Association office is; do you? A I think 1

do, yes, sir .

1

 $\mathbf{2}$

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

		1025
•	1	Q wave you ever been there? A Yes, sir .
	2	Q When? A Oh, I was in the M & M Association numerous
	3	times on lodge work and work they were interested inland
	4	showsthings of that kind, numerous occasions. Al don't
	5	remember the date.
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
		scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 Any time since your arrest have you ever been there? Q $\mathbf{2}$ Α I have, yes sir. 3 Q When were you at the office of the Merchants & Manufacturers' Association after your arrest? A Well, let me 4 think -- I think I can tell you, approximately, at least. 5 6 The latter part of January or the first of February: near that date. 7 When was that that you were at the office of the Merch-8 Q 9 ants & Manufacturers' Association as compared with your statement that you made to the District Attorney --10 Assistant District Attorney, Mr Ford? A It was after-11 wards. Mr Rogers. 12 Afterwards? A Yes sir. 13 ରୁ How long afterwards? Q 14 MR FREDERICKS: Just a moment. may it please the Court. 15 We submit the answer is not intelligible, it isn't to me. 16 "It was afterwards". Which was afterwards? I don't under-17 stand. 18 THE COURT: I don't think that is quite clear. 19 MR ROGERS: Well, I will put it in another form: Does your 20memorandum book show when you went to the office of the 21 Merchants & Manufacturers' Association? A I don't think 22it does, it may though, I am not sure about it. 23 Who went with you to the office of the Merchants & Q 24Manufacturers' Association after your arrest? A Nobody. 25Q You went alone? A I did, yes sir. 26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

the Do you know Mr Zeehandelaar 1/ secretary? 1 Q $\mathbf{2}$ Very well, yes sir. A 3 Did you see him on that occasion? A I did, yes sir. Q You know that the Merchants & Manufacturers Association 4 Q 5 was interested in the prosecution of the McNamaras, and that 6 Mr Zeehandelaar is secretary thereof, do you not? 7 It was common report that they were interested in the Α 8 prosecution, yes sir -- not in the prosecution, either, rather in the clearing up of the matter. I presume in the 9 prosecution, if you want to put it that way. 10 You say no one went with you to the office of the 11 Q. Merchants & Manufacturers Association? A Yes sir, and that 12 13 is true. How many times did you go there? A One. 0 14 To the office of the Merchants & Manufacturers Associa-ନ୍ଦ 15 tion after your arrest? A One. 16 Did you see Mr Zeehandelaar anywhere else, that is, ନ୍ଦ 17 the secretary? A Now, pardon me; I was there twice, on 18 two occasions. 19 When was the other occasion you were in the office Q 20 of the Merchants & Manufactuers Association after your ar-21 A Shortly after my first visit. rest?n 22How long after; will you give us an estimation? ର 23 I think within a day or two. A 24 You know, don't you, and did then, that the Merchants ରୁ 25& Manufactuers Association is interested in the fighting of 26

1 strikes and in combats against unions, and that the Merchants & Manufacturers Association has had charge of all opposition 2 to strikes in this city for a long period of time? 3

I have no such --A 4

To that question we object upon the ground it is MR FORD: 5 incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial. It/certainly is not 6 relevant to any issues in this case, what Merchants & Manua 7 factueers Association do in regard to strikers, and that is 8 best evidenced by the fact -- I don't know it will be proper 9 for me to call attention to the association of any persons 10 with the Merchants & Manufactuers Association, but it cer-11 tainly has no bearing upon the guilt or innocence of this 12 defendant whether the Merchants & Manufacturers Association 13 is opposed to union labor. 14

I presume this question was for the purpose of THE COURT: 15 searching into the motives. 16

MR ROGERS: Precisely.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Read the question. A

(Last question read by the reporter)

can't I eeulanit say that I understand it quite as particular. Α lg as that, Mr Rogers; I have understood common report, 22 that the interests of the M & M Association and the unions 23 in this city are opposed to one another, apparently so, 24 seem to be, according to my mind. 25

Pete 26

ହ

17

18

19

20

21

Wasn't it in your mind, that is, didn't you know

1	we will put that in a little different form Were you not
2	aware at that time that you went up there on those two occa-
3	sions that the Merchants & Manufactumers Association was in
4	charge of the fight against the strikers in the iron strikes
5	and which occurred just before the blowing up of the Times,
6	and had charge of the opposition to that strike?
7	MR FREDERICKS: That is objected to on the ground it is in-
8	competent, irrelevant and immaterial.
9	MR ROGERS: Searching his motives and reasons again; it is
10	only a part of them.
11	MR FREDERICKS: His motives and reasons can certainly have
12	no effect.
13	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
14	A I didn't understand that the M & M Association, Mr Rog-
15	ers, as a body, were making that fight. I had understood
16	that individual members of the M & M Association were making
17	a fight against the unions.
18	Q Didn't you understand A And I didn't think then
19	and I don't think now, that the Association, as a body
20	or I didn't think then, I won't say anything about what I
21	think now but I didn't think at that time that the Asso-
22	ciation as a body, but simply as individual members, that
23	that body was fighting unions.
24	
25	
-0	

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

		1030
	6p 1	Q Didn't you know at that time that the Merchants &
	2	Manufacturers Association had a strike committee and that
	3	that strik committee was incharge of the opposition to the
	4	iron strike, that Mr. Pridham was chairman of it?
	5	MR . FREDERICKS. We object to that as incompetent, irrele-
- Contraction of the second	6	vant and immaterial to any issues before this court.
Series and the	7	THE COURT. Objection overruled.
	8	A No, 1 do not know that.
	9	MR.FORD. It is objected to on the further ground it is
	10	hearsay.
and the lot of the	11	THE COURT. Objection overruled.
a subscription of	12	BY MR. ROGERS. Q Mr. Pridham was the man you met in the
	13	district attorney's office when you were arrested and
	14	brought up, wasn't he? A R. W. Pridham?
	15	Q yes, sir. A Žes, sir.
	16	Q Did you know he was chairman of the M & M strike Com-
and the second	17	mittee? A No, Mr. Rogers, I did not. 1 don't know it
ALL DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER OF T	18	now.
The Party Sector	19	Q Did you know when you went up to the Merchants &
	20	Manufacturers Association that the Merchants & Manufactur-
	21	ers Association had financed the fight against the strike,
	22	the iron strike, for months? A No, 1 didn't know that.
	23	I had no way of knowing it, only by hearsy .
ne	- 24	Q Did you ever meet Mr. Zeehandelaar there or anywhere else?
	25	1 am speaking of Zeehandelaar, Secretary of the Merchants
	26	& Manufacturers Associationanywhere else than at his
		scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	1031
1	office in the Merchants & Manuf acturers Association room?
2	A 1 might have met him onthe street and spoke to
3	him, not to have a meeting with him, no, sir.
4	Q Did you meet him at your attorney's office, George Adams?
5	A No, sir; 1 did not.
6	Q Did Mr. Adams report to you he had had conversations with
7	Zeehandelaar?
8	MR . FORD. We object to that as hearsay.
9	MR ROGERS. No privilege here.
10	THE COURT. Objection overruled.
11	A He did not.
12	Q Who was present at the conversation you had with Mr.
13	Zeehandelaar after you were arrested? A Which conversa-
14	tion do you allude?
15	Q The first. A Well, I can name some of them.
16	Q Who were they? A Mr. Stoddard Jess, the vice president
17	of the First National Bank of this city; Mr. Jevne of the
18	Jevne Grocery Company.
19	Q Which Jevne? A H. Jevne. Mr. Fred/Baker, or Fred
20	Baker
21	Q Fred L. Baker? A Fred L. Baker, of the Baker Iron
22	Works of this city; Mr. Reese Llewellyn of the Llewellyn
23	lron Works, of this city; Mr. Koepfli.
24	Q Koepfli? A Koepfli, the president of some company here
25	1 have forgotten the name of that now.
26	Q He was president of the Merchants & Manufacturers Asso-

1-	ciation once, wasn't he? A I think he was at one time.
2	I know that by hearsay. But he is now president of this
3	Q Bishop? A Bishop Candy Company, yes, sir.
4	Q Any others? A Yes, there were, I think, two others.
5	Q Were they the directors of the Merchants & Manufacturers
6	Association or merely the strike committee? A 1 have not
7	the least idea whether they are either one. I presume they
8	were part of the directors, Mr. Rogers, 1 don't know.
9	Q So you wont up there and met the gentlemen who you presume
10	were the directors of the Merchants & Manufacturers Asso-
11	ciation. On what date was that? A I didn't presume any-
12	thing, I don't know anything about it.
13	Q You met them in their committee room of the Merchants
14	& Manufacturers Association? A I don't know whether it is
15	a committee room. It is a large room with a lot of chairs
16	in it.
17	Q And a big table in the middle? A Yes, sir. 1 presume
18	it is a committee room. It had all the appearance of it.
19	Q You think there were two others. Can yougive me their
20	names? A Well, I ought to be able to. I knew them, but
21	I just cannot call them at this time.
22	Q You know, then, don't you, that Fred L. Baker of the
23	Baker Iron Works is president of the Founders' Association,
24	the association of the iron trade in this city? A 1 have
25	so understood; yes, sir .
26	Q That is to say, the association, owners of the foundries

		1033
Rollin - Am	1	and machine shops?
	2	MR. FORD' I object to that as merely calling for a con-
	3	clusion of the witness. If counsel knows all those things
	4	he can introduce evidence of that matter. I do not think
	5	he has a right to be introducing hearsay evidence on the
	6	part of this witness.
	7	THE COURT. It shows his state of mind.
	8	MR.FORD. 1 move that the answer be stricken out as calling
	9	for a conclusion of the witness.
	10	THE COURT. The motion to strike out is denied.
	11	A 1 wish to change m y answer to that question. 1 don't
	12	know.
	13	BY MR. ROGERS. Q How did you get onto the idea of wanting
	14	to change your answer? If Mr. Ford wanted it struck out on
	15	a certain ground and the court overruled it, do you think
	16	you can help him out a little? A Perhaps.
7p	17	MR. FORD. 1 object to that as entirely improper and ask
	18	that the counsel be admonished to refrain from questions
	19	of that sort.
	20	THE COURT. The Court thinks the statement of counsel is
	21	improper. The witness has a right to correct his testimony,
	22	Mr. ROGERS. Yes, sir.
	23	Q Now, did you know that the strike committee of the
	24	Merchants & Manufacturers Association was Fred L. Baker,
	25	R.W. Pridham, Reese Llewellyn, Stoddard Jess, H. Jevne,
	26	J. A. Koepfli, and those other two men that met you up there

7

	1034
1	in the Merchants & Manufacturers Association's office
2	before you came on this stand?
3	MR . FORD . We object to that question on the ground it has
4	already been answered and asked ofor the second time is mis-
5	conduct on the part of counsel, done purely with the intent,
6	and it is apparent from the intonation he wishes to create
7	that impression in the mind of the jury. If he has evidence
8	of that character let him introduce it properly, if it is
9	relevant.
10	THE COURT. The question asked and answered is whether or
11	not he knew those gentlemen were directors at the time he
12	went up there. He is also asked now does he know at this
13	time
14	MR. FORD. He was also asked if he knew they were members
15	of the strike committee and he said he didn't.
16	THE COURT. At that time.
17	MR. FORD At that time. Now, he is stating it again,
18	it can only be hearsay, and it is objected to as certainly
19	not the best evidence; both on that ground, not the best
20	evidence, and it is hearsay.
21	THE COURT. Objection overruled.
22	A Read the question, please. (Question read.) Well, now,
23	the latter part of that question might mean one or two
24	things. I didn't see them just before I came on the stand,
25	if that is what you mean.
26	Q 1 didn't use the words "just before"? A Yes, about

	:035
1	four months before.
2	Q Yes. A Yes, well, I want that understood.
3	Q Yes, sir. A did not.
4	Q At whose invitation did you go up there to meet those
5	gentlemen?
6	MR . FREDERICKS . That is objected to on the ground it is
7	incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, and 1 would like to
8	state our position in that matter, your Honor.
9	MR. ROGERS. Before counsel proceeds, may 1 enter an excep-
10	tion to counsel saying anything that will tend to enlighten
11	the witness as to what he is to answer. Counsel's posi-
12	tion upon it, if your Honor pleases, is not material to
13	this.
1 4	MR . FREDERICKS . Our position on the objection, 1 would
15	like to make an argument.
16	THE COURT · 1 cannot anticipate what counsel is going to
17	say .
18	MR. ROGERS. You cannot, but I desire to enter an excep-
19	tion in advance and protest in advance to his making an
20	argument in advance which will tendwhether intended so
21	or not,which will tend to put the answer in the witness's
22	mouth, so that I may assign misconduct in case it is done.
23	THE COURT. Coursel has made a proper objection and he has
24	a right to be heard on it. Captain Fredericks, 1 will
25	hear you.
26	MR.ROGERS. Yes, Bir.

