

Vol. XXI 11/14/17 pp. 4266 - 4432

East St. Louis Riot Investigation

Wednesday, Nov. 14, 1917

Index

Edward J. Brennan	4266
Frank D. Marks (continued)	4271
Robert E. Johnson	4306
M. R. Bevington	4381
Reverend Father Christopher Goetz	4412
Paul G. Anderson (Resumed)	4421

Exhibit

List of professional bondsmen furnished by Mr. Marks	4306
Dramshop Licences Issued for 4th Quarter year 1917	442

OK

Honorable Charles
10-16

Wednesday, November 14, 1917.

The Committee met at 10:15 o'clock a.m., Hon.
Ben Johnson (Chairman), presiding.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. BRENNAN,

3628 De Tonty Street, St. Louis, Missouri.

(The witness was sworn by Mr. Johnson.)

Mr. Johnson: Please give the stenographer your
full name.

Mr. Brennan: Edward J. Brennan.

Mr. Johnson: Where is your residence, Mr. Brennan?

Mr. Brennan: 3628 De Tonty street, St. Louis, Mis-
souri.

Mr. Johnson: What is your occupation?

Mr. Brennan: Special agent in charge, Bureau of
Investigation, Department of Justice, St. Louis District.

Mr. Johnson: For the United States?

Mr. Brennan: Yes, sir; for the United States De-
partment of Justice.

Mr. Johnson: What are the duties of that position?

Mr. Brennan: As special agent I am charged with
the duty of investigating violations of the laws of the
United States; collecting evidence wherein the United
States is or may be a party of interest. That is general.

Specifically we are charged at this time more direct-
ly to investigate violations of the Espionage Act, the
Conscription Act, and conspiracies against the Government.

Mr. Johnson: A Mr. Sorrells, whose initials I cannot

now recall, was on the witness stand before this Committee day before yesterday, at which time he testified to having overheard one end of a telephone conversation between you and Mr. Fox of the Aluminum Ore Company, from which he gathered the information that Mr. Fox was endeavoring to get some rifles to be used by the Aluminum Ore Company; and that you were endeavoring-- that you had promised, or offered, your services to Mr. Fox towards securing the rifles. Mr. Sorrells went further than saying he got this information entirely from hearing one end of the telephone conversation, but he said that what information he got in that way was also supplemented by what Mr. Fox told him upon that occasion, tending to state that you had either assisted or that you had expressed your willingness to assist Mr. Fox in securing the rifles for the Aluminum Ore Company. If you have any statement to make regarding that the Committee would be glad to hear it.

Mr. Brennan: Well, if Mr. Sorrells made that statement that I promised Mr. Fox or any other attache of the Aluminum Ore Company to assist him in securing rifles or any other arms, he is very much mistaken.

Mr. Johnson: Well, is that a mistake or simply not true?

Mr. Brennan: It is not true. I can explain the transaction, as you might call it, or telephonic communication between the Aluminum Ore Company and our office.

ating with the St. Louis Police Department-- with which we are practically a unit-- our bureau and the St. Louis Police Department-- we requested all wholesalers and large retailers when they were called on to make an unusual or suspicious sale of fire-arms, to notify the Police Department; also our office. In the latter part of last April and the first part of May I received a telephone message from the Sharpleigh Hardware Company, Mr. J. S. Driscoll speaking, stating that there were two men had called there that morning-- looked like teamsters-- and were endeavoring to negotiate a sale of some forty or fifty rifles.

Mr. Johnson: The teamsters, if I understand you, were not endeavoring to negotiate a sale, but a purchase? They wanted to purchase, did they not?

Mr. Brennan: Yes, sir; they were trying to purchase. As I understand it-- it has been six months ago-- they were to be delivered in some warehouse over here in East St. Louis. Subsequently Mr. Driscoll, accompanied by a salesman by the name of Stoby, I ~~think~~ think-- he is there yet-- called at my office and reiterated the statement; and at that time I am not quite sure whether or not they said that these men stated that it was for the Aluminum Ore Company. However, I called up-- I was interested-- as an agent of the Department of Justice it was my business to run it down and find out whether or not they were intended-- these rifles were intended to fall into the hands of the enemy; and I called several detective agencies over there with a view of finding out whether or not they had sent their men around to pur-

chase rifles; and also a couple of the industries on this side, including the Aluminum Ore Company. I couldn't get any satisfaction from the Aluminum Ore Company-- that is to say, I couldn't get in touch with the manager or assistant manager or anybody in authority. I called up two or three times. Subsequently Mr. Driscoll called up and he was in telephonic communication with some representative of the Aluminum Ore Company and asked about the sale.

Mr. Johnson: The sale or contemplated sale?

Mr. Brennan: The contemplated sale-- and after his conversation I had a talk with Mr. Driscoll and I was satisfied that the contemplated sale or purchase of these rifles was intended for the Aluminum Ore Company. I believe I suggested that they had better go and call direct, in person, on the Aluminum Ore Company. I don't know whether they did or not. I am informed, however, that they didn't sell these rifles; that the purchase was not consummated, and that they weren't delivered to the Aluminum Ore Company, and that these men didn't return to the Shapleigh Hardware Company; and I don't think that they called any other place, because we telephoned around to Simons and other places, asking that if these two men should call in there, to notify us. Our object was to get in touch with them and interrogate them; find out what they wanted and what they were going to do with these rifles; being satisfied in my own mind that they were intending to purchase these rifles for the Aluminum Ore Company. Then I was through. I never considered that I had any authority or

263

to order any sales or to assist any industry to furnish them rifles.

Mr. Johnson: And you never had any conversation with Mr. Fox or Mr. Sorrells or anybody else connected with the Aluminum Ore Company about rifles?

Mr. Brennan: About rifles; no, sir.

Mr. Johnson: Well, if you are through with your statement, I believe that is all.

Mr. Brennan: I say, there were several conversations out of my office by Mr. Briscoll and Mr. Stobey. Whether they talked to Mr. Fox or Mr. Sorrells I don't know.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Briscoll or Mr. