The original documents are located in Box 43, folder "President - Assassination Attempts Fromme, Lynette (2)" of the Philip Buchen Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

BY MESSENGER

October 2, 1975

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM FOR

John C. Keeney
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Division
Department of Justice

Pursuant to the joint request of the Criminal Division,
Department of Justice, the FBI and the Secret Service, enclosed
please find a copy of the Statement of President Ford relative
to the alleged assassination attempt on the President's life in
Sacramento, California, September 5, 1975.

As soon as practicable, I shall forward to you the President's statement relevant to the alleged assassination attempt which occurred in San Francisco on September 22, 1975.

Kenneth A. Lasarus Associate Counsel to the President

KAL:dlm



BY MESSENGER

October 2, 1975

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR

CLARENCE M. KELLEY DIRECTOR REDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Pursuant to the joint request of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice, the FBI and the Secret Service, enclosed please find a copy of the Statement of President Ford relative to the alleged assassination attempt on the President's life in Sacramento, Galifornia, September 5, 1975.

As soon as practicable, I shall forward to you the President's statement relevant to the alleged assassination attempt which occurred in San Francisco on September 22, 1975.

Kenneth A. Lasarus Associate Counsel to the President

KAL:dlm



BY MESSENGER

October 2, 1975

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR

H. S. KNIGHT, DIRECTOR U. S. SECRET SERVICE

Pursuant to the joint request of the Criminal Division,
Department of Justice, the FBI and the Secret Service,
enclosed please find a copy of the Statement of President
Ford relative to the alleged assassination attempt on
the President's life in Sacramento, California, September 5,
1975.

As soon as practicable, I shall forward to you the President's statement relevant to the alleged assassination attempt which occurred in San Francisco on September 22, 1975.

Kenneth A. Lasarus Associate Gounsel to the President

KAL;dlm



President assassination attempt

Monday 10/20/75

Il:20 Ken wanted you to know that tomorrow Lynn Fremme will make a motion in the U. S. District Court in Sacramento to subpoena the President as a witness in the prosecution against her. There is a notion of need in the rule governing the subpoenas and the Justice Dept. anticipates that because of the lack of need, they will be able to quash the motion. They will get copies of all relevant pleadings.

SERALO TO TO THE SERVICE OF THE SERV

1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	
3	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	000
	BEFORE HONORAPLE THOMAS J. MacBRIDE, Judge.
5	000
8	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
7	Plaintiff,
8	CR. NO. S-75-451
9	LYNETTE ALICE FROMME,
10	Defendant.
31	And the first transition date date date date date date date date
12	
13	000
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
15	AFTERNOON SESSION
	TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1975
10	~~ ~~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
Win .	APPEARANCES:
18	For the Government: DWAYNE KEYES, Esq.
19	United States Attorney and
20	DONALD HELLER, Esq., AUSA
21	For the Defendant: JOHN E. VIRGA, Esq.
22	
23	
24	
25	
adaptis Araps	CSR Lic. No. C 2223

DENNIS F. HCKINHON CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER SACRAMENTO



2 (In camera hearing not transcribed.)

€.

2:15 o'clock p. m.

THE CLERK: Court is now in session.

THE COURT: All right. The record will show the defendant is present with counsel.

Now, I have had an in camera discussion with the defendant and her co-counsel, and I concluded that there is justification for the issuance of 35 subpoenas to be delivered at the expense of the Government. Miss Fromme and Mr. Virga have advised me they may not use all of these subpoenas, but nevertheless they have shown the necessity for these persons being here in the event they elect to actually request them to come. But as Mr. Virga has pointed out, the situation may develop that in discussion with a prospective witness, they may make the decision that they want that person and they want to be able to give the subpoena to them at that time. Accordingly, the Clerk is authorized to issue 35 blank subpoenas to the defense.

Now we come to the request for the subpoensing of President Ford. Mr. Virga or Miss Promme, you may address yourselves to that request.

MR. VIRGA: Your Honor, in this matter the case that I'm relying on is U. S. vs. Nixon, cited as 418 U. S., 683.
We are requesting that President Ford be subposensed because he

and the same of th

is a percipient witness to this particular offense or alleged
offense. There have been reports in the newspapers that one
of the agents involved heard a click of this particular weapon,
this .45 automatic that it's alleged Miss Fromme had in her
hand at the time of this alleged attempted assassination. It
is our contention that there was no click of that weapon. I
don't know whether this particular person who allegedly heard
this click it is my understanding from reading the news-
paper account that it was a Secret Service Agent or FBI Agent.
I don't know if this particular person indicates that it's
just the noise of the gun or if it is because there could be
a noise from an automatic, or whether it is the click of the
hammer coming forward. I think the contention that could be
made is that Miss Fromme simply didn't know how to use this
weapon. If she had wanted to use it, she didn't know how to
use it; and that that accounts for the weapon not going off
in other words, she may have confused this with a revolver
where all you have to do is pull back the hammer and pull the
trigger and the shot would be propelled down the barrel. There
have been numerous statements in the newspapers about comments
that Miss Fromme made after this alleged assassination attempt,
something to the effect that "It didn't go off, it didn't go
off. He's not a public servant." I would think that her
demeanor at this time would also be extremely important.
Everything was happening very fast. Exactly how was that said?