MR . FREDERICKS . We are trying a case of bribery against 1 Clarence Darrow, charging him with bribing a juryman in 2 the case on trial in the Superior Court of Los Angeles 3 County, State of California. There is not anything before 4 this court in any way, shape or form, and 1 maintain there $\mathbf{5}$ cannot be anything before this court in any way, shape or 6 form that will show that the Merchants & Manufacturers 7 Association has one whit of interest in this prosecution or 8 in the testimony of this witness. There is --9 MR. ROGERS. (Interrupting) I take an exception to the 10 remarks of counsel just made--11 MR . FREDERICKS . (Continuing) Let me finish and you can get 12 Now, that is our position, one exception covering it all. 13 rhether and that is why we maintain/this witness went to the Mer-14 chants & Manufacturers Association or not has nothing to do 15 with the prosecution of this case; whether the Merchants 16 & Manufacturers Association were fighting the unions or the 17 unions were fighting the Merchants & Manufacturers Associa#r 18 tion, we maintain has absolutely nothing to do with the 19 issues inthis case. I cannot by any stretch of the imagina-20 tion see how the question as to what the relations between 21 the Merchants & Manufacturers Association and the unions 22 were can affect this case. 23 24

1036

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

26

	Las Assis Losary Law Librar 103?
ete1	Now, I may not be able to see as far into the case as counsel
2	for the defense does, but it certainly is not apparent to me
3	that there is any relevency in the fact that there was a con-
4	groversy between the Merchants & Manufacturers Association
5	and the unions. This defendant is not tied to the unions,
6	we are not trying the unions; there is no issue of unionism
7	in this case that is on trial, and so we think it is hearsay.
8	Of course, if there was anybody tried to influence this wit-
9	ness in his testimony, of course, we think that would be
10	material and ought to be shown; but to go into the relations
11	of the Merchants & Manufacturers Association with the unions.
12	we think it is immaterial. Now, that is our position in
13	the matter, your Honor, that it is hearsay.
14	THE COURT: Read the question, Mr Reporter.
15	MR FREDERICKS: We are not in a position to refute it or
16	rebut it when it comes in, because when we would come to put
17	in something it would be hearsay and the other side would
18	object to our idea of questions, and it would be stricken
19	out.
20	THE COURT: Read the question.
21	(Question read)
22	THE COURT: Overruled.
23	MR ROGERS: I desire, at this time, to enter an exception to the statement of counsel as containing statements which
24	to the statement of counsel as containing statement of an are Well, I won't use so bad a word as "intended"
25	are Well, I won't use so bad a word as interesting but which are calculated, not by him, but by the circumstanc
26	Dut which are carcurated, not of the ,

T.L.M.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

and nature of the remarks made, to endeavor to convey to the jury statements which are not evidence and which cannot be evidence, but which are stated by counsel flatly and affirmatively as if they were to be considered by the jury; and, of course, I understand there is a general admonition they are to pay no attention to those matters, but I desire an exception in the record.

8 THE COURT: I again admonish the jury that any statement of 9 facts coming from counsel of their position at the table, 10 unless sworn as witnesses, are not to be considered by you 11 as evidence.

12 MR FREDERICKS: But, your Honor, I made no statement of 13 facts. I think the admonition of your Honor is unjust to 14 the prosecution at this time. I have made no statement of 15 facts to the jury.

16 THE COURT: In that event the admonition falls and has no 17 effect. If the jury should be inclined to consider the 18 statement, they are admonished not to; and if not, the ad-19 monition does not apply. Answer the question.

A In answering that question, Mr Rogers, it will be necessary, perhaps, for me to tell just how I happened to go there I didn't go there at anyone's particular invitation. I will very frankly tell you how I happened to go there and what occurred there, if you wish it, to the best of my recollection will be very glad to.

Q By Mr Rogers: Did you solicit the interview with these

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	1039
1	gentlemen or did they send for you? A Neither one.
2	Q Did you know when you went up there whom you were going
3	to meet? A I did not.
4	Q Did you know when you went up there the nature and
5	character of the assemblage of the meeting? A The char-
6	acter of the assemblage, of the individual members you mean?
7	Q No A What position they occupied with the M & M
8	Association you mean?
9	Q I mean to say, did you know you were going up there to
10	meet a party of men connected with the Merchants & Manufactur
11	ers Association, in some official capacity? A No sir, I
12	did not.
13	Q Did you know whom you were going to meet in a general
14	way? A I did not.
15	Q Did you know that you were going to meet men who had
16	connections with the Merchants & Manufacturers Association,
17	in their rooms? A I didn't know it, but I presumed that
18	they would be members, yes sir.
19	Q Now, you went back again on the second occasion?
20	A Yes sir.
21	Q About two days or so after the first? A I think it
22	was about that time.
23	Q Whom did you meet on the second occasion? A A lady
24	in the outer office and Felix Zeehandelaar.
25	Q You met Mr Zeehandelaar? A I did, yes sir.
26	Q He is secretary and practically the manager of the

	1040
1	affairs of the Merchants & Manufacturers Association to your
2	then knowledge?
$\mathtt{mith3}$	A I think he is about the whole thing in regards to the
4	business end of it, yes sir.
5	Q Did you talk with Zeehandelaar there? A I did for
6	about half a minute.
7	Q Did you talk with any of the other gentlemen interested?
8	A There was nobody there but the lady in the outer office.
9.	I opened the door and stepped in and asked if Mr Zeehandelaar
10	was there, and she went to the door and said "yes", and I
11	went in.
12	Q You saw him then? A I did, yes sir.
13	Q Now, have you ever seen Zeehandelaar of the Merchants &
14	Manufacturers Association at any other place than in his of-
15	fice? A When do you mean?
16	Q Since your arrest A Not to my recollection. I might
17	have seen him on the street.
18	Q Have you ever talked with him on the street I desire
19	you to reflect on that for a moment. A No sir, I have not
20	Q On the street or any other place other than his office?
21	A No sir, I have not. I am quite sure of that. I know I
22	never had any conversation with him; may have met him on the
23	street, I don't remember that.
24	Q Who told you the time that you were to go to the Merch-
25	ants & Manufacturers Association, if anybody? A You mean
26	who told me to go to that place to meet some people?

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

ſ	1041	
1	Q At that time, yes. A JA Crook, sixth floor of the	
$\frac{1}{2}$	Chamber of Commerce building, a contractor.	
3	Q where does Mr J A Crook live, if you know: A Right	and the second second
4	near you, at Hollywood.	
5	Q That is the same one that lives on Vermont Avenue?	
6	A Yes sir; your friend, yes sir.	
7	Q Did he tell you that the men would receive you when you	
8	went over there?	
9	MR FREDERICKS: That is objected to upon the ground it is	
10	hearsay.	Construction of the local distance
11	THE COURT: Overruled.	1.1374-2008
12	A Did he tell me would they receive me?	1993 - A. 4
13	MR ROGERS: Did he tell you that there was a body of men	A Barrel A
14		3. 9. 1. S
15	Q What did he tell you about that?	+
16	MR FREDERICKS: Objected to upon the ground that it is hearsa;	۳ <u>۱</u>
. 17	THE COURT: Overruled .	
18	A Your Honor, it is pretty hard to answer those questions]
19	without telling what came before, very difficult indeed.	
20	MR FORD: I wish your Honor would instruct the witness he is	
21	entitled to explain.	
22	THE COURT: You have the right to make any explanation of	
23	your answer that is necessary to make it interrigible.	
24	A It is not a question of explanation. It is a question	
2	of telling; then I can tell just what happened.	
	5 THE COURT: If telling what came before is necessary to 6	

1 explain your answer to make it intelligible, you have that 2 right: both as to this question and as to other questions. 3 MR ROGERS: He must answer the question first, and then ex-4 plain. 5THE COURT: The question itself must be answered, and then 6 make such explanation as you may find necessary to make it $\overline{7}$ intelligible. Read the question. 8 A (Last question read by the reporter) 9

10 A He told me that he thought there would be some of my
11 friends there, for me to talk about certain matters that I
12 spoke: to him about.

13 MR ROGERS: You had spoken to Crook, then, to get you an
14 interview with the Merchants & Manufacturers Association?
15 A I did not, and I didn't say so; nothing of that kind
16 ever occurred.

You knew that Crook told you to go over to the Merchants Q 17 & Manufacturers Association, that you were going over to the 18 people who had the prosecution of the McNamara case in hand, 19 didn't you, and the fighting against strikes? 20MR FREDERICKS: Just a moment please. That is objected to, 21 may it please the Court; calling for a conclusion of this 22witness; assuming something not in evidence; cannot be in 23 evidence; that is, that the Merchants & Manufacturers Asso-24 ciation had the prosecution of the McNamara case in hand. 25THE COURT: Objection sustained. 26

scanned by LAUAWLIBRARY

1043 🛬 1 MR ROGERS: Mr Franklin, who was it that mentioned the Merchants & Manufacturers Association fer the place for you $\mathbf{2}$ 3 to meet. you or Mr Crook? A Mr Crook. Did he tell you that there would be somebody over there 4 ରୁ for you to see? A Said there would be some of my friends $\mathbf{5}$ there that I could talk to about a matter that I had spoken 6 to him about, yes sir, and not a committee of the M & M 7 Association: not particularly anyody connected with, but 8 that the meeting was to be there and it was to be a meeting 9 of my friends, and I thank God they were. 10 To be a meeting of your friends? A Yes sir, my friends Q 11 Is Fred L Baker your friend? A He certainly is for Q 12 twenty-five years. 13 Reese Llewellyn your friend? A Reese Llewellyn has ହ 14 been my friend for years. 15Stoddard Jess your friend? A He certainly is, yes sir Q 16 They have all been your friends? A Yes sir, and they ନୃ 17 are yet. I hope. 18 They all were your friends before this? A Yes sir. Q 19 Well then, how did it come when they were your intimate Q 20friends, as I understood you to infer by your tone --21 Not intimate A 2223 24 2526 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

[1044
1	Qthat they were in charge of the prosecution of the
2	McNamaras, in a way, or participated in it, that you went
3	on the defense? A Why, simply because it was a matter
4	of business, the same as you are defending Mr. Darrow now.
5	Every manwait until 1 get through my answer, please.
6	Every man has a right to what defense he can get and what
7	money he has to engage counsel and help on the outside.
8	That was my business. I took the position and conducted
9	myself as honestly as 1 could toward my client. 1 conducted
10	it dishonestly towards the people of the State of California.
11	Now, do you understand my position?
12	Q How do you explain the coincidence of thse men being your
13	friends for whom you thank God A Yes, sir.
14	Q and your going to the office of the Merchants &
15	Manufacturers Association, which association you have indi-
16	cated you knew the character of it? How does it come that
17	your friends, those to whom you went as to the horns of the
18	altar, happened to be the strike committee of the Merchants
19	& Manufacturers Association?
20	MR. FREDERICKS. That is objected to as assuming a fact not
21	in evidence, that this was the strike committee of the
22	Merchants & Manufacturers Association.
23	THE COURT. Objection sustained.
24	MR. FREDERICKS. Now, I presume counsel is perfectly within "that they
25	his right in the remarks they are making, "that they
26	can prove that here", inthe hearing of the jury.

