

wit: I am placing in the right-hand margin the words, "Dallas, Texas, the date May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 5, deposition of Capt. Glen D. King," and I am signing my name below that and I am initialing the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh and the eighth pages by placing my initials in the lower right-hand corner.

I have not read this Exhibit No. 5—do you know if there is anything in it that was omitted from the speech?

Captain KING. Not from the speech proper. Actually, I think there are no inconsistencies between this and the speech. There might have been some things said in the prepared text that I didn't say there, and I think there was, or vice versa, but I think there are no inconsistencies.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, in any case, the contents of Exhibit No. 5, whether or not spoken by you at the time you made your speech, represents your views in any case?

Captain KING. That's correct.

Mr. HUBERT. All right, sir, I think that is all. Thank you very much, Captain, and we appreciate it.

Captain KING. Thank you—I appreciate this opportunity to speak with you.

TESTIMONY OF C. RAY HALL

The testimony of C. Ray Hall was taken at 2 p.m., on May 28, 1964, in the office of the U.S. attorney, 301 Post Office Building, Byran and Ervay Streets, Dallas, Tex., by Mr. Leon D. Hubert, Jr., assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. HUBERT. This is the deposition of Mr. C. Ray Hall.

Mr. Hall, my name is Leon D. Hubert. I am a member of the advisory staff of the general counsel of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy. Under the provisions of Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963, issued by President Johnson, and the joint resolution of Congress No. 137, and the rules of procedure adopted by the President's Commission in conformity with the Executive order and the joint resolution, I have been authorized to take a sworn deposition from you. I state to you now that the general nature of the Commission's inquiry is to ascertain, evaluate, and report upon the facts relevant to the assassination of President Kennedy and the subsequent violent death of Lee Harvey Oswald. In particular, as to you, Mr. Hall, our inquiry today is to determine what facts you know about the death of Oswald, the interviews of Ruby, and any other pertinent facts that you may know about the general inquiry.

Mr. Hall, you appear today, I think, by virtue of a request made by Mr. J. Lee Rankin, General Counsel of the staff of the President's Commission to Mr. Hoover, and I suppose through Mr. Shanklin that you appear before me to take a deposition.

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Under the rules adopted by the Commission, all witnesses are entitled to 3 days' written notice prior to the taking of their deposition, but the rules also provide that a witness may waive that 3-day written notice if he wishes to do so, and I ask you now—do you desire to waive that 3-day written notice?

Mr. HALL. I will consent to waive the 3-day written notice for appearance before the Commission's representative.

Mr. HUBERT. Will you rise, please, so that I may administer the oath?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give here will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HALL. I do.

Mr. HUBERT. Will you state your full name?

Mr. HALL. C. Ray Hall.

Mr. HUBERT. How old are you, Mr. Hall?

Mr. HALL. 45.

Mr. HUBERT. Where do you live?

Mr. HALL. Dallas, Tex.

Mr. HUBERT. What is your occupation?

Mr. HALL. I am a special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. HUBERT. How long have you been so employed?

Mr. HALL. Over 21 years.

Mr. HUBERT. And how long have you been stationed in the Dallas office area?

Mr. HALL. Almost 8 years.

Mr. HUBERT. Did I ask you your house residence?

Mr. HALL. I live at 6542 Ellsworth in Dallas, Tex.

Mr. HUBERT. Mr. Hall, were you in Dallas on the 24th of November 1963?

Mr. HALL. I was.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you have occasion on that date to interview or speak to a man by the name of Jack Ruby?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you know him prior to that date?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Would you tell us the circumstances under which you did talk to him? That is to say, how you were assigned the place, time, and so forth?

Mr. HALL. I was in the office of the chief of police in Dallas, Tex., at approximately 12:35 p.m. on November 24, 1963, when I received a telephone call from the special agent in charge of the FBI in Dallas, Tex., Mr. J. Gordon Shanklin, who instructed me to interview Jack Ruby.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you have to secure the permission of the chief to do so, just tell us what happened after that?

Mr. HALL. I immediately contacted the chief of police, Jesse Curry, and advised him that I would like to interview Jack Ruby.

Mr. HUBERT. You were in the same building at the time—you were in his office, the chief of police's office?

Mr. HALL. I was in his office at the time I received the telephone call.

Mr. HUBERT. And he was in there too?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. So, you were able to talk to him immediately?