How it was said could be very relevant in this particular case.

Mow, President Ford is a percipient witness to these matters. What he saw and what he heard will be extremely relevant, because as I see this case, the pivotal issue is obviously intent. I think anyone connected with the case would appreciate that. The testimony President Ford can give in this matter is not only relevant, it's very material, meets all of the tests that are necessary for admissibility in a courtroom into evidence. I can't think of anything he could have seen or heard that would be hearsay or that he wouldn't be percipient to. In the case of United States vs. Nixon, and I know the Court is well aware of that case so I'm not going to go through all the facts and details of the case, but I do want to make reference to Page 1066 of that decision. The

"That the right to the production of all evidence at a criminal trial similarly has constitutional dimensions. The Sixth Amendment explicitly confers upon every defendant in a criminal trial to the right 'to be confronted with the witness against him' and 'to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor.'"

"Moreover, the Fifth Amendment also guarantees that no person shall be deprived

of liberty without due process of law. It is the manifest duty of the Courts to vindicate those guarantees, and to accomplish that it is essential that all relevant and admissible evidence be produced."

The Court goes on to say:

"In this case we must weigh the importance of the general privilege of confidentiality of Presidential communications in performance of his responsibilities against the inroads of such a privilege on the fair administration of criminal justice."

talking about a very delicate situation involving these tapes and whether or not they are privileged. The Court said when we are talking about due process and the fact that someone might be going to prison, you bring those tapes in, present them to the Court. Your Presidential privilege does not extend to that. This case is far beyond that, Your Honor. This is a case where the President is, in fact, the percipient witness, and the fair administration of justice would indicate that he should be here and we should be allowed to hear from him as to what he did see and what he observed and what he heard.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Heller or Mr. Keyes?

MR. KEYES: Your Honor, I don't know that the Nixon case, apparently the only case that they could find in discussing the issue, or the Burr case are of particular help because they discuss a subpoena duces tecum and also discuss Executive Privilege. I don't believe we have that in this case.

2.

8.

Q

2.2

THE COURT: We've had no exertion of Executive
Privilege. In other words, the Executive Privilege wouldn't
come into play unless I did in fact subpoena the President.
At that time, then I would suppose that he might, if he elected
to do so, claim Executive Privilege.

MR. KEYES: Well, I'm not sure that — I presume that would be the point we would reach that question. I'm not sure if the privilege itself would be relevant at this point. I think what we're discussing here is — once again we're still with Rule 17(b), which indicates that as far as subpoena power is concerned the Court is looking at whether the witness is necessary to an adequate defense. That's the question presented to the Court at this time. In the Ninth Circuit case of Wagner vs. U. S., it's a 1969 case, 416 Fed. 2d, certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court. Two points were raised in that case. One, the Court stated that the right given a defendant to subpoena witnesses at Government expense is not absolute but is to be governed by the sound discretion of the trial court. The Court has already acknowledged that today.

The second was the defendant does not have a right to subpoena at Government expense witnesses whose testimony would be cumulative. Now, in this particular case the defendant has not filed an affidavit in support of this request for a subpoena, so therefore we don't have facts alleged by this

defendant which we can respond to.

THE COURT: I think Mr. Virga has stated in open court why he wants the President here. That is the question of whether or not he heard -- I guess he's probably the closest person to that gun, except maybe the one right next to it. As I understand it, the gun was about two feet from him.

MR. KEYES: There were people all around, yes.

THE COURT: So he's looking right at the gun. The question was: Did he hear the gun click, or did he hear the defendant say anything?

MR. KEYES: That's right. Now, Mr. Virga has stated to the Court just now his reasons for wanting that witness. The United States intends to call approximately 15 witnesses regarding these three areas. Each witness will not address themselves specifically to all three, but the areas will be covered. Statements of the defendant at the scene, the demeanor of the defendant at the scene, the sound of a click or lack thereof. Now, we have also indicated at the time of the motions for discovery that at the conclusion of our case we're going to turn over to the defendant Grand Jury statements that

13.

ERAL

were not used by us and all of the statements of any percipient witness of which we had knowledge, which we did not call. I think the defendant is going to have available everybody that was there that we have any knowledge of. They may through their own investigation in fact come up with other witnesses of which we have no knowledge. There's going to be a lot of testimony on the issues stated by Mr. Virga.

B

It's the position of the United States that the testimony of the President, if he were called, would be cumulative, and that this is supported in fact by a statement that has been submitted by the President to Clarence Kelly, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This statement was presented on approximately October the 2d of 1975.

In that statement the President has indicated -- it's separated into 10 paragraphs. The President has indicated that he has -- THE COURT: I think it best you read the statement

into the record.