8

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	1045
1	MR . ROGERS. I beg the Court's pardon. Mr. Appel asked
2	me if we could prove a certainthing and I said certainly
3	we can prove that. It was not intended for the ears of
4	any one except us four gentlemen here. If it was too loud
5	I regret it very much. I didn't intend it. I certainly
6	didn't stand up here and say it to him or to the defendant.
7	THE COURT Gentlemen, proceed.
8	MR. ROGERS. Q How do you account for the fact that these
- 9	intimate of riends of yours were interested in the prosecu-
10	tion of Mr. Parrow? A I don't intend to try to account
11.	for it. I am not trying to account for anything except my
12	own acts and answer the questions as they are asked me,
13	to the best of my ability .
14	Q Are you endeavoring to say to us that that body of men
15	were your friends, personal friends, intimate friends
16	A L didn't say intimate friends.
17	Q to whom you went for personal advice and association
18	at the time?
19	MR. FORD. If the Court please, 1 think the question and its
20	intimation indicates right on the face the argumentative
21	character of that question. We object upon the ground
22	that it is argumentative, not cross-examination, and on the
23	further ground that the matter has been fully gone into,
24	and would only be calling for a conclusion of the witness
25	at this time, and that the witness is not required to account
26	for anything. It is a matter for counse to argue to the

	1046
1	jury at the proper time.
2	MR. ROGERS. Will your Honor hear me?
3	THE COURT · If youwish to be heard.
4	MR . ROGERS . 1f your Honor please, as it appears, not by
5	questionand answer exactly, but by the association of
6	questions and answers all through this testimony, according
7	to our view of it, the Merchants & Manufacturers Association,
8	according to the knowledge of the witness, was an associa-
9	tion which has for its primal object the handling of the
10	employers's end of union labor strikes and difficulties
11	ig this city. We intend to introduce evidence concerning
12	that. Now, we have the witnessthe chief witness for the
13	prosecution before he appears upon the stand and before he
14	enters his plea of guilty, himself, going up to the office
15	of the Merchants & Manufacturers Association and there meet-
16	ing a portion of their directors, their strike committee,
17	and his explanation of that, his endeavor to convey the
18	idea1 doubt if he is succeeding, but he is endeavoring
19	to convey the idea that he thanks God that these men were
20	friends of his, personal friends, and I am asking if he can
21	explain the remarkable coincident, as we claim it to be,
22	of his friends being also the strike committee of the Mer-
23	chants & Manufacturers Association. It is a unique thing,
24	that the Association, which, according to our contention,
25	and what we will show, has participated in the prossecution
26	of the McNamara cases, and has participated in the prosecu-

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Sec.

tion of this case, who, perchance, have this witness up 1 $\mathbf{2}$ there before them in that assemblage with which, we contend, 3 that he must have been impressed by its body of distin-4 guished gentlemen standing around there listening to him, 5 and doubtless assuring him of some future things that would doubtless happen in the future. At any rate, we have a 6 right to probe into his mind, we think, under those remark-7 able circumstances. We have a right to know whether or not 8 they were his friends personally, or whether they were his 9 friends because, perchance, he might come on this stand and 10 testify in this case against Mr. Parrow, who has been the 11 champion of their opponents for a good many years, and we 12 want to know more than that, and this is the relevancy of 13 it, what effect that had upon his mind and would have upon 14 his mind. Here is a man who was taken up there or who goes 15 up there to attend a meeting of the Merchants & Manufactur-16 ers Association, a body of exceedingly impressive men, a 17 body of men, the reading of whose names impresses one as 18 we listen to it. Some of the finest and most distinguished 19 men in the city, yet men who are engaged against Mr. Darrow 20 in this controversy. No question about it. 21 MR.FORD. It isn't in evidence yet. 22 MR. ROGERS. But it is partly in evidence and will be fur-23 ther in evidence, and I have a right to know all the cir-24cumstances of this most unique and remarkable meeting before 25this witness entered his plea of guilty, and went upon this 26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

stand to testify against Mr. Darrow. I can give your 1 Honor a very close illustration of it, if you will permit 2 me: When Mr. Gallagher was on the stand in San Francisco, 3 I was permitted against objections even more strenuous 4 than these here, to show that Mr. Gallagher met Mr. Spreckles, $\mathbf{5}$ the chief friend of the prosecution, although a private 6 cttizen, out in the Presidio at night, and there had con-7 versation with him, and I was permitted to show all the 8 circumstances of how they went there and what for, and its 9 impression on the mind of Gallagher . 10 MR. FORD. We are not arguengthat question at all. The 11 Court has ruled you can do that . 12 MR. ROGERS. 1 can see no reason why we should not be per-13 mitted to ask this question right alorg this line, it is 14 part of it. 1 have a right to probe into this witness 15 to ascertain why he thought there, if he is trying to 16 convey the idea to the jury, that he had an honorable and 17 personal acquaintance and had taspersonal solicitude (for 18 these men who by some strange coincidence are the prose-19 cutors, to a certain extent, of Mr. parrow. Now, far from 20 me to say anything against the Merchants & Manufacturers 21 Association or those men. I have the very highest regard 22 and respect, and for their position. I have nothing to 23 say because it is one which they have a right to take, but 24 the mere taking of this witness up there before that dis-25tinguished body of men, opposed as they are to Mr. Darrow 26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1	upon principle and upon every association in lifethe
2	mere taking of this witness up there and letting him see
3	those men and talk with them and receiving the assurances
4	of their friendship, is enough almost to put this man on
5	the stand.
6	MR. FREDERICKS. Now, may it please the Court, it seems
7	to me
8	THE COURT. Captain, let's have the question and objection
9	r ead.
10	(Last question and objection read by the reporter.)
11	MR. FREDERICKS 1 think the matter is before the Court.
12	It is largely how do you reconcile. Now, we maintain
13	that thisthere is being dragged in here by the heels, you
14	may say, the idea that because counsel has in some slight
15	degree shown that the Merchants & Manufacturers Associa-
16	tion were interested in the prosecution of the McNamara
17	case, that is, 1 will admit there has been some slight
18	indication that way by reason of the testimony of this
19	witness that he was advised to avoid members of the Merchants
20	& Manufacturers Association as jurors and perhaps in one
21	or two other little ways, but in a very minor way but the
22	been idea has/apparently, to my mind, is being an attempt to
23	hitch onto that feeling that the Merchants & Manufacturers
24	Association were interested in the McNamara case, to hitch
25	onto that feeling the idea that the Merchants & Manufacturers
26	Association are interested in this case. Now, 1 might

	1050
1	cite, for instance, counsel's own case. Hewas the attorney
2	for the Merchants & Manufacturers Association in the McNamara
3	case, and he is here properly and rightfully defending Mr.
4	Darrow.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

1 There is absolutely and can be nothing incongruous or inm 2 consistent with the two positions. and this man may have 3 known that the Merchants & Manufacturers Association was 4 interested in the McNamara case, but there isn't one scin-5 tilla of evidence to show that that would disqualify a man 6 from taking -- or that would make a man interested in this $\mathbf{7}$ case. Certainly counsel cannot argue that. Now, we main-8 tain there is no connection between the two cases shown yet. 9 and there cannot be, at least -- I will withdraw that state-10 ment. "there can't be", because anything that has not been 11 done yet can be done in this world; but there is no connect-12 ion between the two. There is nothing in evidence here that 13 shows that the Merchants & Manufacturers Association and the 14 strike breaking committee is interested in the prosecution 15 of this case, or is interested in anything else other than 16 as citizens of this community they might be interested in 17 what they thought was a correct prosecution, or what they 18 theught was not a correct prosecution. They might be inter-19 ested in one side or the other of that, but that has not 20been shown yet. THE COURT: Counsel has declared his intention of making a 21 22further showing. NR FREDERICKS: Yes I know. it has been dragged in by the 23 If we keep on with that we will perhaps all have the 24 heels. impression it has been shown, when it has not been shown. 25 Therefore, counsel is not called upon to reconcile the 26 answer that he has made, when he certainly assumed the

1051

1 hypothesis, which doesn't exist, and calls for the conclu- $\mathbf{2}$ sion of the witness. He is not called upon to reconcile that. 3 THE COURT: Let me have that question once more. 4 (Last question read by the reporter.) 5 Now, if the Court please, there has been no MR FORD: 6 foundation laid for the question at all. This question has 7 one of two purposes and can only be asked for one of two 8 This whole line of questionings are to show the purposes. 9 motives of the witness, to show that these men have gotten 10 this man to testify falsely. That men like Stoddard Jess 11 and Fred L Baker and so forth, have procured this witness 12 to commit perjury and say what occurred in that room. Π Now AW_LIBRARY 13 they can ask him what occurred there, if they want to get at 14 his motives. They can ask him what occurred.withMr Crook. 15 They haven't done so. They have gone along and hit the 16 high spots, and if they seek to impeach the witness let 17 them put the impeaching question to him and lay the founda-18 tion: they have a right to go into that, but there is an 19orderly way to go into it. 20THE COURT: Objection overruled. I will have to ask you to read that question again. 21 Α (Last question read by the reporter) A No. 2223 MR ROGERS: When you went up there, did you go seeking aid 24 and comfort? A No. Q When you went up there you knew that those men were, to 25say the very least, extremely friendly with the prosecution 26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1	in this case? A Mr Rogers 1053	
2	MR FORD: Just a moment. We object to that question as ir-	
3	relevant, immaterial and no foundation laid for its intro-	
4	duction Let them first show that there was something oc-	
5	curred between this witness and those people, and then go	
6	into their relations with the prosecution if they so wish.	
7	If they show there was something between them that occurred	
8	that should not have occurred, then let them go into their	
9	relations; or, even if they have gone into that matter, and	
10	unsuccessfully, and desire to show it all, they are entitled	
11	to go into it; but they are hitting the high spots, and we	
12	object to it upon the ground that no foundation has been	
13	laid and that the question is not cross-examination, incompe-	
14	tent, irrelevant and immaterial.	
15	THE COURT: Objection overruled.	
16	A Read the question.	
17	(Last question read by the reporter)	
18	A I didn't know what men I was going to meet, Mr Rogers,	
19	so I couldn't have known of that:	
20	MR ROGERS: You knew in a general way the kind of men that	
21	you would meet in the Merchants & Manufacturers Association's	
22	offices, didn't you? A Oh yes.	
23	MR FORD: Objected to as calling for a conclusion of the	
24	witness.	
25	MR ROGERS: It is the state of mind.	
26	THE COURT: Objection sustained.	

