At the conclusion of the interview, Mr. WALTERS stated that he recalled that J. PRESS REDDOCH, Sheriff of Jones County, had escorted his entire appointed staff to the Chancery Court Office and had the entire group sworn in as a body. At that time he related that he remembered that LUTHER HOLDER was present. Hence, he could not understand why he was unable to find a record thereof or copies of the instruments in question, in his possession. Thus, he added that in the interim he would continue his search and in the event he was successful, he would make certified copies and mail the same to the reporting agent forthwith.

Regarding the bond of LUTHER HOLDER, MR. WALTERS suggested that it was possible that Sheriff REDDOCH may have the bond of LUTHER HOLDER in his possession, but that would be the only instrument that he would or could retain, because other legal papers should be in Mr. WALTERS' possession as Clerk of the Chancery Court.

Sheriff J. PRESS REDDOCH was interviewed and advised that he possessed a bond of LUTHER HOLDER but stated that same had not been recorded in Chancery Court. However, he was willing to permit the reporting Agent to make a copy thereof. Hence, Mr. WALTERS, Clerk of Chancery Court, Jones County, made a copy of the bond of LUTHER HOLDER, stating that he certified that the copy made was drawn from the original presently in the possession of J. PRESS REDDOCH, Sheriff of Jones County. This copy os being retained in the files of the instant case in the Jackson Field Office.

AT GOODYEAR, MISSISSIPPI

LOUISE WASH, nee BUMPUS, colored, wife of HOWARD WASH, was interviewed and advised as follows: When her husband, HOWARD WASH, had the altercation with CLINT WELBORN on latter's farm, Shady Grove, Mississippi, she had been at Picayune, Mississippi, to administer to the needs of one of her children who was ill. Hence, she did not know what happened until she was ordered to come to Laurel, Mississippi, to be present at the trial. In accordance therewith, she attended the trial of WASH and at the conclusion of this trial, as WASH was being escorted to the Jones County Jail by the jailer, whom she believed to be LUTHER HOLDER, she heard WASH ask HOLDER if WASH couldn't see his wife. HOLDER answered in the affirmative. Hence, about 6:00 P. M., she was advised by the Jailer of Jones County that she could see WASH for a little while. Hence, she was admitted to the Jones County Jail and talked to WASH for about five minutes. At that time, WASH was in his cell and one of the jailers, whose name she did not know, was stationed beside her during the entire time that she conversed with WASH. In addition thereto, she had with her, her two children, ANNIE SLEE, age six months, and LOUISE, age two years.

The first question she asked WASH was if he were praying. WASH answered her that he was praying and that he did not come there to stay forever. He told her to take care of their eight children and to raise them the best that she could.

When queried as to what WASH meant, when he stated that "he didn't come there to stay forever", she related that she was uncertain as to what he meant. When questioned whether WASH hadn't stated to her that he was "not meant to live forever", she replied that to the best of her memory, WASH had not said "live forever", she replied that to the best of her memory WASH had not said "live forever" but had stated "to stay here forever". She continued that she was very sad at the time and did not think much about what he said, but upon reflection believed that he must have meant that he expected something to happen. However, she added that WASH had appeared in good spirits; never mentioned the trial; and never even intimated that he expected a lynching to occur.

Just before she was leaving the jail, WASH gave her a shirt and a pair of pants of his, and also $3.00 to give to the children.

According to LOUISE WASH, she and WASH had worked for CLINT WELBORN for the past eight years on latter's farm. She worked as a maid and WASH was overseer of the livestock. She explained that CLINT WELBORN was a hard man to get along with and mean at times. However, they had not paid much attention to him. She stated that she had not anticipated this trouble. In conclusion, she advised that due to the fact that she had been at Sybur, and Picayune, Mississippi, several weeks prior to the trial and also ever since the trial of WASH, she had no knowledge whatsoever of the plans or participants of the mob that lynched HOWARD WASH.

AT LAUREL, MISSISSIPPI

Confidential Informant T-1 was interviewed and advised as follows: T-1 had heard about the lynching of HOWARD WASH about 10:00 A. M., the morning following the trial of WASH. T-1 was not only dismayed but dissatisfied at this action taken by the people. T-1 not only believed this lynching to be unjust but also a blight upon the entire South because there was absolutely no need for mob violence. In this instance, WASH had been sentenced to life imprisonment for murder by a duly appointed jury. In his opinion, WASH was guilty of only manslaughter. T-1 explained that T-1 had not attended the entire trial, but based his opinion on the testimony that T-1 had heard at the trial. T-1 added that if WASH had followed the plea of self-defense to its logical conclusion, this case would have been discharged according to law. However, WASH stated during the trial