MR. KEYES: All right, Your Honor. This is the

"I, Gerald R. Ford, President of the United States of America, pursuant to the joint request of the Criminal Division and the Federal Bureau of Investigation within the Department of Justice, submit the following:

"One, during the morning of Friday,

statement of President Gerald R. Ford.

September 5, 1975, I was in the Senator Hotel, Sacramento, California.

"Two, at 10:00 a.m., I departed the Senator Hotel on fcot and proceeded diagonally across L Street en route to the State Capitol Building.

"Three, by 10:05 a.m., I had crossed into the Park on the State Capitol grounds and started shaking hands with a group of people gathered, two or four rows deep, on my left.

"Four, as I approached a row of trees, I saw
a woman in an unusual red and orange dress standing
in the second row of the crowd. The woman had greybrown hair and a weathered complexion. She was
standing next to a tree and was visible to me above
her chest.

"Five, as this woman moved her right hand forward toward me through the crowd at about waist level, I saw that she was holding a handgun. At this point, she was about two feet away from me.

"Six, at about the same time I saw the handgum, several Secret Service personnel grabbed me by the shoulders and pushed me down and away from the woman and surrounded me.

"Seven, I have no recollection of hearing the woman say anything or of hearing the handgun

23

22

23

click.

1

3

3.

4

E

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

13

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

"Eight, I was quickly led away in the direction of the State Capitol Building. I turned and looked back momentarily to see two or three Secret Service or other security personnel wrestling the woman down.

"Nine, at about 10:10 a.m., I entered the State Capitol Building and went directly to the office of Governor Brown.

"Ten, this is a complete and accurate statement of my recollections of the incident described above."

It is signed by Gerald R. Ford, The White House, Washington, D. C., September 24, 1975.

As I stated, Your Honor, it's our position that his testimony would be cumulative, and this is supported by the statement just read.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Keyes: Would you be willing to stipulate that if the President were called as a witness by the defense, that that's the testimony that he would give?

MR. MEYES: Yes, Your Honor.

would so testify -- of course, I'm sure that what you would want to hear him say is that he heard no click.

MR. WIRGA: That's right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's what he would say.

SACRARENT'S

if she did make any damaging statements, he didn't hear them.

It would seem to me that those are the areas of inquiry for which you would want the President. If the Government is willing to stipulate that if he was called that that's the way he would testify, then what would be the need for calling the President?

B

MR. VIRGA: Your Honor, I think he can still give testimony that should be heard by the jury. I appreciate that that — that we could enter into a stipulation with regard to some of these things. I noticed, at least I thought what I heard Mr. Keyes say, he indicated he had no recollection of hearing the gan click. Does that mean he didn't hear it click or he has no recollection? That's kind of vague to me. That leaves an open end. He doesn't know whether it clicked or not. Or is he saying it didn't click? Certainly, I would like to be in a position where I can show that he was there, which obviously he was, that if it had clicked, he would have heard it and he didn't hear a click; not that he doesn't recall. That's basically what we're getting into now, an area of the right to cross-examine, the right to confront. I appreciate —

THE COURT: I'm sure, Mr. Virga, that if you had President Ford on the stand and you asked him: Did you hear a click? And he would say I have no recollection of hearing a click, you would say "Thank you, Mr. President."

MR. VIRGA: That may very well be the case. Your_

Honor. He may be our most important witness after listening to what Mr. Keyes has to say. There might be 14 witnesses who say they heard a click, he says he didn't hear one. It was my understanding -- what if the gun was closer to him than two feet? It's our contention it was closer to kim than two feet. Then if there was a click, would he have heard it? It depends upon a number of things.

B

grey-brown hair. Now, she doesn't have grey-brown hair, she has reddish brown hair. I don't notice any grey in her hair at all.

THE COURT: I don't think that that's too important, frankly.

MR. VIRGA: Well, I don't think it is of the greatest significance. Is he talking about Lynette Fromme? Maybe there was someone there who had grey-brown hair.

THE COURT: Someone else that they wrestled to the ground?

MR. VIRGA: Is he talking about the same particular person? I don't know. What did he say with regard to the weapon, what did he say with regard to her demeanor, the expression on her face, if he saw it, if he noticed? Was it an anxious demeanor; was it a panic-type demeanor? None of that is covered in his statement. I simply feel this is a situation where it's highly unusual that the President would be

the alleged victim and percipient witness. His testimony is vital and necessary. I'm certain that if subpoenaed he would be more than happy to be here. I'm sure he wouldn't need a subpoena. I'm sure a phone call from the Court or the U. S. Attorney's Office, or maybe even me -- I haven't called because it seemed to me an impossibility for me to get through. It seemed the best thing for me to do would be to ask you for a subpoena. I don't know if he noticed the hammer back on the gun even if he didn't hear anything. There would be so many questions that should be covered, because from what Mr. Keyes has to say, there are definitely some people who say they heard a click. I don't think there's any question about that. That's going to be very, very important on the issue of intent.

closest person to that weapon. His ability to perceive and recollect might be much greater than anyone else because he's the one actually confronted with it. What other people might not notice, I'm certain he would. This is something that certainly he will never forget. His power of observation could be increased tenfold because of what happened directly to him.