	1054
1	MR ROGERS: Exception. Didn't you know when you went
2	up there, whether you knew the precise individuals or not,
$\frac{1}{3}$	that they were to meet in the Merchants & Manufacturers
4	Association's offices.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
1 4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
20	

	1055
138 ₁	MR. FORD. Objected to upon the ground it has already been
2	answered.
3	THE COURT. Objection sustained.
4	MR . ROGERS. Q Now, if you didn't know whom youwere going
5	up there to meet, how do you contend that you went up there
6	to meet friends of yours?
7	MR. FORD. Just a moment we object upon the ground that
8	the question is irrelevant and immaterial and the witness is
9	not contending for anything. He is simply answering ques-
10	tions put to him. Objected to upon the ground that it is
11	not cross-examination.
12	THE COURT It is argumentative.
13	MR. FORD. And it also assumes a fact not in evidence, that
14	the men whom he methe testified were personal friends
15	of his. He didn't say he was going to meet personal
16	friends. He said he was going over there to meet some men,
. 17	Mr. Crook advised him to meet.
18	THE COURT * Objection sustained.
19	MR . ROGERS . Q You say you didn't know whom you were going
20	to meet?
21	MR. FORD. Objected to upon the ground the question has
22	already been answered.
23	MR. ROGERS. Just a moment-I would like to finish my ques-
24	tion, with all due respect.
25	THE COURT. Finish your question.
26	MR. ROGERS. Q You say youdidn't know whom you were going
1	

No.02

	1056	and a second sec
1	to meet. You mean by that youdidn't know the individuals	
2	you were going to meet or do you mean you didn't know what	
3	kind of men you were going to meet?	
4	MR . FORD . Objected to upon the ground the matter has	
5	been fully gone into and fully answered.	
6	THE COURT. Overruled.	
7	A Well, 1 certainly didn't knowwho I was going to meet and	Contraction and the second
8	if I didn't know who I was going to meet I certainly couldn't	
9	know the character of men 1 was going to meet.	
10	BY MR . ROGERS. Q But you knew the character of place to	
11	which you were going, didn't you? A Yes, sir. I am willing	
12	to testify	1=D
13		W
14	gone into.	
15		HP
16	MR • FORD Objected to upon the ground it has been fully	AN
.17	answere d and gone into.	
18	THE COURT. Objection sustained on that ground.	
19	MR. ROGERS. On the ground that it has been fully answered,	
20	your Honor?	
21	THE COURT. Yes, sir.	1
22	BY MR. ROGERS. Q How long before you went up there was it	
23	that you and Mr. Crook had thistalk about your going up?	
24	A Why, I think about two days, I am not sure as to the exact	
25	time.	and Brade Internet
26	Q Who suggested it first, you or Crook? A Mr. Crook.	WITH THE WAY AND
		1

1 Q You know Mr. Crook's connection with the Merchants & 2 Manufacturers Association? A No, sir, 1 don't think I do; 3 1 am not sure whether he is a member or not. Q You know he is a contractor and builder? A Yes, sir. 4 Q You know he is an employer of nonunion men and an opponent 5 6 of unions, don't you? MR. FORD. The question as to what Mr. Crook is or is not 7 would be, as far as this witness is concerned, purely hearsay 8 and 1 cannot see the relevancy of it. Counsel is making 9 statement after statement as evidence, in other words a 10 statement he makes it in the form of questions and 1 cer-11 tainly think, until the relation of Mr. Crook to this case 12 appears that there ought to be some way of preventing in-13 I HERELEV quiring into whether he is a married man or whether he has 14 any children and what his affiliations are, and Church, 15 etc., and non union labor, and any other subject, until some 16 connection is shown. 17 THE COURT. This is not an inquiry. The question is what 18 does this witness know about it. 19 MR. FORD. The question is, "Don't you know he was an employer 20 of nonunion labor?" Now, what difference does it make 21 until we can show his relation to the case; let it be 22shown there that he has some relation to the case and let 23them show what occurred before that fact can become at 24least relevant, certainly there has not been a scintilla 25of evidence to show that union labor is in any way connected 26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	1058
1	with this case and with this charge. I am sure I have
2	just as much sympathy, and possibly more practical sympathy
3	with union labor than some that are claiming it now.
4	MR. APPEL. Your Honor, the question is simple, we are try-
5	ing to show the conduct, your Honor.
6	THE COURT. Objection overruled.
7	A Read the question .
8	(Question read.)
9	A No, sir, 1 do not.
10	Q in this meeting with the Merchants & Manufacturers, in
11	the Merchants & Manufacturers Association office, with these
12	gentlemen whose names you have given us as being present
13	in their office, including Mr. Zeehandelaar, the secretary of
14	the Merchants & Manufactusers Association, all these meetings
15	occurred before you plead guilty and got this alleged fine
16	and promised to testify inthis case?
17	MR. FREDERICKS That is objected to, because the question
18	is dual in its character, "before you plead guilty would
19	be one time, possibly, and "before you promised to testify"
20	ano ther.
21	MR.ROGERS. All right.
22	THE COURT. Question is withdrawn.
23	
24	
25	
26	

ì

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

-

By Mr Rogers : Before you plead guilty in the next etel. 0 2 department, and got that so-called fine? A The conversa-3 tion. the meeting with the people at the M & M Association 4 occurred between the time that I had made and signed a $\mathbf{5}$ sworn statement to the District Attorney of the facts in this case and the time I plead guilty. It was after I made 6 7 the statement to the District Attorney. and I want that dis-8 tinctly understood. \mathfrak{Q} When did you make that statement to the District Attorney. 9 I think it was the 25th day of January; I can tell if 10 A you will allow me to refresh my recollection. 11 MR ROGERS: Gentlemen, will you be kind enough to furnish 12D W me that statement in order that I may compare the testimony 13 of the witness in cross-examining him about it. MR FREDERICKS:We assign counsel's request as being misconduct. 14 15 P II V Counsel knows he has no right to make such a request: he 16 knows those notes are our private notes, and he has no right 17 to make a request for them, and we will not give them to him; 18 and we assign his request as misconduct. 19 MR ROGERS: I ask for an order of the Court upon counsel's 20refusal, to require them to furnish the statement of this 21 witness as having been made and referred to in his testimony. 22at a particular date. 23THE COURT: The application is denied. 24MR ROGERS: Exception. 25By Mr Rogers: Now, when was this meeting at the M & M Q -26

1059

	1060
1	Association rooms, having fixed those two dates?
2	A I cannot tell you the exact date. It was sometime sub-
3	sequent to the time I had made this statement.
4	Q Does your memorandum book show? A Yes sir, it does.
5	Q Where is it? A In my pocket.
6	Q Let's see it. A I will let you see that page. It is
7	a loose leaf
8	MR FREDERICKS: We object to the question and direction
9	it is hardly a question, but we assume that counsel is asking
10	the witness to produce it; but if he does, he can only produce
11	it for his own enlightenment and not for counsel's.
12	MR APPEL: We ask the Court to make an order requiring the
13	witness to produce that memorandum referred to by the wit-
1 4	ness at this time, and referred to by the witness heretofore
15	in his direct examination.
16	MR FORD: If the Court please, the witness is entitled to
17	use his memorandum book if he desires to refresh his recol-
18	lection at any time; and if he does use it, then counsel is
19	
20	it from him and introduce it, we will be the ones that will
21	have the right to examine it, not they. The witness has
22	not used his memorandum book in order to refresh his recol-
23	lection from it, and counsel are not entitled to look at it
24	unless the witness himself is willing to confer that privi-
25	lege upon him. Now, the witness has said he is willing to
26	give them the memorandum of that date; it is a loose leaf

.

1 memorandum -- if they want it, and we have no power and the 2 Court has no power to compel him to give up his private 3 record for inspection of counsel unless the witness desires 4 to do so, unless the witness himself should produce the 5 book.

6 MR APPEL: We are simply making a request upon a proposition 7 that the law says, and which everybody ought to know, that 8 the defendant is entitled to the process of this Court, is 9 entitled to the process of this Court for the purpose of 10 making his defense. We have followed a line of simply 11 asking the Court, in our humble judgment, for our rights. 12 He is not our witness: he is a witness against us, and he says that he has in his possession certain information from 13 which he can state as to dates here. We ask him to produce 14 that memorandum. We have a right to ask it. We can only 15 ask the Court to enforce that right, and we simply are asking 16 the Court now to enforce our rights as against the witness', 17 to produce that memorandum. That is all we are asking for, 18 and we think we are right, and that is the reason we ask for 19 it. 20

MR FORD: Section 2047 of the Code of Civil Procedure contains the law on the subject: "A witness is allowed to refresh his memory respecting a fact by anything written by himself, or under his direction at the time when the fact occurred, or immediately thereafter, or at any other time when the fact was fresh in his memory and he knew the same

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	1062
1	was correctly stated in the writing; but in such a case
2	the writing must be produced and must be seen by the adverse
3	party who may, if he choose, cross-examine the witness on it
4	and may read it to the jury."
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	1	
		1063
þ	1	Now, if the Court please, the expression of one thing
	2	in the law is the exclusion of another. In this case the
	3	law expresses the circumstances under which the witness may
	4	be allowed to use that memorandum. The witness has testified
	5	here from his recollection, and unless he is unable to
	6	testify from recollection then he is allowed to use the
	7	book, but he has testified here from recollection and has
	8	not asked to see the book. They are the ones that are
	9	asking to see the book and the law does not confer any
1	.0	privilege upon them to go into this man's private books.
1	.1	MR . APPEL. The witness says he cannot state the date exactly,
1	.2	except by reference to that memorandum.
1	.3	THE COURT * Is that your statement, Mr. Franklin?
1	.4	MR · APPEL. That is what he said, that is what the record
1	5	states.
1	6	A 1 will state, to the best of my recollection that meeting
. 1	7	THE COURT. Let us see what the record says about that date.
1	8	(Record read by the reporter as follows: "Q"Then did
1	9	you make that statement to the district attorney? A 1
2	0	think it was the 25th day of January. I can tell if you
2	1	will allow me to refresh my recollection.")
2	$2 \mid$	MR .nAPPEL. That is not correct, your Honor. He said, "That
2	3	1 can refresh my recollection from a memorandum." He
2^{4}	4	desired to use the memorandum.
2	5	MR. FORD. To save time, 1 will stipulate the whole memo-
2	6	randum may be put into evidence.

p

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	CBI Aspeles Consty Law Libres 1064
1	MR. APPEL. That is the same stipulation, and we except to
2	it
3	MR . Ford. Then I will withdraw the stipulation.
4	MR. APPEL. We will take another exception and we assign
5	that as error and trying to prevent us here and putting us
6	on examination as to our ideas of conducting the case, com-
7	pelling us in a certain manner to respond to that and
8	keep silent as to each matter that is necessarily before
9	the jury. We do not like that, your Honor.
10	THE COURT . The question is a little vague in this, that
11	it does not indicate to the Court for what purpose the
12	memorandum is to be produced.
13	MR. ROGERS. The reporter didn't read
14	MR. APPEL. The reporter didn't get it right.
15	MR. ROGERS. The reporter didn't read the situation as it
16	was.
17	THE COURT. The reporter has read it as 1 recalled it,
18	but you might reframe the question .
19	MR. ROGERS. 1 will do so.
20	Q_{IS} there any way you can tell us exactly and precisely
21	what day youfirst went up to the Merchants & Manufacturers
22	Association to meet these gentlemen at their offices?
23	A No, 1 do not think so. It was a time subsequent,
24	though, to the 25th day of January.
25	Q wave yousomething in your possession by which you can
26	make it absolute? A The time?

	1065
1	Q ves, sir. A No, sir, not exactly.
2	Q Haven't yougot a memorandum book in which it is set down,
3	the day you went up there which you made approximately at
4	the time as you have heretofore testified ?
5	MR . FORD. If the Court please, the witness has not here-
6	tofore testified.
7	MR. APPEL. There is no objection. He is arguing
8	MR. FORD I object to the question on the ground it
9	assumes the witness has testified to a state of facts which
10	he did not testify to. Counsel has asked him if he didn [*] t
11	heretofore testify he had a memorandum as to the date he
12	went up there to meet these gentlemen. The witness didn't
13	testify to that. He testified he had a memorandum by
14	which he thought he could fix the date when he made a state-
15	ment to Mr. Ford, which is an entirely different matter. The
16	record shows it and I object to counsel making statements
17	which are not in accordance to the fact.
18	MR . ROGERS. The record shows.
19	MR. FORD. Read it and settle it right now. There are
20	too many of those misstatements like that.
21	THE COURT. Objection overruled.
22	MR. ROGERS. If your Honor please, counsel states, "There
23	have been too many misstatements like that." If your
24	Honor pleases that is not fair; tand 1 have made no mis-
25	statements and if your Honor will permit me, in order that
26	that may not go before the jury as a fact, I desire to say
-	what the record is and to produce the record.

	1066
etel	MR FORD: We join in the request.
2	MR ROGERS: He says on the 14th of January he commenced to
3	keep an account of where he went and all whom he met, that
4	he dictated it to his wife at night and he tried to produce
5	it here on one or two occasions and he was kept from doing
6	so, and I asked him right in this examination if he had a
7	memorandum in that book showing that he was up to the Mer-
8	chants & Manufactuers Association office and he said he did.
9	A I said I didn't say any such thing.
10	MR FORD: I would like to have the record produced on that
11	matter right now.
12	THE COURT: Produce the record if you want it.
13	MR ROGERS: Very well, sir, as soon as it is written up I
14	will return to it.
15	THE COURT: Objection overruled. But, counsel desires you
16	to produce the record, and in view of the statement he has
17	that right.
18	MR ROGERS: Read the question, please.
19	(Question read)
20	THE COURT: Gentlemen of the jury, bear in mind the admoni-
21	tion of the Court heretofore given you. We will take a re-
22	cess for ten minutes.
23	(Here a recess was taken for ten minutes. After recess
24	jury returned into court-room.)
25	THE COURT: The jurors are all present. You may read the
26	last question, Mr Reporter.