Mr. HALL. Yes; well, actually, I took the phone call outside of his office, just outside of his office. I went into his office and explained to him that I would like to talk to Jack Ruby. Chief Curry stepped outside his office where a uniformed officer was and instructed this officer to take me immediately to where Jack Ruby was, and instructed the officers there on duty that I was to interview Jack Ruby immediately.

Mr. HUBERT. And where was Jack Ruby, then, when you first saw him?

Mr. HALL. Jack Ruby was in a cell in the city jail at Dallas, Tex.

Mr. HUBERT. Was he interviewed in that cell or elsewhere?

Mr. HALL. He was in a cell block area, by that I mean, there was an outer door and then a series of cells, with a hallway in between and he was the only occupant in that cell block area, the only prisoner being held in that area. There was a table and some chairs in the space between the front of the cells.

Mr. HUBERT. In the hallways?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir; Ruby came outside to the table and we sat at the table during the time I interviewed him.

Mr. HUBERT. And your interview must have begun, then, about 5 minutes later, you suppose?

Mr. HALL. My interview with Jack Ruby commenced at 12:40 p.m. on November 24, 1963.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you know who else was present at the time you first went in?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Who was that?

Mr. HALL. Detective T. D. McMillon [spelling] M-c-M-i-l-l-o-n, of the auto theft bureau was seated in front of the cell where Ruby was sitting at the time I walked in. Just a few minutes later another detective named B. S. Clardy [spelling] C-l-a-r-d-y, from the auto theft bureau of the Dallas Police Depart-

ment came in. A uniformed officer, K. H. Haake [spelling] H-a-a-k-e, Badge No. 1107, was on guard duty at the outer door of the cell block.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, did those three persons you have mentioned remain within the sight and hearing of your interviewing of Jack Ruby throughout the whole time, from the beginning to the end?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, maybe we would be better to get the change of personnel first before we get into the statement. Could you clarify that—for instance—if McMillon left and someone else took his place and Clardy left, if you have a notation of that it will be helpful.

Mr. HALL. Officer Haake was some distance away at the outer door. He was present there but I doubt seriously if he heard the complete interview.

Mr. HUBERT. Was he inside or outside the outer door?

Mr. HALL. He was outside.

Mr. HUBERT. Outside the outer door?

Mr. HALL. Yes; Detectives McMillon and Clardy were present up until 3:15 p.m. when Jack Ruby was taken to the office of Capt. Will Fritz, the homicide and robbery bureau of the Dallas Police Department. After Ruby came back upstairs to the jail from the interview with Captain Fritz, apparently Detectives McMillon and Clardy had gone off duty and from that time on I was alone with Ruby in that cell block area interviewing him.

Mr. HUBERT. There was, then, sort of an interruption of your interviewing?

Mr. HALL. Yes; there were interruptions.

Mr. HUBERT. How long did this interruption take, so that we might, for instance, fix the time when the second part of this began, if you are able to help us on that?

Mr. HALL. There was more than one interruption, yes, sir; and I first entered the cell where Ruby was confined at 12:40 p.m. on November 24, 1963. Ruby conferred with Attorney Tom Howard from 1:58 p.m. to 2:02 p.m. He was then examined by Dr. Fred A. Bieberdorf (spelling) B-i-e-b-e-r-d-o-r-f, at 2:06 p.m. and I interviewed Ruby again from 2:24 p.m. until 3:15 p.m. I then returned to interviewing Jack Ruby from 4:30 until 5:30 p.m.

Mr. HUBERT. And at 5:30 p.m. your interviewing was over with?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. And, as I understand it, then McMillon and Clardy were there from the time you began at 12:40 until the time you first stopped, that is, at 2:24, roughly?

Mr. HALL. McMillon and Clardy were actually with me from 12:40 until 3:15, because at the time Ruby was taken down to another floor to talk with his attorney and be examined by the doctor, McMillon, Clardy and I all went to the floor where he was taken, so we were all together all during that time from 12:40 p.m. until 3:15 p.m.

Mr. HUBERT. Then, you reinterviewed him for another hour, from 4:30 to 5:30?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, from 3:15 to 4:30 he was being interviewed by Captain Fritz?