THE COURT: I throw this out only as a suggestion. Would you consider taking the President's deposition?

MR. VIRGA: I would consider that. I would much prefer to have him here. I appreciate the problems of the

Fresidency.

B

THE COURT: It's a very onerous thing. He's been bere. He's ill right now. Of course, I will admit that your case is different than the Moore case. In the Moore case, the lady was alleged to have been across the street. It would be hard to say that he was as much of a percipient witness in that case as he was to this for the reason he probably didn't see her until somebody directed his attention to Miss Moore. In this case, he was directly confronted, so it is claimed by Miss Promme.

MR. VIRGA: I would suggest that if the Court is inclined to require we take his deposition, we do it on video tape so that the jurors can not only listen to his words but see his expressions. I would much prefer that he be here to testify.

THE COURT: That would be a solution to the problem, that his deposition be taken on video tape. I think that's about the closest I can give you to a solution.

Mr. Keyes, would you like to comment on that?

MR. KEYES: Yes, Your Honor. I think, as the Court realizes, it is within the Court's discretion. We are not talking about a one-witness case. Apparently 35 subpoenas have been issued, or authorization for 35 subpoenas to the defendant. I believe I have indicated that approximately 15 witnesses will testify on this point. I would ask the Court

4.

\$

3

福

5.

6

7

13

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, of course, you speak of cumulative, cumulative to whom? I mean, if the Government puts on 20 witnesses and they all say the same thing, or near the same thing, and then the defense attempts to put on some witnesses, I couldn't permit you to stand up and object to testimony taken from a defense witness, maybe it's on the same subject and say this is purely cumulative to answers that came out during direct examination in the Government's case. They're entitled to put on the case they want. They've got their witnesses and you've got your witnesses, all of whom are percipient witnesses of the same incident. But they're entitled to put on just as large an array of witnesses as you are. They may all say exactly the same thing, but I don't think it's within your province to object to a witness that they want to put on and say this witness' testimony is merely cumulative to testimony that's been elicited from the Government witnesses.

MR. KEYES: We're not to that point, Your Honor. We're at the point --

Point, which is at the conclusion of the Government's case.

7 MR. KEYES: Fine, before they put their case on. 2 We're now at where the cases are that discuss this very 3 subject. They're discussing whether the Judge was wrong when 4 he did not allow the issuance of a subpoena where there was a E supporting affidavit indicating what the witness was going to 0 say, and they have said it was cumulative. The Court was well 7 within their discretion to denv the issuance of a subpoena, 8. that's where we are at right now, and that's where the cases 5 are that discuss this. We certainly are willing to present 10 witnesses -- they're going to present witnesses, they're all 11 perciplent, all standing within two or three feet of each 12 other, some are further away, but there are some that are equally as close as the President. I don't think there's 13 going to be a lot of testimony in that area. I think the Court 14 presumes we're putting on witnesses that only heard a click. 15 18 There are coing to be witnesses that didn't hear a click. So 17 it isn't a case of, you know, finding 20 witnesses that all heard her say a certain thing and heard a click, that's not 18 13 the case or the nature of the evidence. . THE COURT: There's probably no click that's more 20 important than the click that wasn't heard by the President, 21

though.

22

23

24

25

MR. KEYES: I don't know, Your Honor. I think, quate frankly, probably the agent that sees the gun is not going to hear a click. It depends on what draws your attention, quite

frankly. If I saw the front end of a .45, I wouldn't even recognize who was holding it. But that's something we'll come to at a later time. The question here is, I think -- obviously, even the suggestion of video tape -- the defendant has tried to commit a crime for a particular reason, I think her alleged reason is publicity. We now have the President of the United States who was her intended victim, she now wants the President of the United States here in this trial. For what. reason? Allegedly it is extremely important.

1

2

4

6

63

7

8

9

10

1)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm suggesting to the Court there are going to be a lot of witnesses for the jury to hear on the question of intent. Why is the President so important? Not necessarily because he was a victim, but because he is the President. I suggest there may be a little of that in the request also. I think it's well within the discretion of the Court to deny it, or at least to wait until the -- and the defendant still has time to take the deposition or whatever they wish to do, but to wait until the conclusion of our case, then they can indicate to the Court in camera how many witnesses they are calling upon what points.

I already discussed with them in camera the witnesses they're calling and approximately what they're going to say. That's why I am seriously considering therea. subpoena.

