

GAME WARDEN ROY.

LUMPKIN TESTIFIES IN RICHARDSON CASE.

Richardson Will Not Produce Books—Lumpkin Denies That There Was Any Deal With Governor—Herbert Insistent That Records Be Produced as to Telegrams.

Columbia, Feb. 8.—The senate committee continued its hearing of the charges of the governor against A. A. Richardson, former chief game warden, yesterday, taking up the whole of the session with the cross examination of Mr. Richardson by Mr. Herbert, attorney for the governor. Only two features marked the session. Immediately upon the convening of the committee, M. C. Lumpkin appeared and made a statement before the committee, in regard to statements concerning him that had been made before the committee during the investigation. Another sensation was the calling to the attention of the committee, by Mr. Herbert, that a record which had been introduced by Mr. Richardson, failed to show the earmarks of age. This caused some excitement in the committee when Mr. Richardson attempted to explain the difference, and branded as a "liar" any person who insinuated otherwise. No blows were passed, but the sergeant at arms was called to keep order. Permission was requested of the committee for the entrance of C. N. Sapp, assistant attorney general, as counsel for Mr. Richardson.

Captain Lumpkin, in regard to the statements which had been made in the hearing yesterday concerning him, stated, in substance, as follows: That previous to the opening of the session of that year he had called at the office of the governor. He had been a Manning supporter and called to offer the governor his support again. He stated to the governor that he was very desirous of being placed on the ways and means committee, and he recalled that the governor told him that he did not have very much influence with the speaker, but would do his best for him.

Later in the conversation the governor stated to him that there were two measures in which he wanted his support on his veto. The governor had been courteous to him and he told the governor that he would support him. One of these was the game warden bill, the veto of which he supported. Later he was met by Mr. Richardson and asked why he had not supported him in the house, and he told Mr. Richardson that the force of the bill at the time of the promise did not strike him, but as he had promised he could only do as he had said he would. He desired to support Mr. Richardson for the reason, among others, that he was a neighbor and a friend of several years' standing.

These facts he cited to Mr. Richardson, and did not know that they were regarded differently until the statement in the paper this morning. The governor did not offer him a position on the judiciary committee in return for supporting his veto, but the remarks that he stated came up in the general conversation, and the promise that he made was in no way connected with the request for a place on the ways and means committee, as he did not know that the governor had the power of influencing the appointments. This statement, Mr. Lumpkin said, he made of his own free will and in fairness to himself.

Following this statement several questions were asked by Mr. Richardson of Mr. Lumpkin as to the statement mentioned in the answer to charges yesterday. Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Lumpkin if he did not have a conversation along this line with Dr. E. C. L. Adams, to which Mr. Lumpkin replied that he did not remember such a conversation, but it could have been nothing concerning an agreement with Governor Manning as no such an agreement had been made. Mr. Richardson also asked if he has not said in the judiciary committee room that Governor Manning had helped to put him on the committee, but that he was footloose and free to do as he pleased. Of this, Mr. Lumpkin said he had no recollection.

Mr. Lumpkin further stated that all that had come up in the office of Governor Manning was in the trend of general conversation, and that there had been no semblance of the trade mentioned.

The attorney for the governor then took up the cross examination where it had been left off the evening before. Mr. Herbert again requested that the committee have the financial records of the game warden's office brought before the committee, for the deciding of any point that might arise. Again Mr. Richardson declined to bring the voluminous records to the committee, stating as his reason that he was under bond for the safe delivery of those records to his legal successor, and that if

they were brought to the room and scattered about, he would ask to be relieved from his responsibility and bond.

The attorney for the governor then renewed his questioning of the item of the record of the Hutchinson case, which the committee adjourned for the purpose of allowing Mr. Richardson to obtain from his office yesterday. The cause concerned the disposal of a fine of \$50 which was not shown on the report of the office.

Mr. Richardson produced the copy of the file, showing the recording of the case, which was included in an unitemized remittance from his office to the comptroller general. The reason why the name of Mr. Hutchinson did not appear was given by Mr. Richardson as follows:

That M. B. Hutchinson, B. F. Taylor and T. T. Hyde, Jr., with two others had been apprehended in Dorchester county in the act of killing game out of season by Deputy Warden Sloan. Owing to the fact that some of the parties held official positions in the Audubon Society, and Mr. Hutchinson's position with the Clyde Line Company, the parties came to the game warden's office to ask that the publicity of a court process and the names be suppressed and assurance was given by the chief game warden that it would. Whereupon they were asked to pay the amount of \$10 each, or \$50 in all, which was done and a receipt taken.

