

## COMPLICITY IN BRIBING DENIED BY BOTH SIDES

Los Angeles, Nov. 29.—“They say this is a damned frame-up. Well, let the man that owns this \$4,000—a fair sum of money—come forward and prove his property, and if it was not used to try to bribe a prospective juror I will give it to him.”—District Attorney Fredricks.

“The only real information I have has been from the newspaper men. I have no knowledge of any attempt at bribery; in fact, not even the suggestion, and, everybody that knows me knows how futile this story is. But then, what can we expect? We told our friends what would come before we went into this trial. I will show my check-books and accounts if the District Attorney will say when and where this particular money was drawn.”—Clarence Darrow.

“Any man who says I would frame anybody is a liar. I got these men with the goods.”—Samuel L. Browne, chief of Fredricks' secret service.

“This is a frame-up and I will prove it. Wait until the truth is told.”—Lecompte Davis, of the McNamara defense.

While both sides deny any complicity in a job, the fact remains today that there is \$4,000 in actual cash in the safe in District Attorney Fredricks' safe without an owner, the state alleging it was used to bribe a prospective juror in the case of James B. McNamara, accused of murder in connection with the

destruction of the Los Angeles Times.

The defense charges point blank that the money was contributed by the Merchants and Manufacturers' association to discredit them, McNamara's lawyers, on the eve of opening the trial.

Yesterday's sensational developments completely eclipsed the regular routine in the case, which continued before Judge Bordwell today, and whispers that will not down declare the end is not yet in sight.

District Attorney Fredricks is known to be considering demanding that a new grand jury be summoned immediately. If that be done, it will not be necessary to take the charges against Bert Franklin, chief investigator for the defense, who is accused of trying to bribe C. N. Lockwood, a prospective juror, before a committing magistrate immediately.

The grand jury could indict every one connected with the defense and retain possession of the indictments until the present trial ends, then hand them up.

On the other hand, should Franklin be forced to put in a defense before a committing magistrate then it would be an easy matter for the defense to compel the state to tell most of what it knows about the alleged bribery.

Meanwhile the question of bribery is entering into the interrogation of jurors. Talesman Haskell, under examination when court convened today, was asked point blank by Horton whether