> Well, the witnesses there, Your Honor MR. KEYES: Answer this, Kr. Keyes: If this was the

THE COURT:

President of General Motors, what would I do with it, would I 1 issue the subpoena or not? 2 MR. KEYES: That depends. I don't think it should 3 be -- I think quite frankly --4 THE COURT: What if it was just the manager of one 5 of the branches of Bank of America here in Sacramento? 6 MR. KEYES: I would like to point out some language 7 that Justice Marshall, sitting as a District Judge, or equi-8 valent to that, in 1807 in the Burr case. I think it's G apparent that the President is in a slightly different position 10 because of his duties and responsibilities. Quite frankly, 11 maybe the defendant wouldn't even want the President of General 12 Motors if that were the victim. 13 "In no case of this kind would a Court be 14 required to proceed against the President as 15 against an ordinary individual. The objections 18 to such a course are so strong and so obvious, 17 that all must acknowledge them." 18 Now, the objections, unfortunately, Chief Justice 19 Marshall didn't set forth. He said they were obvious. I 20 suggest that if it were the President of Crocker Bank or if 21 it were the President of General Motors, the defendant might 22 not even be that interested. We have the President of the

THE COURT: Did you also read in the Burr case,

United States, I think the Court --

23

24

25

was cited in the Nixon case, the following language:

"Whatever difference may exist with respect to the power to compel the same obedience to the process as if it had been directed to a private citizen, there exists no difference with respect to the right to obtain it. The guard furnished to this high officer to protect him from being harassed by vexatious and wanecessary subpoenas is to be looked for in the conduct of a court after those subpoenas have been issued, not in any circumstance which is to precede their being issued."?

In other words, what they said in both Burr and Nixon is that I'm not to look to the high office to determine whether or not the person should be subpoensed if, in fact, he is a percipient witness and would be of assistance to the defendant in her defense, but to let the high officer, in this case the President, interpose his objections to being required to obey the subpoens and then to consider whatever good reasons he may have for not responding to the subpoens.

MR. KEYES: Well, of course, in the Nixon case, Your Honor, they were discussing who was going to make the determination of whether or not the tapes should be turned over to the Special Prosecutor. The Court decided that the Judge, in camera, would make that determination. So we're talking about,

B. FO

in that specific language, about something different than we're talking about here. We are talking about will there --

THE COURT: You think they were talking about it in the Burr case?

MR. KEYES: They were talking about a letter. The President had the letter and the prosecutor wished to excise certain parts of the letter that they felt were private. It was a private letter to begin with, but they felt there were parts that shouldn't be made public. They were talking about a duces tecum subpoena.

THE COURT: In both instances?

MR. KEYES: In both instances, Your Honor. But I feel that it is within the Court's discretion, as the Ninth Circuit has said it is, to make that determination of whether the testimony to be elicited is cumulative in deciding whether the subpoena should issue. I feel that the Court would be in a much better position, and I do not feel that the defendant would be suffering if the Court heard some of the evidence. We are turning over the rest of our material at the conclusion of our case, that would be a very appropriate time for the Court to make that determination.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Virga.

MR. KEYES: Thank you.

MR. VIKGA: Your Honor, I disagree with Mr. Reyes,

concerned. As I read the Nixon case, we are talking about the Sixth Amendment, and it says the Sixth Amendment confers upon every defendant in a criminal proceeding the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him and to have compulsory processes for obtaining witnesses in his favor. It doesn't say discretionary, it says compulsory. I don't see this as being a matter of discretion for the Court. I think that the Court's analysis is correct, that the subpoena must issue and the President can then raise whatever objection he has to the subpoena.

.8

MR. KEYES: This is an indigent case, Your Honor. Ware talking about a different matter. Counsel has --

MR. VIRGA: May I be allowed to finish, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VIRGA: The other material issues, Mr. Keyes says there were other people. Certainly there were other people. Which direction were they facing? What did they say? Mr. Keyes said if someone put a gun to his face he wouldn't remember a thing. I'll tell you, if you put a gun in my face, I'll remember you, and I think you would, too, Your Honor. I think I'd remember a lot more than maybe the guy standing next to me who maybe wasn't cognizant of what was happening. I'm the one who sees it. We're talking about a click. That could turn to a clang when that cell door slams behind her every night. It bears materially upon the issue of intent, which is

the pivotal issue in this entire case. I'm not trying to make a grandstand play by having the President here — I resent that What I'm saying is that the President of the United States is not above the law, he's not above due process. He should be the epitome of due process and the law. I need not go into Watergate and everything that went on there. As a citizen of the United States and in a criminal case such as this where he can give very relevant, probative testimony, his presence should be required by way of subpoena, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Is there anything else to be said about this?

MR. VIRGA: No, Your Honor.

B

MR. KEYES: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I'm ready to rule. I think that under the circumstances of this case, the President should be asked to testify. He is a percipient witness to the case. The affidavit indicates that the testimony that he would give insofar as the click is concerned would be exculpatory insofar as the defendant is concerned for the reason there is the charge that the gun did click, which suggests that she did in fact attempt to fire the gun. Although the President has stated in his affidavit he has no recollection, he can be examined further on that subject to determine whether or not it was a case of no recollection or did he in fact not hear the gun click.