Mr. HALL. He was interviewed by Captain Fritz and then he was arraigned before Justice of the Peace Pierce McBride on a charge of shooting and killing Lee Harvey Oswald. Then he was returned to the fifth floor of the jail where he was searched by the jailers and given a white shirt and trousers as jail clothing and then returned to his cell. That is what occurred between 3:15 p.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Mr. HUBERT. Were you present during that period, 3:15 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, you were with Ruby all the way through?

Mr. HALL. Yes; I was with Ruby from 12:40 p.m. until 5:30 p.m. I did not participate in the interview by Captain Fritz, nor did I participate in any search of Ruby's things, but I was present.

Mr. HUBERT. But you were present?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. When you first went there, you found McMillon and Clardy?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. And Mr. Sorrels of the Secret Service was not there?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Mr. Dean was not there, I believe, of the Dallas Police Department—P. T. Dean—only the two of them?

Mr. HALL. Those two officers were the only ones present, and Officer Haake was at an outer door. Mr. Sorrels of the Secret Service was in Captain Fritz' office during the time that Ruby was being interviewed down there.

Mr. HUBERT. But he was not present when you interviewed him?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Let me ask you this general question: first of all, did you or anyone in your presence, threaten Jack Ruby, offer him any promises of help, take any action or do anything to affect the voluntary nature of what he said?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Is it your opinion that what Jack Ruby told you was completely voluntary?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir. At 12:45 p.m. on November 24 I advised Jack Ruby at the beginning of the interview that he was not required to make any statement, that he had a right to talk with an attorney before making any statement and that any statements he made could be used against him in a court of law.

Mr. HUBERT. And he indicated he understood what that meant?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he ask for any attorney?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. How did Mr. Howard get into the matter; do you know?

Mr. HALL. I was interviewing Jack Ruby when one of the jailers, a uniformed officer that I did not know, came in and said that an attorney was downstairs and wanted to talk with Jack Ruby. I told him that Jack was available immediately to go talk with his attorney. Jack was wearing only a pair of shorts. The officers produced his clothing, gave him a shirt, trousers, his shoes, and then after dressing, he went downstairs and then talked to Mr. Howard.

Mr. HUBERT. You went with him too?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir; I went with him too. Ruby did not know who the attorney was.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he recognize him when he saw him? I mean, did he say anything or do anything to indicate he did?

Mr. HALL. I don't know—Ruby walked over to a door where there was a screen where people can confer with prisoners and I was at the back of the room and I did not hear any of the conversation. They had a private talk—Ruby and Mr. Howard had a private talk.

Mr. HUBERT. Through the usual accommodations for attorneys-clients?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. They are separated by a screen?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir; and I stayed with the other officers and we were back. I knew Mr. Howard personally, I knew who he was, but whether Jack Ruby did or not, I do not know.

Mr. HUBERT. And that was, as I understand it, between 1:58 and 2:02?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Or just about 6 minutes?

Mr. HALL. Four minutes.

Mr. HUBERT. Four minutes—and then he was brought back up?

Mr. HALL. The jail doctor, Dr. Fred A. Bieberdorf, was in the jail area and had apparently been there on other business, and one of the officers, I don't recall whether it was McMillon or Clardy, asked the doctor to look at Jack Ruby while he was there.

Mr. HUBERT. And when was that finished?

Mr. HALL. We returned to the floor above there, the fifth floor, and they—the police officers removed the clothing that had been given Jack and he was returned back to where he was wearing his shorts. Then, I started interviewing him again.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, this has been clarified to some extent already, but I would like to clarify it a bit further. Prior to doing so, let me mark the documents—I'm going to refer to for identification. I have marked the document which

purports to be a report of an interview by you, Mr. Hall, of Jack Ruby taken on November 24, 1963, appearing in the Clements' report of November 30, 1963, at pages 160, 161, 162, and 163.

We are identifying that document on the first page as follows: I have written into the right-hand margin the words, "Dallas, Texas, May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 1 of the deposition of C. Ray Hall," and I have signed it "Leon D. Hubert, Jr.," and I have marked the next page of that document, being page 161, with my initials in the lower right-hand corner and the same with pages 162 and 163.

The other document also purports to be a report of an interview by you of Jack Ruby, dated, on the face of it, November 25, 1963. I have marked that document on the first page with the following: "Dallas, Texas, May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 2 of the deposition of C. Ray Hall, Leon D. Hubert." This document with the successive pages also appears in the Clements' report of November 30, 1963, pages 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, and as to each of those pages, I have identified them for the purpose of this deposition by marking my initials in the lower right-hand corner.