	1067
1	MR ROGERS: I will withdraw the last question.
2	THE COURT: All right.
3	Q By Mr Rogers: Did you put down in your record a memo-
4	randum of the meeting between yourself and Mr Zeehandelaar
5	and others at the Merchants & Manufacturers Association?
6	MR FORD: We object to that on the ground the memorandum
7	itself is the best evidence.
8	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
9	A I am not positive as to that, Mr Rogers.
10	MR ROGERS: Mr Petermichel, will you be kind enough to turn
11	to that record which was called to your attention during the
12	recess concerning a matter, and I ask that it be read.
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	MR FREDERICKS: In order to save repeating, we would like
15	to have it read on the page before it.
16	MR ROGERS: Never mind that. I will have him read for me,
17	and if counsel desires further reading it may be done.
18	THE COURT: All right.
19	(Record read by the reporter as follows: "Q Now, when
20	was this meeting at the M & M Association rooms, having
21	fixed those two dates? A I cannot tell you the exact date. I t was sometime subsequent to the time I had made
22	this statement. Q Does your memorandum book show?
23	A Yes sir, it does. Q Where is it? A In my pocket
24	A let us see it. A I will let you see that page. It is
25	
26	a loose leaf")

	• 1068
1	MR FORD: I listened very carefully at the time that in-
2	formation was given, for the reason, I might state frankly
3	to the Court, I have read the memorandum book and I listened
4	carefully to the testimony of the witness, and my recollect-
5	ion is that the statement as to what was in his memorandum
6	book was with reference to the time when he made the state-
7	ment to me.
8	MR APPEL: We take an exception, your Honor, to counsel in
9	this Court telling the jury what the facts are so far as he
10	is concerned, and we assign this as error again.
11	MR FREDERICKS: I think that the record of the reporter is
12	susceptible to that interpretation, even now the way it
13	stands.
14	THE COURT: The record was read to the jury, and let them
15	interpret it.
16	MR APPEL: But my friend didn't say as to what his recollect
17	ion is, what he read in that memorandum.
18	MR FORD: I think it is incorrect, and I am going to state
19	it to the Court. I think the reporter left out a portion
20	of it there, it sometimes happens, it frequently does happen.
21	THE COURT: It appears that this matter is not of sufficient
22	importance to justify any further time.
23	MR ROGERS: Now, sir, will you be kind enough to explain
24	your answer that the reporter read. Please read it again,
25	Mr Reporter. A I understand what the answer was.
26	A 1 understand what the answer was.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

•	
1	Q You understand what the answer was? A Yes sir.
2	MR FREDERICKS: That is objected to on the ground it assumes
3	that the answer calls for any explanation.
4	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
5	MR FORD: The witness is not required to explain the Reporter's-
6	A I did not understand your question to allude to the
7	meeting in the M & M ASSociation. I thought you meant the
8	time I made the statement to the district attorney, and I
9	think my answer was to that effect.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

	1070
ete 1	Q Please read the record again, Mr Reporter.
2	A The record does not so show the way it read.
3	MR FORD: We object to the reading of the record. For the
4	benefit of the witness I would like the question preceding
5	that read by the reporter.
6	THE COURT: Is it necessary to have it re-read, Mr Rogers?
7	MR ROGERS: Yes sir.
8	THE COURT: You are entitled to it.
9	MR ROGERS: Yes sir.
10	THE COURT: Go ahead.
11	MR FORD: I think the witness is entitled to have read the
12	preceding portion of it.
13	THE COURT: Read the portion called for. If it becomes
14	necessary I will order more read.
15	MR FREDERICKS: Now, may be please the Court, I maintain
16	that that does not show any contradiction.
17	MR ROGEDS: That is a matter of argument, sir, to the jury.
18	A If your Honor please, before we go any further, I don't
19	wish to be understood as testifying that my book shows any
20	entry of any meeting at the M & M Association. I did not so
21	intend my testimony, didn't wish you to understand that
22	from my testimony. I intend my testimony to say that my
23	memorandum book does show the meeting at the time I made
24	the statement and this meeting at the M & M Association was
25	subsequent to that time.
26	MR ROGERS: Now, will you let me see the memorandum by which

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1	you can tell what day you were at the Merchants & Manufactur
2	ers Association? A I will if you want it, yes sir. That
. 3	part of my memorandum.
4	MR ROGERS: Yes. A Yes sir. (Produces memorandum).
5	Q You have handed me a memorandum dated January 25, 1912.
6	MR FREDERICKS: We object to counsel reading it in evidence.
7	MR ROGERS: I desire to inquire if this memorandum is one
8	which will refresh his recollection concerning the date of
• 9	the meeting in the Merchants & Manufacturers Association
10	rooms.
11	MR FREDERICKS: No objection.
12	A Yes sir. I cannot tell you the exact date, but it was
13	a few days subsequent to that time, to the best of my recol-
14	lection.
15	MR ROGERS: Now, this memorandum I offer in evidence, if
16	your Honor please.
17	THE COURT: Counsel are entitled to see it.
18	MR ROGERS: Yes sir. I understood from Mr Ford he had seen
19	it, from his remark, so I didn't show itt to him.
20	MR FREDERICKS: Your Honor, we think it is immaterial and not
21	no foundation laid; therefore, it is/madmissible. We don't
22	make any particular point on it, following the rules of
23	evidence.
24	MR ROGERS: Show it to the Court.
25	THE COURT: Let me see it. (Witness hands memorandum to
26	Court) Objection overruled.

1071

	1072
1	MR ROGERS: Let me have it. (Reading): "January 25, 1912.
2	During day built chicken yard. Received telephone message
3	from Mr Ford at 4 p m. After supper went to Lawler's of-
4	fice. Mr Ford and Mr Lawler were both there. Stayed until
5	11:30 p m ¹¹ . With your permission
6	I will omit: the last part. Do you desire me to do so? It
7	doesn't refer to any matter I am concerned about.
8	A Yes sir, I do wish you to.
9	Q By Mr Rogers: Now, who was the Mr Lawler referred to
10	here? A Oscar Lawler, Ex-United States Attorney.
11	Q Special prosecutor in the so-called dynamite conspiracy
12	cases, is that right? A I don't know.
13	Q You don't know? A I haven't any knowledge, no sir.
14	I have understood.
15	Q You so understood?
16	MR FORD: We ask that the last part of the answer be stricken
17	out. They are seeking continually to put hearsay testimony
18	in this record, and it isn't that it is a matter in itself
19	so important, but it is setting a precedent that we certainly
20	object to. I move to strike out the last part of that answer
21	as being a conclusion of the witness and not responsive to
22	the question.
23	THE COURT: Motion denied.
24	
25	
26	

	1073
s 1	MR. ROGERS. Now, is this the date that you made the state-
2	ment that you say you made to Mr. Ford? A It is the date
3	1 say 1 made the statement and it is the day that 1 did
4	make the statement.
5	Q Did you make that statement in the presence of Mr.
6	Oscar Lawler? A Part of it.
7	Q Did you make that statement inthe office of Mr.Oscar
8	Lawler? A 1 did, yes, sir.
9	Q Mr. Oscar Lawler was present, who else besides yourself
10	an Mr. Ford? A Mr. Petermichel, shorthand reporter, as
11	1 remember, 1 am quite sure it was him.
12	Q Any one else? A I don,t think so; no, 1 am sure
13	there was not.
14	Q Who asked you the questions, Mr. Lawler or Mr. Ford, at
15	the making of that statement? A Mr. Ford.
16	Q Do you know why it was that the statement was made in
17	Mr. Oscar Lawler's office, the attorney for the United
18	States authorities in prosecuting the so-called dynamite
19	cases? A 1 haven't the least idea in the world.
20	Q Do you know why they didn't go to Mr. Ford's office?
21	A 1 haven't the least idea inthe world.
22	Q Who telephoned you to come to Mr. Lawler soloffice instead
23	of to the State's Attorney's office? A Nobody.
24	Q How did you come to go to Mr. Lawler's office instead of
25	Mr. Ford's office?
26	MR.ford. We object to that as calling for a conclusion

	1074
1	of the witness. I can explain that.
2	MR . APPEL . But we want the witness to state.
3	MR . FORD. The witness's conclusion.
4	MR. APPEL. Your Honor, we object to his making a state-
5	ment or giving any intimation or suggestion to this witness
6	MR. FORD. 1 am not going to make any suggestions.
7	THE COURT · 1 can't read the mind of Mr. Ford.
8	MR. APPEL. 1 can read his mind by the way he starts. It
9	is not necessary to read his mind.
10	THE COURT. He is making an objection, Mr. Appel, and he is
11	entitled to be heard. Proceed.
12	MR. FORD. He said he don't know why that office was
13	selected. Now, any other questions, if he don't know,
14	would be merely a conclusion. He stated the reason he
15	went there was because Mr. Ford requested him. Now, let
16	them subpoena me, if they want to know why that office was
17	selected. That is the proper way. I am not saying they
18	should do it. I am not saying they are required to put
19	him on the stand but I am simply making the point as to
20	this witness under the circumstances it would be a pure
21	conclusion on his part as to why that office was selected,
22	and we object to it on the ground that it is a conclusion.
23	THE COURT. Read the last question, Mr. Reporter.
24	(Last question read by the reporter.)
25	THE COURT Objection overruled.
26	A 1 don't know anything about it. 1 went there with Mr. Ford

1075 BY MR . ROGERS. Q Did Mr. Lawler tell you at that time 1 that he was engaged in the prosecution of cases in the $\mathbf{2}$ United States court? A Mr. Lawler didn't address me in over 3 ten words all the time I was there. 4 Q Did you go to Mr. Lawler's office at the advice or 5 request of Mr. Ford? A I did, at the request of Mr. Ford. 6 Q Now, having made that memorandum of your being at Mr. 7 Lawler's office on the 24th does--the 25th--does your memo-8 randum book of a similar rature to this page which you 9 have given me, show your going to the Merchants & Manu-10 facturers Association's rooms and there meeting Mr. Zeehande-11 laar, Mr. Fred L. Baker, Mr. Reese Llewellyn, and the others 12 whose names you have mentioned in the Merchants & Manu-13 facturers Association's rooms? A I don't know, because I 14 haven't read my memorandum from the time it was made. 15 Q Be kind enough at the present moment to look it over 16 and see. A Certainly. I don,t think it does. 17 Q Will you explain, then, why you put down the fact that 18 you went to Lawler's office and did not put down the fact 19 that you went to the Merchants & Manufacturers Association 20offices? A lt was not necessary to have that to refresh 21 my memory; 1 remember it. 22Q Was it necessary to refresh your recollection as to being 23at Lawler's office? 24MR . Ford. Object upon the ground that the question is argu-25mentative and not cross-examination; irrelevant and imma-26

1 terial.

2 THE COURT. overruled.

A ves. sir; 1 considered that a very important point in my life. I put that down, and I didn't consider the visit to the Merchants & Manufacturers Association important to this case or to any other one. MR. ROGERS. The important things you could remember, is it not true? and the unimportant you could not, so why didn't you put down the unimportant instead of the important thing?

1 MR FORD: Objected to on the ground it is argumentative.
2 It calls for a conclusion of the witness; no foundation laid
3 as to whether the witness has any special skill in psychology
4 which would enable him to --

5 THE COURT: I think it is calling for a conclusion of the 6 witness. Objection sustained on that ground.

7 MR ROGERS: Mr Franklin, then that memorandum book of yours 8 does not purport or pretend to contain where you went or who 9 you saw, only that which you chose to put down; is that not 10 true?