1 It's unfortunate that the Chief Executive of the United States has to be put to this burden. At the same time, 2 3 I don't know what else Congress had in mind when they passed 4 the statute that states that it is a Federal offense to attempt to take the life of the President of the United States. B Certainly, they must have contemplated there would be those 6 7 circumstances where the President of the United States would 8 have to be a witness whenever such a charge came to trial. I 3 don't think, however, that it is mecessary that we have the 10 presence of the President here. I think that Mr. Virga's 11 suggestion for taking his deposition on video tape is an 12 excellent suggestion. Modern technology and electronics and 13 the like I think has given us a blessing in our ability to 14 bring that deposition here so that we can not only hear what 15 the President says but also the manner in which he says it. 16 He can be thoroughly examined as if he were here. I don't see 17 any great problem. I would hope this will not discommode him 13 to any great extent. He's got a busy schedule. 13 I think, Mr. Virga, you or an associate -- you would

I think, Mr. Virga, you or an associate -- you would yourself go back to the deposition, is that what you would intend?

MR. VIRGA: Yes, Your Honor.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I assume Mr. Keyes or Mr. Heller or both of you also would go back. Certainly the expense of flying you back will be less than bringing Air Force One out here. So

that will be the order, that a subpoena will issue for the taking of a deposition of the President of the United States at the White House or any other place that is convenient to the president -- 1'm stopping the sentence for the reason that I believe he's supposed to be in London. Maybe some of the news media would know whether --

MR. KEYES: It's after the start of the trial.

THE COURT: Is it after the start of the trial he's going to London?

MR. KEYES: Yes.

1

2

3

4

B

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Well, in Washington, D. C., or at THE COURT: the White House or any other place that is convenient to the President for the reason that it may be possible to schedule a hearing on this in some place where he is making a speech or doing something, going about his business in some place other than Washington, D. C. That schedule can be established, that time and place can be established, and it may be necessary that instead of going to Washington, D. C., you could go to Kansas City or Los Angeles, or wherever the President might happen to be. The equipment should not be in the least bit difficult to obtain. Video tapes, we witnessed this the other day when we saw the motion picture "Manson" here, which was an extremely simple device, the whole movie being in a cassette for that was simply shoved into a device, and there it was on TV right in front of us. It was almost a marvel to see the way

they were able to Go it. Certainly with sound movies and the like nowadays, there shouldn't be any great difficulty in taking the President's deposition.

3.

- 53

All right. Now that I've made this order, let's get set on a time. This trial is to commence on Tuesday, November the 4th, which is exactly two weeks from today. I would think that this deposition should be taken within 10 days. That's going to be my temporary order, that the deposition will be taken within 10 days.

In the meantime, Mr. Keyes and Mr. Virga and Miss Fremme, I would think that you'll simply have to try to work this out. Undoubtedly now that I have made the order, Mr. Keyes, obviously you're going to be in immediate touch with the Justice Department and with the White House to determine what will be the least onerous from the standpoint of time and place that the deposition can be taken. Then, of course, I can't say that we're home free yet for the reason that the President and his counsel may object to this. If they do, it would be necessary, of course, that we have further hearings on the matter. But I would think that the order that I've made would be the least objectionable to the President and to his legal counsel. I would hope that they would abide by the order, the subpoena, and permit the President's deposition to be taken.

MR. KEYES: Who will be present at the deposition

DENNIS F. MCKINNON CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER SACRAMENTO Your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, Miss Fromme will not be present.

I would not consent to Miss Fromme going back for the taking of the deposition.

Sorry about that, Miss Fromme. Mr. Virga certainly will very ably represent you at the taking of the deposition.

You and Mr. Heller or either of you, or if you want the deposition to be taken by someone of the Justice Department, that's up to you. But I think that Mr. Virga can take the deposition by himself.

MR. VIRGA: May I direct a comment to the Court?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VIRCA: Will you be there? I would prefer you be there to make rulings on any objections that might come up. I don't want to be in the situation where we go back there and take his deposition and be's instructed by his counsel not to answer a question, or the U. S. Attorney feels a question should not be answered, or I feel it is a vague and ambiguous question. I think we need somebody there to make a ruling. I think if this deposition is going to be taken, that it should have all the atmosphere the Court provides and it should be just a supplemental to this trial with you there, your Honor. I would also request, since the U. S. Attorney has indicated that at the conclusion of his case he is going to turn over all statements, I request that before I depose the President I.

ment so I know what he has to say before I depose him.

THE COURT: You're seeking to call the President as one of your witnesses.

MR. VIRGA: I know that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This is a defense witness.

MR. VIRGA: I understand that.

B

THE COURT: Although he may be an adverse witness, you are calling him as one of your witnesses in your case.

MR. VIRGA: That is right. If we were to proceed in the orderly procedure in the trial, the U. S. Attorney's Office or the Government would have completed their case by the time I get to the President, and I would have copies of all the statements and be able to hear all the other witnesses who would testify in this case. They would have rested before I called the President. I wouldn't know what questions to ask and exactly how to proceed with a particular witness who I feel may very well be the most significant witness in this case.

THE COURT: Mr. Keyes.

MR. KEYES: Your Honor, as far as the deposition is concerned, it does provide in Rule 15(d) that the deposition may be taken in any manner provided for in civil actions, then the Court may request of a defendant they be directed to take a deposition on written interrogatories.

MR. VIRGA: That's in a civil action, isn't it, Your Bonor?

MR. KEYES: This is under Rule 15 in the Rules of Criminal Procedure.

taken. I'm not going to impugn his integrity in any way and charge him with the idea of sensationalism in this case. I have great confidence in him; and that's not his purpose here. Bis purpose is obvious. The President is in this particular case, is probably the most percipient witness there is to this. He's the man that was looking right down the barrel of the gun. In this case, he is, in a way -- with all due respect to the President, I don't mean to be disrespectful -- but he is no different than the poor, little girl who is the teller of a bank who looks down the barrel when somebody holds up a bank. He is the most percipient witness.

MR. KEYES: What is the motion before us now?

THE COURT: Well, the motion before us now is that he be furnished -- you should have been listening to this one. Mr. Keyes, it's pretty tough. He wants the identity of all the witnesses that you're going to present and the testimony that they're going to give before he goes back to take the deposition of the President.

MR. KEYES: We have had the discovery motions, the Court has ruled on it. I believe there are cases within the

cases cited in Rule 17(b) and (c) that say the issuance of a subpoena is not to be used as a means for discovery. Now, the Court has ordered the deposition, obviously --

(3

1.4

15.

THE COURT: Well, we'll go from the second to the first. He made two requests, one is that I be present at the taking of the deposition. The second one was that you should be required to furnish all the names of all of your witnesses and also their testimony. The latter request will be denied. I don't see the necessity for it in this case. You're going to take his deposition, you'll know what he is going to say. You can cross-examine him to your heart's content, provided that the White House doesn't interpose an objection that I would have to sustain. But anyway, you are going to be able to examine him at length on this incident. I don't think there's any need for your being given the names of the Government's witnesses or their testimony. That request is denied.

Now, as to the request that I be there. I'm perfectly willing to be there. I'm starting a bank robbery case -- I started it 45 minutes ago, frankly.

My Clerk has just suggested that I could preside here in Sacramento and that it would be like a three-way conversation on the telephone. In other words, I could be here but I could view the whole thing and could make my rulings from here as I view the deposition being taken, whether it be in Kansas City or Washington, D. C.

That would certainly be a first, Mr. Fitzpatrick, 1 and I commend you for the idea. 2 MR. VIRGA: I would much prefer that you simply go 3 with us and make the rulings there. 4 I appreciate your feelings. 5 THE COURT! Your Honor. B MR. KEYES: 7 THE COURT: Yes. On this particular issue, perhaps the 8 MR. KEYES: Court would like to reserve it until I find out the position 3 of the White House and the schedule. Then, of course --10 I think we'll do that, Mr. Virga. I think 11 THE COURT: it would be well if I could be back there, but at the same time 12 I think that I better reserve this. I have this trial starting, 13 Judge Halbert is selecting the jury right now, I'll probably 14 take it as soon as we finish here today. 15 There was one other matter, Your Honor. MR. VIRGA: 16 know there's another matter. I want THE COURT: I 17 the deposition taken within 10 days, that would be by the 30th. 18 Let's just see how it goes. I'm not going to guarantee that I 19 will go back there at the present time, we'll see what we can 20 work out. But at least for the time being, my order will be 21 that the deposition be taken within 10 days and it be taken 22 on video tape, either in Washington or at some other place 23

that's more convenient to the President, and that Mr. Virga

be present, and whatever counsels the Government wants to

24

25

provide for the taking of the deposition. If I can't be present, it would be my intention to ask that some other U. S. District Judge, possibly we could have one of the District Judges in Washington, D. C., sit in for the taking of the deposition, or a U. S. District Judge wherever the deposition is to be taken. That will be the order on that one.

Now, as you say --

MR. VIRGA: Are you going to set a time and date for your final ruling on that, Your Honor?

THE COURT: For my final ruling on the question --

MR. VIRGA: Yes.

THE COURT: I can give you an answer on this.

Shouldn't we be able to answer this by this Friday, Mr. Keyes?

MR. KEYES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sure you'll be on the phone, maybe not today but certainly tomorrow. We ought to get an answer on this by Friday.

MR. VIRGA: Will it be necessary for us to be in court on that day?

THE COURT: Probably we should be in court, I think.

If we can avoid being in court, I would sure like to avoid it,

because I want to press this other trial as fast as I can so

we can be ready to try this case on the 4th. So for the time

being, let's schedule it for Friday morning at 9:30 with the

hope that possibly we'll be able to resolve the whole thing.

simply by telephone and possibly in chambers, a conference or something.

MR. VIKGA: Could that possibly be Friday afternoon?

I was supposed to be in San Francisco on a motion to continue

a case there.

THE COURT: Would 1:30 Friday afternoon be all right?

MR. VIRGA: That's fine.

THE COURT: Will you be back by then?