Mr. Hutchinson was called to the stand by Mr. Richardson and asked to verify the statement made, which he did. On cross examination, however, he stated that he did not know whether a warrant was issued or not, but he did know that none was served on him. That he was asked to put up no bond but to pay a fine of \$10. Mr. Richardson then introduced the correspondence of the office with Deputy Sloan of Charleston. A great sensation was caused when Mr. Herbert said that "he would not be true to his duty as an attorney if he did not call to the attention of the committee the fact that the writing which was done in pencil was not as old as other papers in the same file which had presumably been written at the same time. Furthermore the holes punched in the top of the sheet for filing purposes were not similar placed."

Mr. Richardson took exception to this, and stated that the file offered was bona fide in every respect and was taken within 15 minutes after the case had been heard in his office, and that any person who said or insinuated otherwise "lies." Mr. Herbert resented the epithet, and after some words between them the chairman of the committee was forced to call for the sergeant-at-arms to preserve order.

In regard to the \$50 fine which had been collected Mr. Richardson stated that it had been sent to the comptroller general in a monthly remittance of \$195. This account was not itemized and no mention was made of the individual item for the reason of evading publicity. There was no record in the office of the game warden to show the whereabouts of this sum, except the checks and stubs of the voucher book. He further stated that he had kept no record of individual accounts of fines and cases for his office, but that was filed in the office of the comptroller general. Mr. Herbert again asked that the committee request that the records of the office be turned over to the committee, which, after much discussion, was refused on the part of Mr. Richardson's attorneys. They did agree, however, to get any specific record for which Mr. Herbert might inquire.

The item covering the automobile hire was then taken up by the attorney for the governor, and Mr. Richardson stated under cross examination that after the refusal of the assembly to furnish the requested machines, under advice from the attorney general he had purchased machines of his own, which he rented to the department at so much a day. That this price charged was \$7.50, but the upkeep in each case had been paid by him personally. When asked by the attorney if these claims against the department for the hire of his own machines did not have to be paid by him, he admitted that they did. The attorney then asked where the records of the amounts paid were listed. Mr. Richardson stated that such an account was not kept in his office. Mr. Herbert also asked if he rented any machines from the Carolina Saxson Company in Columbia in 1916. Mr. Richardson stated that he had, and while he did not remember exactly he thought the amount paid was about \$10 per day and that they had been rented altogether about one month. When asked if there was a record of this money being paid out by the office he replied that there was not, but his vouchers would show. He also stated in reply to questioning that he had rented machines from other people in the city, but did not remember the amounts paid, would have to look through the files of his vouchers for the correct amounts. Again Mr. Herbert requested the presence of the

financial records of the verification of evidence submitted.

Mr. Richardson then said that if he were given a list of the records wanted he would bring them down to the meeting tomorrow, and this list was given. Several such questions pertaining to the financial report of the office was asked and in each case the reply was the "I will tell you tomorrow." Again Mr. Herbert requested that the committee ask Mr. Richardson to produce the records, which was flatly refused by counsel for Mr. Richardson. The item of \$1,598, which the report of the office shows was expended by the office for auto and boat hire was placed in the examination and the question asked if the office had any records of these expenditures. The answer was the same, that all such information was contained in the vouchers and warrants which had been issued by the comptroller general.

Mr. Herbert then brought forward the telegrams which were mentioned in the statement of Governor Manning, and which Mr. Richardson stated were incorrect as those of a personal nature had been paid by his personal check. Mr. Herbert then called to the attention of the committee that Mr. Richardson had paid for the telegrams which he claimed he had settled with his "personal check," were paid for, only on the second day of the committee meetings. Further than that he brought out on cross examination that the statement made by the governor was correct, in that a statement signed by Mr. Richardson, had stated that the department owed the telegraph company \$87, and later Mr. Richardson had found several more telegrams. The cost of which amounted to \$4.54, which were of a personal nature, which reduced the amount still more. This Mr. Richardson explained by saying that he checked the bill the first time without a list of the messages, and thought that it was for one month, but found out later that the account was for two months, which, of course changed the statement just that much.