11 MR FORD: It is a self-evident proposition. Objected to 12 upon the ground it is not material. The memorandum book is 13 not in evidence. It is a personal matter and not cross-14 examination.

15 THE COURT: Objection overruled.

16 A I put in that memorandum book just such things as I
17 thought might be necessary as a protection to myself at
18 some future time, from the time it was made, and to refresh
19 my memory on dates that I considered important.

20 MR AFPEL: Now, if your Honor please, in view of what we 21 consider the different statements of the witness with refer-22 ence to this memorandum in relation to the subject of this 23 inquiry, we ask now for an order of the Court requiring the 24 witness to produce the memorandum for the inspection of the 25 attorneys for the defendant. We contend, your Honor, that 26 at one time the witness said there was something there by

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 which he could tell the exact date, and at another time he 2 said it was not there. In view of that statement we ask 3 now for an order of the Gourt requiring him to produce the 4 memorandum and allow the defendant's attorneys to inspect 5 the same, to enable them to further cross-examine him upon 6 that question.

7 MR FORD: Now, if the Court please, we object to that. It is purely a private matter, just as much as our records 8 9 are private matters. There is ample opportunity, and there are a number of men out of which number they can surely 10 11 find at least one reputable witness among the number of Stoddard Jess, Reese Llewellyn or Fred L Baker, to find 12 the date that he was down there: the date he was down there 13 is the only important thing apparently, and there are 14 plenty of reputable witnesses from whom they can secure 15 that information. They have no right to inspect the 16 private memorandum of the witness where the witness does 17 not use it to refresh his recollection; and then it is 18 only the adverse party that is entitled to it. where the 19 witness is relying on memorandum. They are seeking to 20 put it in and they would not let us put it in when we 21 wanted to. 22

1R APPEL: We again on the part of the defendant protest
against the conduct of Mr Ford in persistently making statements of facts to the jury which are prejudicial to the
rights of this defendant. We assign this conduct as error.

	1079
1	We assign his continual custom in that respect, of which
2	this is only one incident, as unprofessional and as pre-
3	judicial to the rights of this defendant, and because he
4	being one of the prosecutors here he is taking advantage
5	of the situation in order to make those statements, which
6	is undue advantage of our rights. Now, with respect to
7	the question here, counsel says that the adverse party has
8	a right to inspect the record, your Honor. What does
9	"adverse party" mean? It means the party against whom the
10	witness is produced. Can your Honor put a, any other
11	construction upon that, it means the cross-examiner. It
12	means the person who has to meet what the witness testified
13	to.
14	THE COURT: I agree with you as to that phase of it, Mr
15	Appel.
16	MR APPEL: So we are entitled to see this this section authority
17	which he reads is our parky for that request. The adverse
18	party may look at that memorandum but not only that, your
19	Honor, he stated he stated here
20	THE COURT: That is the point I want to get at.
21	MR APPEL: that the witness made this memorandum on the
22	14th day of January, this year, and that he put down the
23	proceedings from time to time. Begins on page 771-2 and
24	including 722:
25	
90	

	1080
0s 1	(Reading) "QIs that because on the 14th day of January
2	you started making a memorandum? ANo, sir, it is not.
3	QWhen did you start making a memorandum? AThe 14th
4	day of January. QYou have been reading that memorandum
5	from time to time since? ANo, sir, I have not; It is
6	not necessary. QDidn't you say the other day on the
7	stand you had read it? AI said I had read it after Mrs.
8	Franklin had written it to see if it was correct. I read
9	each entry after it was made. Q1 say, you read it
10	from time to time? ANo, sir, I have not; I have read
11	each day's after it was written down, after it was written,
12	to see if it was correct. QThe journal of the day's pro-
13	ceedings; those proceedings might perchance be set down?
14	A π hey were set down there in as short manner as possible
15	so if 1 wished to refresh my memory, and as a protection
16	to myself, any certain transaction 1 wished to allude to.
17	It has not at this time been necessary for me to do so."
18	And so on, your Honor, showing that this memorandum if it
19	cantained the proceedings from day to day of those matters
20	which he thinks important, as he says in this particular
21	case, we are entitled to see it. Now, whatever is there
22	which is material we are entitled to it. If there is noth-
23	ing there that is material we are not entitled to it. Cer-
24	tainly, your Honor, that is a continuing memoranduma
25	continuing memorandum. Those continuing events are related
26	to each other. It is concerning the same subject. It is
	concerning the acts and doings of this witness. Now, we scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1081 1 don't have to ask the witness a particular question in a $\mathbf{2}$ particular way to get a particular fact. We have a right 3 to show his conduct. We have a right to show his acts. 4 We have a right to show that this witness, your Honor. 5once aligned on the part of the defendant, according to 6 his testimony, immediately upon the condition of things 7 being such that then he sought association, sought consul-8 tation, that he became a willing party in the office of 9 Tom, Dick and Harry who were interested in he prosecution 10 of Mr. Darrow or in the prosecution of the McNamara cases, 11 which is related to this. We have a right to do that. Wouldn't they have the right, your Honor, while 1 am associat 12 13 here, wouldn't they have the right, if I went upon the stand 14 against any of my colleagues here to show that I was travelin 15 around with Mr. Ford, that I was traveling around with Mr. 16 Fredericks and that I was traveling around with others; that I traveled with the United States officials indirectly 17 18 or directly interested. How would you prove the conduct 19 of a spy? Wouldn't you show he was upon one side of the 20controversy and afterwards he was seen going over there and 21 going over on the other side? Haven't the jury the right 22 to see this man traveled from time to time after certain 23events occurred, after he made his statement down there to 24Mr. Ford? MR. FORD. Bardon me, I object to --25MR . APPEL. Haven't we the right to ask of this jury this

26

	1082
1	conduct
2	2 THE COURT. Just a moment.
9	MR. FORD. 1 object to this statement of facts and I assign
4	this man's conduct as to these matters as misconduct.
5	If the Court please, the only question before the Court is
6	with regard to that memorandum and not an argument about
7	other matters. Let him confine his argument to the memo-
8	randum.
9	THE COURT . As soon as he gets away from the subject before
10	the Court I will admonish him.
11	MR. FORD. 1 am calling your Honor's attention to the sub-
12	ject, was the right to examine the memorandum.
13	MR. APPEL. I beg your Honor's pardon and 1 beg counsel's
14	pardon. 1 am going to be extremely, unduly and extraordinar-
15	ily polite and mild. Perhaps that will have a better
16	effect upon counsel on the other side than by being a
17	rough-neck, if you will allow me the expression, and I want
18	to be1 want to reform. Your Honor has been very kind
19	to me and admonished me in a very good way how to reform,
20	and I am going to take your Honor's suggestion.
21	Your Honor, 1 am simply illustrating what we want to
22	show. We are entitled to that information that he has
23	there inthat book; If there is any there that we can
24	view. It is the only means of knowing, your Honor,
25	what this man did and whom he saw and 1 am illustrating
26	why it is material for us to know what points we want to

1

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

I.

1 address. Of course, I want to show, your Honor, that a 2 man went into a house and took something from there and 3 carried it off in the dark, and then to ask him, "Did 4 you steal it?" He will say, "No, I didn't steal it". 5 He might not construe his act as "I stole it", but I 6 rather show his act in reference to the matter and if 7 there is anything there, in all justice, your Honor, the 8 Court ought to afford us the most liberal means in the 9 world to get at this gentleman's relation and position to 10 the prosecution. In other words, if there/one inducement 11 for him to testify we have a right to show there was another 12 inducement. We want to show to the Court what the induce-13 ments were. We have a right to show that there an accumulation of inducements. The Supreme Court of this state 14 said you may ask a witness not only whether or not he is 15 16 receiving pay to testify in a case, but you have a right to show how much, and the Court reversed the case for that 17 reason. So, in a question of inducement, if the question 18 19 of motives were like Mr. Franklin's testimony against Mr. Darrow we have a right to go into the inducements in showing 20how correct those motives are, how correct these inducements 21 are, and if we cannot get it from the witness we have a 22right to show it by his acts. If we cannot -- if the witness 23 will not say and if it be not true that any one in authority 24 induced or pgave him inducemtents to testify, we have a 2526right to show that he was inconsultation with him. We have

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 a right to show that person in authority beckoning him 2 said to him, "Go here, go there; youdo this; you do 3 that." We have a right to show he was under the influence 4 of that man by those acts, so that the jury may draw the $\mathbf{5}$ inference whether or not those little things- now, a man 6 might as well say, "My boy, I am not going to offer you any 7 thing to testify, but you understand." Now, the witness 8 could truthfully testify that no offer was made to him to 9 testify, but the suggestion, the mere suggestion, the mere 10 saying, "you understand." We would have the right to show that, and we have a right in conjunction with that to 11 show his acts in reference to that person. Now, here is a 12 witness who has made adverse statements in respect to this 13 matter, and if there is anything inthat memorandum con-14 cenning that meeting down there, why, it wont hurt him; 15wont hurt the prosecution, wont hurt us, but if there is 16 anything there that he is concealing from us, and to show 17 he is we are entitled to show it to this jury, that when he 18 said there was nothing in there with reference to that meet-19 ing that he didn't tell the truth, and if there is not 20anything in reference to that meeting, then he stands here 21 æquitted of any desire to mislead anybody, but as counsel 22has said here and as counsel has come to the aid of the 23witness, and has so nicely said, "I have read it and I know 24 what there is in there, and there is nothing in there to that 25effect -- " why, GentHemen, if it is so, here, you satisfy

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1084

	1085
1	yourselfhere it is. What is there to conceal about
2	this? And I say in view of the attitude of counsel on the
3	other side and inview of the attitude of the witness, in
4	view of the different statements here, we ask your Honor
5	to extend to us the most liberal means of ascertaining the
6	exact truth in respect to to that matter.
7	MR . FORD. If the Court please, I hope counsel's reform
8	will be permanent, but there is one point I want to call
9	your Honor's attention to
10	THE COURT ' I don, t think it has any application here. 1
11	see this question from the standpoint of the materiality of
12	this book as you do, and it is unnecessary for you to pre-
13	sent it further. The objection to the demand that the
14	witness produce the memorandum book is sustained at this
15	time.
16	MR . ROGERS . Since the Court has been talking you have
17	been running over the leaves of that memorandum, haven't
18	you? A Yes, sir .
19	Q In the presence of the jury? A I have.
20	Q Not once but twice? A yes, sir, twice.
21	Q Let me see what you ran over. A I didn't read any par-
22	ticular part of it.
23	Q Well, while you have been on the stand
24	MR. FORD. If the Court please, the witness didn't read it.
25	MR. APPEL. Now, is that fair
26	MR. FORD. Just put the record right, before the witness
	scanned by the AMATERARY

	1086
1	answers, what he said. I ask that be done before I say
2	anything further.
3	(Last answer read by the reporter.)
4	A 1 did not read it; I simply glanced at it to see if there
5	was any memorandum there in regard to the meeting of the
6	M & M Association.
7	MR. ROGERS. Q Now, is there? A Not that I have seen.
8	Q Let me see what you ran over? A It is my private
9	property and I refuse to produce it.
10	THE COURT. The objection of the witness is sustained.
11	MR. ROGERS. Q Now, having looked at your memorandum
12	book, could you tell us whether you met Mr. Oscar Lawler,
13	prosecutor in the dynamite cases, so-called, at any other
14	time than the time that you were there with Mr. Ford and
15	made this statement?
16	MR. FORD. Now, if the Court please, we object to the ques-
17	tion on account of the first part contained in it, on the
18	ground that it is assuming something that is not a fact;
19	not been testified to; no foundation laid for its intro-
20	duction; that the witness is testifying by reason of having
21	looked at his memorandum. Counsel is seeking ingeniously
22	to work in to the question something that the witness might
23	overlook and from which he might later argue a right to
24	examine that memorandum book. The rule being this that if
25	the witness testifies to any fact by refreshing his recol-
26	lection from a memorandum book he has a right to look at it,