Now, there has already been clarification, as you know, concerning the date on this Exhibit No. 2, that this was really an interview of November 24 rather than November 25.

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. That is to say, they are both November 24?

Mr. HALL. Yes; that was a typographical error.

Mr. HUBERT. Yes; that was a typographical error and that has been clarified.

What I would like to have clarified now was whether or not these two documents, and which actually appear in different places in the Clements' report, and to which I have given two exhibit numbers, really are a composite of the same interview, or does one of them refer to the first half, such as you have described it, and another to the other half? In other words, your interview was interrupted, you see, and I don't know whether this is a composite of all of it or whether one of them deals with that first half, which went from 12:40 or 12:44 to 3:15 p.m. and the other part from 4:30 to 5:30 p.m., just how it came to be—that there were two separate documents?

Mr. HALL. These two documents are a composite of the entire interview. The reason they were divided is for reporting purposes. By that, I mean, that the first document relates to the events that happened.

Mr. HUBERT. And by that "the first document" would you use by identification the exhibit numbers I have given them—which one do you mean by "the first"? The first one in Clements', of course, is Exhibit No. 2, as far as physical position is concerned, because it runs from page 13 to page 18 of the first volume of the Clements' report of November 30.

Mr. HALL. Your exhibit number here is wrong.

Mr. HUBERT. That's Commission Document No. 4, you see?

Mr. HALL. And this is what [indicating]?

Mr. HUBERT. Well, this is Commission Document No. 4 too, but different volumes.

Mr. HALL. Commission Document No. 4, vol. 1, relates primarily to the event that happened involving Jack Ruby.

Mr. HUBERT. That has been identified by us as Exhibit No. 2 for this deposition.

Mr. HALL. Yes; Exhibit No. 1, which is Commission Document No. 4, vol. 2, relates to background information. In this report we tried to set up a section of the report dealing with the background of Ruby.

Another section dealing with the event surrounding the murder of Lee Harvey Oswald was set up, and it was for that reason that there were two separate reports of an interview here set out, but it was actually a composite of the information obtained during this time between 12:40 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. on November 24, 1963.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, I notice from your report and principally, for example, at the bottom of page 15 on Exhibit No. 2 that Ruby refused to answer certain things and would not say, for instance, how he got into the basement and why he brought his revolver and so forth. Do you recall, or is there any way you can tell us whether that denial on his part came before or after he was interviewed by his attorney, Mr. Howard?

Mr. HALL. Well—

Mr. HUBERT. I notice that you are referring to some notes; are those the notes that you took contemporaneously with the interviewing?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Have you a copy that will be available for introducing into the record?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. These are your entire notes on the transactions?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. You say there are two parts?

Mr. HALL. I have three copies of the same thing here for your benefit, Mr. Hubert. There are 3 pages there.

Mr. HUBERT. I understand; is this your entire notes?

Mr. HALL. This is an interview log in which I set forth the circumstances of the interview. These are not my notes on the actual interview. I do not have my notes of that interview. I took my notes and prepared these reports of the interview and I commenced the night following the interview and after that was typed up, then I destroyed the notes that I took at the time.

Mr. HUBERT. So, actually the running notes of the interviews themselves do not exist?

Mr. HALL. That's right.

Mr. HUBERT. That is, as I understand it, standard practice and the interview notes are destroyed after the report is made?

Mr. HALL. After the report of the interview has been prepared. In this case it was a matter of hours following that, and this represents my notes in effect because it was prepared from them.

Mr. HUBERT. It was prepared directly from them?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. And immediately—the same day?

Mr. HALL. Immediately afterwards; it probably actually was extended after midnight that night.

Mr. HUBERT. What you have handed me as being your notes is really a log?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir. It's a log showing the times, the date, who was present, and specifically the times and what happened.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, I'm going to mark it for the purpose of identification as follows: "Dallas, Texas, May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 4 of the deposition of C. Ray Hall." On the first page I am signing my name below that. There is a second page which I am initialing in the lower right-hand corner and a third page which I am initialing in the right hand corner, and Mr. Hall, you have been kind enough to supply me with two extra copies which I thank you for, but I will just mark the one for identification, and I think you have already testified concerning what it is.

Mr. HALL. Back to your previous question as to whether this denial on the part of Ruby was before or after his conference with an attorney, Mr. Tom Howard, I believe his conference with Mr. Howard was after that denial?

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, he had refused to tell you he got in, in effect?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Prior to having talked with Mr. Howard?

Mr. HALL. Yes; I based that on the time he went there, because his conference with Mr. Howard was almost 2 o'clock and there was only—a majority of the interview had been conducted before then.

Mr. HUBERT. Which was—an hour and 15 minutes it had been going on already?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Was he speaking freely to you?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, if you will refer again to what I have marked as Exhibit No. 2, I notice that Ruby at that time mentions a girl by the name of Karen Bennett of Fort Worth and about sending her a telegram. There is no mention in this report of having received a telephone call from her. Am I correct, then, in my assumption that he did not tell you that at that time?

Mr. HALL. He did not tell me that at that time.

Mr. HUBERT. I take it also that he did not tell you that the girl had called him

at that time—he did not tell you at that time that the girl had called him on the night before?

Mr. HALL. That's true. He did not tell me at that time.

Mr. HUBERT. Referring again to Exhibit No. 2 and page 15 thereof, in the very last paragraph, I wonder if you could clarify for us just what he meant there? You say that this is what Ruby advised you—"He said that sometime after sending the telegram he entered the basement building where the police department is located, entering from the Main Street side. Ruby did not wish to say how he got into the basement or at what time he entered."

We were a bit confused about that and wanted to get some clarification, because we don't know if he admitted then that he did go down the ramp, but didn't want to say anything more about it, or left any question open as to how he got in there. I mean, there is the possibility that there was another Main Street entrance that he could get in. As I understand it, really, he didn't deny, from what you gather, he went in through the ramp that goes down to the basement, but that is as far as he would go?

Mr. HALL. Yes; he would not give any details as to how he got in or what time—how he went about getting into the ramp to the basement from the Main Street side, but he did admit entering the basement from the Main Street side, and that ramp is the only way to get into it.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, I would like to show you another document which purports to be a report of an interview of Jack Ruby by you, Mr. Hall, and Mr. Clements—Manning C. Clements on December 12, 1963. For the purpose of identifying that document, as I understood your testimony about it later, I have marked it on the first page as follows: "Dallas, Texas, May 28, 1964, Exhibit No. 3, deposition of C. Ray Hall," and I have signed my name below that and I have marked each of the other pages with my initials in the lower right-hand corner. That document is the report of an interview of December 21, 1963, and runs from page 2 to the top of page 17 of the Clements' report of January 8, 1964.

Now, I would like you to tell us the circumstances of that interview, how it was arranged, who was present when it started and when it ended and so forth.

Mr. HALL. We had arranged for this interview with Mr. Melvin Belli, the attorney for Jack Ruby, who granted permission for this interview. The interview was held in an interview room located on floor 6-M of the Dallas County Jail in Dallas, Tex. Mr. Melvin Belli of San Francisco, Calif., Mr. Joe Tonahill of Jasper, Tex., Mr. Sam Brody of Los Angeles, Calif., and Mr. William Choulos, [spelling] C-h-o-u-l-o-s, of San Francisco, Calif., were present at the time Special Agent Manning C. Clements and I interviewed Jack Ruby.

Mr. Belli introduced Mr. Brody and Mr. Choulos as members of Mr. Belli's staff. This interview with Ruby commenced at 1:50 p.m. on December 21, 1963, and concluded at 5 o'clock p.m. on December 21, 1963.

Mr. HUBERT. Were the attorneys present all through that period, sir?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir; during the entire time.

Mr. HUBERT. Did they take part in the interview at all in any active way?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Did they make any suggestions or make any objections?

Mr. HALL. I recall that at the beginning of the interview with Jack Ruby I advised Mr. Ruby that he did not have to make any statements and that he was represented by his attorneys who were present at the time of the interview and that any statements he made during this interview could be used against him in a court of law. At that time Mr. Tonahill objected to that statement, that the statements could be used against him in a court of law, and advised me under the Texas law that Mr. Ruby was under arrest and that oral statements could not be used against him in the court of law and that he would not waive such rights, but he would consent to the interview and that Ruby would answer any questions, and Mr. Belli told Ruby to go ahead and answer any questions, and assured Mr. Ruby that he was present and would look after his interests and would be awake during the entire time of the interview.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you conduct this in sort of a question and answer form, or did you more or less tell him to tell it in his own story?