Mr. Herbert then went over the list of messages which had been put in evidence the first day and showing to the committee that several of the telegrams which were on the certified bill, recommended for payment by the department, contained some of a personal nature, and were not contained in those marked out by Mr. Richardson. This the former chief game warden claimed occurred by reason of the fact that the Western Union had failed to obey his instructions in regard to separating the telegrams of his office on private business from those of the department, after his term expired. Mr. Herbert then went over the list again and pointed out several that were marked out after the date of expiration among those that were marked out.

The committee then adjourned until this afternoon at the usual hour, at which time the cross examination will be continued, and Mr. Richardson will have a chance to produce the records, a list of which were given to him following the meeting yesterday, which are desired by the attorney for the governor, in lieu of the financial record which Mr. Richardson has declined to bring in.

Columbia, Feb. 9.—The senate committee reached the conclusion of the Richard investigation yesterday afternoon at 6 o'clock, after sessions extending over four days for a total of more than ten hours. The committee will now review the testimony submitted and in a short time make its recommendation to the senate. The last day of the investigation was taken up in the further cross examination of Mr. Richardson, and the introducing of new testimony on the part of the attorney for the governor. The attorneys for Mr. Richardson entered a flat refusal to bring any more of the records of the office before the committee, and stated that the committee was permitting too much latitude in the matter of evidence that was submitted, and that in the future the attorney for the governor would be asked to commit himself to the charges, stated in the veto message, as they felt that they had permitted too much extraneous matter already.

The effort of the attorney for the governor to demonstrate laxity in the office management of Mr. Richardson extended throughout the session yesterday, the telegrams and telephone bill were again brought before the committee. Mr. Herbert, on Thursday asked that Mr. Richardson produce some record from his office to show what salary was paid to C. H. Glaze, and what was the rate per diem. The list of various expenditures of this nature were given to Mr. Richardson following the adjournment of the committee. Yesterday when Mr. Herbert asked again for these records Mr. Richardson stated that he had misunderstood the question and according to the information that he had obtained from the stenographer, he was asked to bring the records for the year 1916 and that he had brought

those records. The records which were wanted by Mr. Herbert were for the first two months of 1917, when C. H. Glaze was employed as court stenographer, and also as clerk of the judiciary committee.

During the investigation this afternoon, Senator Sinkler of the judiciary committee, was called to make a statement before the committee in regard to the resolution which was passed by the judiciary committee keeping anyone but members from holding meetings in the committee room. Mr. Richardson rose to ask if this had meant as brought out by the attorney for the governor, him and his friends. To this Senator Sinkler stated they had been included, but that their names had not been mentioned at the time.

The investigation session was featured by the introduction of testimony by W. H. Gibbs, the governor's appointee for the office of chief game warden. There was much humor caused by the play of wits between the attorney for Mr. Richardson and Mr. Gibbs, several sallies of the witness on cross examination convulsing the room with laughter.

Upon the convening of the session Senator Bonham, for Mr. Richardson, made a statement to the committee in which he stressed the fact that so much new and irrelevant matter was introduced that the committee could adjourn immediately without losing any needed information as to the facts in the case. "It seems to me," stated Senator Bonham, "that the time of the committee is being taken up rambling around in a circle. The purpose of this investigation, as I understand it, is to clear the name of Mr. Richardson if the charges of Governor Manning against him can not be sustained. The committee has before it all information needed intelligently to render an opinion as to Mr. Richardson's integrity and manhood."

Senator Bonham referred the committee to the statement made by Mr. Herbert, attorney for the governor, on the day before wherein he stated that nothing that was said or done was in any manner to reflect on the honesty and integrity of Mr. Richardson. That, the attorney declared, had been the purpose of the investigation. He did not think "that the governor had refused to sign the bill under contention because the man then in office had gotten his personal and business telephone accounts mixed." He did not think "that the governor had vetoed the bill and stated the charges in the message because Mr. Richardson had hired this man or that to run a motorboat."

"The time of all of us is valuable," stated the attorney, "and all that we ask of this investigation is that Mr. Richardson be given a clean bill of health. There is no need of personal feeling in the matter. Men with the best intentions often run afoul in the discharge of their duty, in matters of public interest. Is it necessary to further go into the petty details of Mr. Richardson's office, and if so where will it end?"

When asked by Mr. Herbert if he asked that the investigation be dropped, Senator Bonham stated that it was up to the committee. Mr. Herbert then took the position that as Mr. Richardson had courted the investigation that it would be stopped on his request for such a procedure.

The governor had no desire to carry it on against Mr. Richardson's wishes. Mr. Herbert then took up the questioning of the automobile account, saying that Mr. Bradley had stated that he had itemized the account in the office, and had also itemized the personal account of Mr. Richardson, which was not included in the itemized account of the State, and that the account had been paid by the State he had been led to believe by Mr. Bradley's statement.

Senator Bonham again took the floor and stated that for the benefit of the attorney and the committee he wanted to state, and for which statement he took full responsibility, that the counsel for Mr. Richardson absolutely refused to allow the bringing in of any more of the records of Mr. Richardson's office. He stated that the matter had been placed in the hands of Mr. Richardson by the committee when they ruled that it was a matter of what Mr. Richardson cared to do about it.

Mr. Richardson then stated that he had not asked for the investigation because Governor Manning had charged him with dishonesty, or because he had cast reflections on the chief game warden, but that general reports that were going around the city and State it had become a widely spread rumor that if the office was investigated that a shortage would be found. He then asked for the investigation so that his reputation could be vindicated. "If I have made official mistakes I am sorry. I have made the department pay more than twice as much money as I spent. I claim the credit for having made it what it is today. If it is the will of the committee to go ahead I am not asking that the investigation stop."

Mr. Herbert then took up the letter

which Mr. Richardson had written to the State treasurer in regard to the Hutchinson matter, in which he asked Mr. Richardson to explain why he had stated that he had remitted this in the first sum sent in by him after its collection when the record showed that the fine had been collected on the third of March and a remittance had been sent in on the sixth which did not include the \$50. Mr. Richardson stated that he was out of the city and that the remittance on the third had been sent in by him from the lower part of the State and did not pass through his office, he merely indorsing the check on the back. Mr. Richardson also stated that the difference in the records which were pointed out by Mr. Herbert on the afternoon before were caused by the files being sent in by different wardens, and for that reason some were dirty and some clean.

The question of the Audubon Society was brought into examination at some length, and Mr. Richardson was questioned in regard to the packed meeting, at which new members were brought in the society on the day before the meeting was held. Mr. Herbert asked if Miss Belle Williams did not resign on the 23rd of December, rather than transmit Mr. Richardson's name to the governor, chosen under such conditions. Mr. Richardson stated that she had resigned, but he did not know the reason. The letter of Mr. Hampton, the president of the society at that time, was offered as evidence by the attorney for the governor, stating why he had withdrawn his support from Mr. Richardson, giving as the reason that the voting of proxies, who had no right to vote and allowing it to stand would break up the society.

Mr. Richardson was asked if he had not been appointed as one of the committee to pass on the credentials of those who would be allowed to vote, which he admitted. He was also asked if the committee did not state that those who had not paid their dues for the year 1917, which still had several months to run, would be ruled ineligible to vote on the question, and that the ruling of the committee had been overruled by Dr. E. C. L. Adams, the president who had appointed them. Mr. Richardson stated that this was true. It was also introduced as evidence by Mr. Herbert that the Hampton letter had been sent to Gov. Manning five days before the veto message was signed, showing that it had affected the charges as made by the governor.

Mr. Richardson stated under further examination that all 26 of the members that had been present at the meeting of the society which had caused so much discussion had voted for him. When asked if he could name any five of the old members that had voted for him, he said he could not remember. When the subject of the telegrams and telephone messages was again introduced and the question asked if he had not recommended that the bill be paid from the funds of the State Mr. Richardson stated that he was at that time a private citizen and his recommendation meant nothing to the acting chief game warden.

Mr. Herbert then brought in the resolution which had been adopted by the judiciary committee to prevent the holding of conferences in their committee room or the use of that room by others than the members of the committee. Senator Sinkler who was called to substantiate the resolution stated that while Mr. Richardson's name had not been mentioned at the time the resolution had been brought up in the committee that he and his friends were included in the order. The committee was asked to strike the resolution from the record as incompetent as it did not follow the rule of evidence. Senator Williams, after a consultation, stated that they had failed to observe the rules of evidence so far and that it would be admitted. The letter of Mr. Richardson, which was written prior to the naming of the committee, giving his reasons for not turning over his books to Mr. Gibbs, where he stated that he would turn them over to the committee from the senate, which he understood would investigate the matter. This was cited by the attorney for the governor as a reason for his insistent request for the records which had been denied to the committee.

W. H. Gibbs, serving under a contested title as chief game warden of the State, took the stand and told of conditions as he had found them. He told of the statement made to him by Macy Hays in regard to the manner in which any one in the office could use the telephone for long distance calls and have them charged to the department, paying them later. He related the incident of the telephone and telegraph bills which had come to him for payment and on which he asked a certificate from Mr. Richardson as to their being for official business. That the telephone and telegraph were charged altogether, as they were in the hands of the master company for collection. When asked by Mr. Richardson as to why he had not come to his office in an effort to have

them straightened out, Mr. Gibbs stated that very little consideration had been shown him and he did not feel the necessity of bothering about Mr. Richardson's private affairs.

The attorneys for Mr. Richardson then began the cross examination of Mr. Gibbs in regard to the Audubon Society meeting.

"Mr. Gibbs, you voted about 225 proxies for yourself at that meeting, did you not? You must have been doing some hustling as well as Mr. Richardson," asked Mr. Sapp. "Oh, yes," answered Mr. Gibbs. "I always found it wisdom to follow precedent." When asked if Mr. Barron, the vice president, had not been called to the city from Greenville for the purpose of holding this "rump" meeting, Mr. Gibbs said that he had, because it was the general report around the city that the president, Dr. Adams, had left the State to keep from holding it. A number of items were introduced by Mr. Richardson's attorneys to show that certain sums of money had been paid to Warden Little at Greenville and to Mack Hays for keeping books and acting as warden for Richland county. This Mr. Gibbs explained by saying that this large amount was paid during only a few months in the year, and that the total for the year would be shown to be about the \$1,200 allowed by law. Mr. Gibbs was also asked if he did not bring 166 proxies to the May meeting to vote them for himself. This Mr. Gibbs admitted and added that "of that number only 63 were voted for me, as they were ruled out by that famous committee on credentials."

At the completion of the testimony the governor made the following statement to the committee in regard to his position in the matter. The statement is as follows:

"In my veto message I did not charge Mr. Richardson with any crime or with the misappropriation of funds. I simply gave my reasons why, in my judgment, he should not be continued in office. I thought then, and still think, that the office was being conducted irregularly in the respects set out."

"I am doubtful whether or not the general assembly has the legal right to inquire into such reasons as I gave in my veto message or on what grounds same were based since it appears to be in the nature of an encroachment by the legislative power upon the power of the executive. However, I have waived this and in courtesy to the senate I have answered its summons. I have nothing to hide in regard to the matter and am entirely willing to put the senate in possession of all the facts and records in my possession."

Following this the committee adjourned the investigation and announced that they would go over the testimony as soon as it could be transcribed and make its report to the senate. This will be done before the adjournment of the legislature, declared the chairman.

HIRED BY GERMANY.

Bolshevik Leaders On Pay Roll of Kaiser Government.

Paris, Feb. 8.—The Petit Parisien continues today publication of official German documents which, it says, were brought to France by a prominent French scientist who obtained them from a Russian revolutionary paper. The latest installment consists of a series of documents tending to show that the Bolshevik movement in Russia has been financed by Germany.

Among these documents is a circular dated March 2, 1917, from the German imperial bank to all representatives in Switzerland instructing them to honor all demands for money from Nikolai Lenine, M. Zinovieff, Leon Trotsky, M. Kamenoff, one of the Russian representatives at the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations; M. Soumenson and Mazsta Koslovsky who has been described as the chief German agent in Russia, all of whom have taken a prominent part in the Bolshevik movement as well as to Mme. Alexandra Kollantay, a supporter of Lenine and now in charge of the Bolshevik department of public welfare; General Sivers and M. Mercalin. The money was to be paid "under certain conditions."

Another document is a letter dated Stockholm, September 21, 1917, from Y. Furstenburg to Raphael Schumann at Haparanda reading: "Honored Comrade: Varburg's bank, on receipt of a telegram from the president of the Rhenish Westphalian syndicate has opened an account for Comrade Trotsky's enterprises. The lawyer has brought arms and arranged for their conveyance as far as Lulea and Varda. Instruct the firm at Lulea as to whom they are to be consigned, and the name of the confidential person to whom the sum asked for by Comrade Trotsky is to be paid over."

Other letters announce the payment to Lenine of sums varying from 100,000 to 300,000 marks.