	1087
	1 just as your Honor ruled in that particular case where
2	2 it was done. Now, counsel is trying to claim from all
	3 of these questions that the witness by reason of having
4	4 looked through the memorandum book can now testify to another
Ę	5 matter. We say the witness has no right to refresh his
Ē	recollection from the book until he states he is unable to
7	testify. They are seeking to put something in that ques-
8	tion that is not evidence and no foundation laid for asking
9	such a question, and we object upon the ground it is impro-
10	per to the witness, assuming something to be true that the
11	witness did not testify to be true, and that it is incom-
. 12	petent, irrelevant and immaterial and the question is com-
13	pound and complex.
14	THE COURT. Read the question.
15	(Last question read by the report er.)
16	THE COURT . Objection sustained .
17	MR. ROGERS. On what ground, if your Honor please, for
18	the benefit of framing the next question?
19	THE COURT. On the ground that the part of the question
20	saying, "Having looked at the memorandum book"
21	MR.ROGERS. Q I will withdraw that. It occurred in the
22	presence of the Court, of course. Answer the latter part
23	of that question and omit the first clause, having run
24	over your memorandum book.
25	MR . FORD . Your Honor, we object to the rest of that
26	question on the ground it assumes something not in evidence

	1088
1	calls for hearsay answer, namely, that Mr. Lawler was the
2	prosecutor in the dynamitercases.
3	MR. ROGERS. I will withdraw this witness and put Mr. Ford
4	on the stand for the purpose of laying the foundation.
5	
6	J.W.FORD,
7	a witness called on behalf of the defense, being first
8	duly sworn, testified as follows:
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION.
10	BY MR. ROGERS. Q You know Mr. Lawler? A I do.
11	Q To your knowledge is he not the special attorney for the
12	United States Government engaged in the prosecution of the
13	dynamiting cases? A 1 know nothing about that subject
14	except what was told to me by others?
15	Q By Mr. Lawler, among others? A I had a certain assump-
16	tion upon which I acted and 1 don't believe I ever ques-
17	tioned him about the matter; I am not sure.
18	Q But you do know that he was special attorney for the
19	United States Government in the dynamiting cases, in the
20	United States Court? A I object to that on he ground
21	that the warrant by the Government would be the best evidenc
22	of that fact, if such is the fact, calling for hearsay.
23	MR. ROGERS. 1 ask for a reading of the question.
24	MR. FREDERICKS. We further object to it, your Honor, on
25	the ground that it is absolutely immaterial whether Oscar
26	Lawler was attorney for the dynamiting cases or not;

ł

	1089
1	further, that it is hearsay and calls for a conclusion of
2	the witness and not the best evidence.
3	THE COURT. Gentlemen, what is the use of wasting time on
4	this matter? It is a matter of common knowledge that
5	Oscar Lawler occupied that position and the Court takes
6	judicial notice of it and so declares it at this time.
7	MR. ROGERS. Q Isn't the reason you went down there that
8	Oscar Lawler was known to you to be such attorney and went
9	down there to his office with Mr. Franklin at the time
10	indicated? A The reason I selected that office was, I
11	wanted Mr. Lawler's assistance by reason of any knowledge
12	either of fact or law that he might have.
13	Q lsn't it a fact, to be fair about it and frank about
14	it, that you went down there because he was special attor-
15	ney for the Government in the prosecution of the dynamiting
16	cases? A The reason I went down there was because of my
17	respect for Mr. Lawler's knowledge of the law and the facts
18	concerning which I was investigating, I was conducting the
19	examination before the grand jury at that time, and I wanted
20	his professional assistance regardless of any official
21	position he may or may not have occupied at that time.
22	Q Mr. Ford, do you say to this jury that Mr. Lawler's posi-
23	tion as special attorney in the dynamiting cases or the
24	prosecution thereof had nothing to do with your going to
25	his office and taking Mr. Franklin's statement?
26	MR.FREDERICKS. I assume, may it please the Court, that the

dynamiting cases and the special prosecutor means the
 United States dynamiting cases and the United States prose cutor?

 $4 \mid$ THE COURT. Solely.

A 1 don't know how I can answer that . You can draw your $\mathbf{5}$ own conclusions and so can the jury in regard to that. 6 matter.l never have examined into/particularly things that 7 led me to go down there, but the reason that I asked his 8 assistance at that time and some other people in whom I 9 had confidence at various stages of the proceedings on 10 questions of law or questions of fact. I went there to 11 Mr. Lawler not because of any official position he held, --12 I will say positively I went there not because of any 13 official connection he had at the time with any case, but 14 because of his professional knowledge of the facts and the 15 16 law.

Did he get a copy of the statement taken at that time? 17 Q, 1 am not sure that he did. 1 am rather of the impression A 18 that he did not. I might be mistaken on that. 19 Q You mean to say he did not get it at that time or did 20not get it at all? A At any time. I don, t see any 21 reason why he should want it and my impression is that it 22 was not given to him. I couldn't see anything in it that 23 the United States or anybody else would be interested in 24 except the County of Los Angeles . 25

26 Q 1 am asking for your recollection and not for an argu-

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

ment. A I am stating the grounds upon which I base my recollection, and that is my recollection, that he hasn't any. I might be mistaken. I am stating my reason that strengthens me in my belief he hasn't any, that I cannot s ee any reason why he is interested in it by reason of any official capacity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

Q Why did you spar and refuse to answer that youdid not 7 know Mr. Lawler was an attorney for the United States 8 Government in the prosecution of the dynamiting cases when 9 the Court told you that it was a matter of common knowledge 10 which he would say to the jury is a matter of common know-11 ledge? A I will answer that question I don't think the 12 Court had any right to state any fact which he could not 13 stake judicial notice of. I don't think he could take 14 judicial notice and I don't want to set a precedent for you 15to be introducing evidence which I know to be clearly 16 incompetent and hearsay and not because of its value what-17 ever. I have conclusions and the jury may have conclusions 18 in regard to that matter, and they may have learned things 19 in general. I don't care to set any precedent for you, that 2021 is my reason.

MR. APPEL. I understood the court took judicial notice
of the doings and acts of the different departments of the
Government were true, and whether said seemed to indicate-A Out statute doesn't say that. Such is not the law.
MR. FREDEPICKS' I don't think there is anything before the

	1092
-	1 Court.
2	2 MR. ROGERS. I said that is all; you may cross-examine.
i i	MR . FREDERICKS . That is all.
4	1
5	5 BERT H. FRANKLIN,
6	recalled for further cross-examination.
7	BY MR. ROGERS. Q Please answer the last question put
8	to you.
9	A Read it, please.
10	MR. Ford . Hefore we proceed further, I want to take an
11	exception to the Court taking judicial notice of the occupa-
12	tion of Mr. Lawler at any time and ask that the Court strike
13	it out and 1 do that without disrespect to your Honor. 1
14	think your Honor is mistaken in that. You have no right to
15	take judicial notice of that fact: (Reading)
16	THE COURT. Motion to strike out is denied. The exception
17	will be noted.
18	MR. Fredericks. We understand we may want to prove
19	Mr. Lawler is just what the Court mays he takes judicial
20	notice of, and we understand counsel makes no exception to
21	the fact that the Court has taken judicial notice of the
22	fact that Oscar Lawler was the deputywas an assistant
23	United States attorney, generally?
24	MR.ROGERS. Not in general. He has a special appointment
25	for the prosecution of the dynamiting cases, so-called, of
26	which there are supposed to be many, in this jurisdiction

1 and in other jurisdictions, and his appointment is a 2 special appointment and not general appointment, as 1 · 3 understand it. 4 MR . FREDERICKS . I don't know that counsel can bind his client in a stipulation of fact, but at any rate I presume 5 counsel will not make it very difficult for us if we were 6 7 to prove--MR . ROGERS. Notany more difficult than Mr. Frod tried to 8 make it for me. I might get back in that respect. 9 THE COURT. Any further cross-examination of this witness? 10 MR. ROGERS. Yes, sir, I would like to have the last ques-11 tion read and his answer, if 1 am correctly informed 12 about the record. (Last question read by thereporter.) 13 MR. FORD. We object, if your Honor please, upon the 14 ground that it is assuming a fact that is not legally in 15 evidence, in that Mr. Lawler was the dynamiting prosecutor 16 for the United States. 17 THE COURT · Objection overruled · 18 A Now, what is the question? 19 MR. ROGERS. Q The latter part of that question, omitting 20 the first part, "Having looked at your memorandum", the 21 latter part you may answer, if you please. 22 A It is impossible for me to tell where the first part 23of that question stops and the latter part commences, for 24that reason it is impossible for me to answer it. 25THE COURT. Did you adopt the question as the reporter 26

	1094
1	read it?
2	MR. ROGERS. Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT. Read it again.
4	(Last question read by the reporter.)
5	A Now, if you will fix the time, Mr. Rogers, I wild
6	answer that question. I met Mr. Lawler frequently, but
7	never since that time: I don t think I have ever set eyes
8	on him.
9	Q You haven't met him, then, since the 25th day of January
10	when you were in his office in company with Mr. Ford and
11	made this statement? A I don't recollect. I don't think
12	I have, no, sir. I don't think I have even seen him.
13	Q How long before that had you met him? A Considerable
14	length of time.
15	Q Well, would you give us your best recollection as to the
16	time? A Do you mean by meeting him to see him or to
17	converse with him?
18	Q To converse with him? A For months.
19	Q Now, when you went to the Merchants & Manufacturers
20	Association's rooms and there met Mr. Seehandelaar, had you
21	known him before that date? A You mean when 1 met him the
22	second time or the first time?
23	Q The first time? A In company with the other men?
24	Q Yes. A Oh yes; yes, sir.
25	Q When had you last met him before that time? A To con-
26	verse with him, youmean, or to see him on the street?

-	1095
1	Q 1 don:t mean, of course, the ordinary passing by on
2	the street. I mean whenever you had seen him to talk with
3	him or any person in his presence? A Months, years,
4	I guess; probably two years.
5	Q Then he was not a special friend of yours? A yes, sir
6	not a special friend1 never testified that he was.
7	I said he was a personal friend of mine and I say so now.
8	Q You associate with him socially? A 1 did not.
9	Q Did you at that time? A I did not.
10	Q You hadn't seen him and spoke to him that you know of
11	in a couple of years? A I don:t think so.
12	Q How long before that meeting had you seen Fred Baker?
13	A To speak and converse with him?
14	Q Yes. A I don, t remember; considerable time, though.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

	1095-a
25-Sm 1	Q As long as Zeehandelaar, a couple of years?
2	A Perhaps so.
3	Q Your acquaintance with Mr Baker in recent times has
4	been considerably limited, has it not? A My acquaintance
5	has lasted about twenty-five or six years.
× 6	Q Not socially? A Not socially, no sir.
7	Q Had you met Reese Lieewellyn to talk with him at any
8	time within two years before this meeting? A Yes sir.
9	Q Where? A At his place of business.
10	Q When? A I don't remember; it was during election
11	time.
12	Q Election time? A Yes sir.
13	Q Your call upon him was political? A Yes sir.
14	Q When, before that political conversation that you had
15	with Reese Llewellyn, was it, that you had last seen him?
16	A I don't remember.
17	Q A long time, wasn't it? A I don't remember; a con-
18	siderable time.
19	Q A considerable period of time? A I was out of the
20	city myself, most of the time, Mr Rogers, for the last five
21	years, out a good share of the time. It was impossible for
22	me to meet him.
23	Q Well, you haven't met him to speak of within five
24	years, had you? A No, I don't think that I have.
25	Q How is it with respect to Mr Stoddard Jess. Have you
26	met him to speak to him or talk to him before this meeting