Mr. HALL. It was primarily in a question and answer form. However, in answering a question, sometimes Ruby would continue and answer the question

and continue furnishing other information and as long as he talked I just made notes and then asked other questions.

Mr. HUBERT. Mr. Clements was present the whole time too?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he make notes also?

Mr. HALL. We actually divided up this interview. I asked the questions during the first part, and in this Exhibit No. 3, page 12, at the beginning of the last paragraph on that page, Mr. Clements asked the questions and made the notes for the rest of this. That material preceding that, I asked the questions and made the notes.

Mr. HUBERT. What happened to the notes that you made and that Mr. Clements made?

Mr. HALL. As soon as I recorded this interview for my part of the interview on December 23, 1963, I destroyed my notes.

Mr. HUBERT. And that is in accordance with the standard procedure?

Mr. HALL. That is in accordance with the standard procedure.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know what he did with his?

Mr. HALL. No, sir; I don't.

Mr. HUBERT. If he followed the standard practice, he would have done the same thing too?

Mr. HALL. It is optional—he may have retained them, but it is not necessary for him to do so.

Mr. HUBERT. But you were present when he was interviewing and he was present when you were interviewing?

Mr. HALL. Yes; I was present—both of us were present during the entire interview from 1:50 p.m. until 5 o'clock p.m., except for about a minute—I stepped out to get a drink of water at the time Mr. Clements commenced his interview—just outside—and returned immediately.

Mr. HUBERT. I notice on page 12, which I think would have been as you described it, part of your interview, you have there what purports to be a direct quote in the sense that the language is contained in that middle paragraph in quotation marks?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Does that mean that you actually wrote those words down, or is that a paraphrase too?

Mr. HALL. I wrote his exact words down there.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, the fact that you put them in quotation marks in the report means you actually wrote the words down, and that is why you put quotation marks?

Mr. HALL. That's right; that's why I put the quotation marks.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, it was a paraphrase, in a sense of what he is telling you?

Mr. HALL. It is in the third person and the others were in the first person language; yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. When you put language in quotes that way, actually take it down, did you or did you here read it back to him?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. I guess he had to slow down or something so that you could get it, or were you using shorthand?

Mr. HALL. I used some shorthand, yes, sir; but primarily I was making actual notes. In something I thought was extremely pertinent, I took down his exact words.

Mr. HUBERT. Was this report ever shown to him or to his attorneys later?

Mr. HALL. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Mr. HUBERT. If you would refer to page 10 of Exhibit No. 3, that is to say, the interview of December 21, in the middle paragraph you will note that here Ruby does refer to a call from "Little Lynn," who has been identified as Karen Bennett, on the morning of November 24, and following that, there is a statement that he told you on Friday night, November 22, he had to give her \$5 so she could get home—is that what he told you?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. What I'm getting at, that is not a typographical error?

Mr. HALL. No, sir; because—I said, "Friday night," although that is what he told me, but if you will notice on page 1 of this exhibit when he is describing the incident where Little Lynn became sick, he said it was either on November 20 or November 21, so the exact days—it's possible that he was not sure of the exact dates, but this is what he told me.

Mr. HUBERT. That's what he told you? That's what I wanted to get straight.

Mr. HALL. That's what he told me because I had Friday, November 22, in my notes.

Mr. HUBERT. I think you appeared at the bond hearing in January and at that time apparently you were asked a series of questions relating to what Ruby had said to you about his activities on the morning of November 24, and you were asked whether he told you that he got up about 10, at least, ate breakfast, went downstairs and talked to his next door neighbor about building a dog fence. And then you asked to refer to your notes and they told you you could, but you said, "I don't have in my notes the time he got up." On the next page they had repeated that about the next door neighbor and the dog fence that they were talking about and then you stated, "He told me he talked to a next door neighbor. I don't recall him telling me about a fence." Now, did he mention who that neighbor was—is that the one that is referred to—

Mr. HALL. He referred to this next door neighbor as the father-in-law of Police Officer Buddy Munster.

Mr. HUBERT. And he said that he had talked to him but he didn't talk to him about a dog fence?

Mr. HALL. That was my testimony.

Mr. HUBERT. Yes.

Mr. HALL. That was my testimony which is recorded on there.

Mr. HUBERT. That's right; I just wanted to identify it with that.

Mr. HALL. With your exhibits here.

Mr. HUBERT. Your testimony when you said he did talk to you about a next door neighbor but you didn't recall him talking to you about a fence or a dog fence is actually a part of your report on page 10 of Exhibit No. 3, the very last paragraph?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. And it is a fact that he didn't say anything about a dog fence or talking to this man about a dog fence, but merely talking to him?

Mr. HALL. He just made this statement as he drove out of his driveway he stopped and talked to his neighbor, name unknown, but who is the father-in-law of Police Officer Buddy Munster.

Mr. HUBERT. And that's what you referred to; is that it?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir. If you wish to know who that neighbor was—he is Mr. J. Doyle Stokes or J. D. Stokes and he lives at 213 South Ewing. Now, Mr. Ruby did not give me that information.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you get a statement from him?

Mr. HALL. Yes; he was interviewed and you will find it in an interview under the name of Doyle Stokes.

Mr. HUBERT. He lives at 213 South Ewing Street and his real name is Jefferson D. Stokes; is that correct?

Mr. HALL. I'm not sure—his name is J. D. Stokes, I'm not sure whether the J. stands for Jefferson, but the D. stands for Doyle.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you testify at the trial on the merits too; that is to say, the main trial in February and March?

Mr. HALL. Of Ruby?

Mr. HUBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. No, sir; I was not subpoenaed.

Mr. HUBERT. They only called you for this bond hearing?

Mr. HALL. I was subpoenaed at several of the hearings, but this bond hearing is the only court hearing of any type that I actually testified in.

Mr. HUBERT. Was Mr. Clements called to your knowledge?

Mr. HALL. During the trial?

Mr. HUBERT. Yes.

Mr. HALL. I'm not positive, but I don't believe he testified during it or at any of the hearings.

Mr. HUBERT. Did any of the State officials confer with you for the purpose of using you as witnesses to what Ruby had told you?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know the reason why?

Mr. HALL. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. I think that's about all, Mr. Hall. Have you anything else you would like to add?

Mr. HALL. No, sir; I'll try to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. HUBERT. I don't think I have any more. That clarifies it all. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HALL. Thank you very much.

Mr. HUBERT. Mr. Hall, prior to the beginning of this deposition, you and I had not met in fact nor had we conversed in any way at all?

Mr. HALL. That's correct. As far as I know, I have never seen you before I entered this room.

Mr. HUBERT. I think we did speak about some of the acquaintances I knew many years ago in the FBI, but we did not speak about anything concerning this deposition at all?

Mr. HALL. No, sir; we had no conversation concerning this matter that you are connected with at anytime except during the time you were taking this deposition.

Mr. HUBERT. And so that all of our contact as to this whole matter has been a matter of record?

Mr. HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. That's all, and I thank you very much.

Mr. HALL. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF SETH KANTOR

The testimony of Seth Kantor was taken at 9:15 a.m., on June 2, 1964, at 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C., by Messrs Burt W. Griffin and Leon D. Hubert, Jr., assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Kantor, as you know, the Commission has been set up pursuant to an Executive order of President Johnson, and a joint resolution of Congress, which was enacted on November 29 of last year. The Commission has been directed to inquire into and evaluate the evidence with respect to the assassination of President Kennedy and the murder of Lee Harvey Oswald. We have asked you to come here today because, from the interview that you have provided to the FBI it appears that you would have some information which would bear upon the activities of Jack Ruby, and the events that transpired between the time the President was assassinated and the time that Ruby shot Oswald. I believe that you received a letter from us.

Mr. KANTOR. I did.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Can you state for the record when you received the letter?

Mr. KANTOR. I want to make sure. I am not sure whether it was Thursday or Friday morning. The letter was dated May 28. I received it on the 29th.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Under the rules of the Commission, you are entitled to receive a 3-day notice by mail, and I believe that has been complied with.

Mr. KANTOR. There is something in the letter, though, I would like to bring up. It says, "The Commission is authorized to pay you the same fees as are paid to witnesses whose depositions are taken in connection with"—et cetera. I want to waive any fee which would be connected with this.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All right. You are certainly entitled to it. It is minimal, I can assure you. Do you have any other questions that you want to ask before we get started?

Mr. KANTOR. No, none.