MR. VIRGA: I'm certain 1 will. If not, I'll call the Court and advise you.

deposition, assuming that we are successful in getting the deposition, assuming that we are successful in getting a video tape, that video tape will then go into the possession of the clerk, much the same as an original deposition. A transcript could be easily prepared. Well, as a matter of fact, in order that he'll know exactly how he's going to testify, regardless of how he looks when he testifies, you could have a Court Reporter there who would take down verbatim what he says in addition to how he sounds and looks over the tape. I would suggest that you get yourself a transcript back there. Do you follow me, Mr. Keyes? Then you'd have that available to you.

MR. VIRGA: What do you mean get a transcript there?
You mean ak that it be transcribed there?

DENNIS F. McKINNON CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER SACRAMENTO

1	THE COURT: What I'm saying is, this video tape itself
2	will go into the possession of the Clerk's office just as any
3	
4	MR. VIRGA: You are talking about a Court Reporter?
5	THE COURT: I'm talking also about having a Court
6	Reporter when the deposition is taken, then get a transcript
7	from the Court Reporter of what the President says so that it
8	will be available to you if you need to study it. Needless to
9	say, I'd just as soon save expense of the Government, but at
10	least I make that suggestion to you, if you think you need it.
11	MR. VIRGA: I assume a Court Reporter would be
12	present.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? Now, you have
14	another motion?
15	MR. VIRGA: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Is that your motion or Miss Fromme's?
17	MR. VIRGA: Miss Fromme will be arguing that motion.
18	THE COURT: All right. Miss Fromme, you have a motion
19	to make?
20	MISS FROMME: This is a motion to continue, Your
21	Honor. I submit that.
22	THE COURT: You have a motion to continue and you
23	submit it.
24	MISS FROMME: Yes.
25	THE COURT: Any objection? Do you wish to respond?

MR. KEYES: Yes, Your Honor. The trial date was set approximately six weeks ago, and it was agreeable at that time. In fact, I believe the defendant stated on at least one occasion in court she was very interested in a speedy trial herself. The legislative history of the speedy trial act, Senator Ervin heard much testimony. In fact, he heard testimony against it from many defense attorneys, prosecutors, and from the Judicial Office of the courts, because they felt they had a rule that was workable now. But it was the interest of Congress that it is not only all of the participants in the courtroom who are interested in a speedy trial, but it is the public, they wanted trials to be tried as soon as they could after the arraignment. So we would oppose a continuance and ask that we hold to the date of November the 4th.

B

1.1

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Miss Fromme?

DEFENDANT FROMME: Well, Your Honor, you know my

argument, you know my reasons for wanting a continuance.

THE COURT: Yes, I do.

DEFENDANT FROMME: I don't feel I need to argue.

THE COURT: I'll state, then, into the record, Miss

Fromme has advised me the reason she wants a continuance is

because her new counsel has turned over to her a great number

of papers that she hasn't had an opportunity to read. She

felt that during the period she was represented by the Federal

Defender, that there wasn't sufficient work done in preparation

DENNIS F. McKINNON CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER SACRAMENTS



for her trial. I find that initially when this date was set, I gave her the choice of either November the 4th or November the lith, and on the record she stated that she preferred November the 4th because we want to get this over with as soon as possible.

1

2:

3

\$

5

6.

27

8

3

10

13

12

13.

14

15

18

17

13

13

30

21

53

23

24

25

I have observed from the time that Mr. Walker and Mr. Holley first came into the case they were working all of the time, they made all the appearances, they made their appropriate arguments, and the matters in connection with your visitation privileges, your right to have witnesses come and see you, your obtaining certain facilities at the jail and so forth, all of those things were done for you with alacrity on the part of the Federal Defender. I'm satisfied that you were adequately represented by him up to the time Mr. Virga has taken over the case. I've heard nothing to indicate that Mr. Virga is not ready to go to trial on the 4th. Furthermore, I think the longer this trial draws out, the more chance there is for unfortunate publicity to get into the newspapers. As it is now, I think we're rolling along quite well. impossible to keep a low profile on a case like this, but nevertheless, I think we kept as low a profile on this case as is possible to do. I think that to take the chance of going beyond November 4th prejudices the possibility of our getting a fair and speedy trial, a fair trial for you, a fair trial for the Government and a speedy trial in the sense that it will

that have not been too exposed to those matters that from time to time, unfortunately, appear in the news media. We're set to go to trial, I think we can do it notwithstanding some difficulty we may have in connection with this order I made today in asking to take the President's deposition. I still think we can make it, and I'm going to hold to it. It is my present intention to go ahead with the trial commencing at 10:00 o'clock on November the 4th. The defendant is ordered back for trial at that time.

This is the time for a trial confirmation hearing, but it's obvious to me this case is going to trial November 4th, having just ordered it. All right.

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, DEMNIS F. McKINNON, Official Reporter, certify
that the foregoing 43 pages constitute a true and correct
transcript of the matter thereis contained as reported by me
and thereafter reduced to typewriting to the best of my ability.

20

2

3.

6

É.

PAF

100

1

10

11

13

13

14

25

13

17

18

19

21

5.5

2:3

24

25

---000---

R. FOROLIS

CSR Lic. No. C 2223