	1095-ъ
1	at the Merchants & Manufacturers Association within recent
2	times? A Yes sir, I met him frequently.
3	Q Where? A At the bank.
4	Q Talk with him? A Yes sir.
5	Q Business with him? A Yes sir.
6	Q Just depositing money, wasn't it? A No sir.
7	Q What business was it?
8	MR FREDERICKS: Objected to upon the ground it is incompetent
9	irrelevant and immaterial.
10	THE COURT: Objection sustained.
11	MR FREDERICKS: Unless shown to refer to his testimony in
12	the case.
13	THE COURT: It doesn't so appear at this time.
14	MR ROGERS: Mr Koepfle, had you known him well? A No sir. Had
15	Q You met him within recent time? A No.
16	Q Had you ever met him before? A Not to my knowledge.
17	Q Mr Jevne, had you seen him within recent times before
18	that meeting at the Merchants & Manufacturers Association?
19	A Very little in the last four or five years.
20	Q Very little? A Very little. I was out of the city
21	most of the time.
22	Q Do you remember when you last saw Mr Jevne before the
23	meeting at the Merchants & Manufacturers Association?
24	A I do not.
25	Q Do you remember the other gentlemen who were there?
26	

	1096
Al-P1	A No, I do not.
2	Q Were they friends of yours? A That would be impossibl
3	to tell unless I remember who they were.
4	Q If they had been intimate friends of yours, or special
5	friends of yours, do you not think you would remember them?
6	A Not necessarily, no, Mr Rogers.
7	Q Suffice it to say you don't know who it was at this
. 8	time. A It didn't make any particular impression on
9	my mind that I should try to remember.
10	Q Please answer me. A That is my answer.
11	MR FORD: We submit the witness has answered.
12	Q Read the question, please. (Question read)
13	A No, I don't remember, Mr Rogers.
14	Q Now, having gone up there with Mr you saw Mr Zee-
15	handelaar first, did you not? A No sir.
16	Q Whom did you see first? A A lady in the outside
17	office.
18	Q Well, aside from the lady in the outside office, whom
19	did you see first? A Well, that is difficult to tell.
20	There were several of them there at the time, three or four
21	of them, two or three of them.
22	Q When you went up there whom did you ask to see of the
23	lady in the outside office? A Now, there were two or
24	three in the outside office when I went there.
25	
26	time. I think Mr Jevne was one of them, I think Stoddard scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

	1097
1	Jess was another.
2	Q Were you then taken into the rear office, or private
3	office of the Board of Directors? A I was not.
4	Q Did you meet them in the outside office? A Yes sir,
5	all at one time.
6	Q Who opened the conversation, you or they, or some one
7	of them? A I think Mr Zeehandelaar did.
8	Q What did he say? A I don't remember.
9	Q Could you remember any part of what Mr Zeehandelaar
10	did in opening the conversation? A No, I don't remember,
11	Mr Rogers. I would be glad to.
12	Q Did you reply to Mr Zeehandelaar, the Secretary of the
13	Merchants & Manufacturers Association? A He didn't ask
14	me anything.
15	Q Did you reply to him. I didn't say "Did you answer
16	him". I asked: "Did you reply to him"? A I did not to
17	him, no sir.
18	Q Well then, who spoke next after Mr Zeehandelaar had
19	spoken to you? A Mr Franklin he didn't speak to me.
20	Q What did you say? A He didn't speak to me.
21	Q He didn't speak to you? A No sir, he spoke to the
22	gentlemen there generally.
23	Q He spoke to the gentlemen there generally? A Yes sir
24	but I don't remember his language.
25	Q Well, give us the substance and purpost of what Mr
26	Zeehandelaar said to the gentlemen there generally, the

Secretary of the Merchants & Manufacturers Association,
 in your presence in their rooms.

MR FORD: We object to that as purely hearsay, pure and 3 simple, as not in anywise being cross-examination, not in 4 anywise tending to show statements made by this witness in-5 consistent with those made on another occasion. There is 6 only way in which a witness may be contradicted, and I want 7 to put this clearly before the Court. I do not for one 8 moment contend that counsel has not the right to show by 9 legal evidence that any transactions occurred which in-10 fluenced this witness at that place, or that any things were 11 done by other people which influenced him. but let him 12bring the people in who made the statement in order that we 13 may cross-examine them. Now, he is seeking apparently to 14 impeach this witness, or to show somethingsaid or done by 15 this witness, or to this witness, which would influence this 16 witness. That would be proper and we made no objections to 17 this time, but now he is trying to introduce something that 18 was said by somebody to somebody else, not addressed to this 19 witness, and as far as I know or can see at the present time 20something over which this witness had no concern. Now, if 21 this witness had testified to some negotiations, some ar-22rangements had between him and any person there present and 23 that they want to explain something that was said in the 24 presence of this witness by somebody else, all right, let 25them lay the foundation, then. At this time we object on 26

4-2-P

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

the ground it is hearsay, pure and simple, not cross examination, no foundation laid for its introduction; in competent, irrelevant and immaterial.

4 THE COURT: Objection overruled.

I think Mr Zeehandelaar notified those present that A 5 Mr Franklin wished to make a statement and I recall that 6 at the time I went in Mr Zeehandelaar said to me: "Do you 7 wish to make a statement to the gentlemen present?" And I 8 said. "Yes". After Mr Zeehandelaar had made that state-9 ment. if I remember correctly. F L Baker who said that he 10 thought as he had known me a long while that any statement 11 I wished to make that they should listen to, and I thereupon 12 made my statement. 13

14MR FREDERICKS: The question calls for the whole conversa-15tion.A I did not so understand it.

16 MR ROGERS: No, the question didn't call for the whole conversation, if your Honor please. The question called for the conversation as I wish to bring it out, namely, item by item, and person by person.

20 MR FREDERICKS: All right. I withdraw my understanding.
21 Q By Mr Rogers: Now then, after Mr Baker had said he
22 thought you ought to be permitted to make a statement to
23 them -- A I think it was Mr Baker --

Q You made a statement? A I did, yes sir.

24

25
26 Then the first words said to you up there were "Do you want to make a statement?" A Yes sir, if I remember correctly, that is what Mr Zeehandelaar said to me just after

1 I went into the room.

2 Q Then how did Mr Zeehandelaar have in his head you
3 wanted to make a statement, do you know? How do you know he
4 didn't think you came up there to collect a bill or something
5 MR FREDERICKS: That is objected to as calling for a con6 clusion of the witness.

7 Q If you know.

8 THE COURT: Objection overruled.

9 A I have no way of knowing.

10 Q Did it surprise you? A Not a bit.

When Mr Zeehandelaar said "Do you want to make a state-Q 11 ment?" and turned around and said "Mr Franklin desires to 12 make a statement"? A Not a bit. I had been told by 13 Mr Crook those gentlemen would be there. friends of mine. 14 and said to come there a certain time, and I went. 15 Friends of yours? A Yes sir, friends of mine, that is Q 16 what I said. 17

18 Q Two of them you don't remember, and the others you had 19 seen the first time, and do you call those friends? A Yes 20 sir, I do.

21 NR FORD: We object to those comments on the testimony by
22 counsel as improper. We are not allowed to do that; they
23 objected continually whenever we made them, to any testimony.
24 THE COURT: All that is necessary is to make the objection.
25 Objection sustained.

Q By Mr Rogers: Had you ever been in the house of any one

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1	
	1101
	1 of this committee in your life? A Not to my knowledge.
1-3-P	2 Q Had they ever been in your house, any one of the
	3 committee? A Not to my knowledge.
4	Q Did you ever do any business for any one of them
ł	before that time? A Not to my recollection.
6	Q Did any one of them ever do any business for you?
7	A Yes sir.
8	Q Before that time? A Yes sir.
9	Q Who? A Mr Jess, Mr Jevne.
10	2 As a small depositor in the bank, in the case of Mr
11	Jess, and as a purchaser of groceries of Mr Jevne's empor-
12	ium thereof, isn't that true? A As to the small amount,
13	that is a matter of your opinion and easily proven. I made
14	them as I stated.
15	Q Well, not to differ with you about the size of the
16	account, your business with Mr Stoddard Jess is exemplified
17	in the bank-book which you have produced here, is it not?
18	A It is not
19	MR FORD: We object to that on the ground the witness has
20	already testified he had other transactions with Mr Jess,
21	and your Honor sustained objection to counsel's going
22	into those other relations.
23	MR ROGERS: I beg your pardon, I think the counsel is not
24	stating the testimony accurately. He did say Mr Jess
25	had done some business for him, but he didn't say ${}^{\mathbb{M}}$ r Jess
26	had done business with him. And I asked him relating to

	1102
1	his business with Mr Jess, if it was ememplified in the
2	bank account.
3	THE COURT: All right. Answer the question.
4	A I said "no".
5	Q By Mr Rogers: What other business had Mr Jess done
6	for you, other than the banking business? A That is my
7	private business, and none of yours.
8	MR FREDERICKS: We object to that, and move that the
9	answer be stricken out
10	A I beg your pardon, Mr Rogers
11	MR ROGERS: All right.
12	THE COURT: The answer is stricken out. Mr Franklin, the
13	Court has admonished you, and does admonish you, that you
14	are not testifying here for the benefit of counsel on
15	either side, and the remark you have just made here is
16	entirely out of order; you are not testifying for the
17	benefit of counsel, you are testifying for the benefit of
18	this Court and jury.
19	MR FRANKLIN: I have offered an apology to Mr Rogers and
20	he has accepted it. I should not have made the statement.
21	Q By Mr Rogers: I do not want to interfere with any
22	matters you regard as private busines . What I am reaching
23	is whether or not, outside of the banking business, that is,
24	fn Mr Jess' position as a member of the Board of Directors
25	and an officer of the First National Bank, if he ever had
26	done any business for you? A No sir.
	scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

		1103
	1	Q Then your relations with him were purely financial
	2	and things connected with that bank; that is what I was
	3	reaching for? A Yes sir.
	4	Q Now, you said you had never done any business for any
	5	of them A Not
	6	Q I beg your pardon A Finish your question.
	7	Q Did you say that? A I think so; I think that is
	8	correct.
	9	Q You went up there on this occasion and you asked them
	10	for business in the future, did you not, in words or effect?
	11	A I did not.
	12	Q What did you say to them when you made this statement,
	13	that Mr Zeehandelaar asked you if you wanted to make?
	14	A I told those ment that I had made a statement to the
	15	District Attorney of this County as to the facts in relation
	16	to my arrest, what led up to it, all the accurrences as far
	17	as I remembered them at the time I made the statement, that
	18	my future in this city was going to be a very difficult one
	19	and I felt that those men, being friends of mine, would to
-	20	later on assist me and try to build me up in the community,
A-4-	21	being business men.
	22	Q And assist you by giving you business particularly?
	23	A That is what I meant, yes sir.
	24	Q Assist you by giving you business? A Yes sir, that
•	25	is what I meant.
	26	Q You meant business for the Merchants & Manufacturers

	1104
1	Association as well as for the individuals, did you not?
2	A I did not, no sir.
3	Q Why did you make this statement here in the rooms of
4	the Merchants & Manufacturers Association to their Secretary
5	and those gentlemen there, if you didn't mean that you
6	wanted the business of the Merchants & Manufacturers Associa-
7	tion?
8	MR FORD: To that we object on the ground it is argumenta-
9	tive.
10	THE COURT: Objection sustained.
11	Q What did they say in reply to that, when you asked
12	them for business?
13	A They told me they thought that was not the proper time
14	to discuss questions of that kind, and I left.
15	Q What did you go back for the second time?
16	A I don't remember. Yes, I do. Yes, I remember very well.
17	Q What was it? A I went to Mr Zeehandelaar and said
18	when I went to trial, or plead guilty, there would be some
19	questions, some statements in the papers that might injure
20	me, and then I asked him to go to the Los Angeles Times,
21	and the Los Angeles Examiner, and request them not to make
22	statements derogatory to my character.
23	Q Why did you go to Mr Zeehandelaar and ask him to induce
24	the papers not to say much A I went to him
25	Q as distinguished from any other person.
26	MR FORD: To that we object on the ground that it is irre-

	1105
1	levant and immaterial; his reasons for doing it are not
2	material. The only things that are material are what oc-
3	curred.
4	THE COURT: Objection sustained.
5	MR ROGERS: If your Honor please, I can put it in another
6	form. My throat is played out, I have had a long session.
7	THE COURT: (Jury admonished.) We will adjourn until
8	two o'clock this afternoon.
9	
10	0
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

Γ

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY