

# Kansas City Police Say Turner Lies About Guns

WASHINGTON (AP) — Three Kansas City police officers said today they would never have released confiscated weapons to the Army's former provost marshal general had they known he intended to sell them for private profit.

But, retired Maj. Gen. Carl C. Turner, citing the wording of receipts for the 96 guns he obtained, insisted the officers knew the weapons they gave him were for his personal collection, not for Army training or display.

His testimony and that of the police officials was heard by a Senate subcommittee investigating charges that, as provost marshal, Turner blocked an Army investigation of an alleged multimillion-dollar grati by a ring of top enlisted men.

Later, Turner denied repeatedly under oath that he ever whitewashed a criminal probe of the Army's top enlisted man. Turner said he rejected a full investigation of Sgt. Maj. William O. Woodbridge because allegations against him were based on "capricious, malicious

gossip."

"I want to make it abundantly clear that I never protected Woodbridge or any other man," Turner told Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, D-Conn.

Ribicoff, referring to what he termed sharp conflicts in testimony given by Turner and several former subordinates said he may decide to call Gen. Harold K. Johnson, former Army chief of staff, to clear up the matter.

Ribicoff is chairman of a Senate investigations subcommittee.

Turner heard his testimony on the guns contradicted by Clarence Kelley, chief of the Kansas City police department, and two other police officials.

"Quite Clear"

"He was quite clear . . . that the guns eventually would go to the military police museum at Ft. Gordon, Ga.," said Charles

Don Bishop, a retired Kansas City police official.

Bishop said he never would have recommended that Kelley release the guns to Turner if he had thought otherwise.

Kelley said such disposal of weapons confiscated by police officers in their official duties would be "unethical and improper."

Turner, however, said the official receipts he signed contradicted the officers' testimony.

Turner read into the record of the hearing a receipt he signed which said the weapons were to be used for spare parts "in connection with weapons which he

(Turner) maintains in a gun collection."

Bishop said Turner told him he would use some of the weapons in lectures on firearm safety to civic groups. But Bishop said repeatedly he had been given to understand all of the guns were eventually to be donated to the military police museum.

"No statement was made nor did I feel that any was implied that these weapons were to be for Gen. Turner's personal use or for resale," Kelley testified.

In an earlier session, James B. Conlisk Jr., Chicago police superintendent, said Turner lied when he testified Conlisk knew 396 weapons he obtained from

the Chicago police force in 1968 were for his own use and not for Army exhibition and training.

Turner has admitted he sold some of the weapons he received from the two departments. But he has insisted, despite signed receipts stating the opposite, the weapons were given to him personally and not in his official capacity.

Turner, who said his decisions in the Wooldridge case were just a few of thousands he had to make, testified he had complete confidence that a background investigation would not have uncovered any wrongdoing by Wooldridge.

He attributed to Army jealou-

sy all allegations that Wooldridge was a leader in a conspiracy of sergeants to loot the non-commissioned officers clubs they ran.

"My decision (to remove Wooldridge's name from an investigation at Ft. Benning, Ga.) was just and based on the best interest of the Army" Turner testified.

Turner told the subcommittee he was not prepared to refute testimony of subordinates when he served as provost marshal general. But he said he does not agree with all their conclusions.

Lt. Col. Jack Pruett, who in

Continued P. 9, Col. 7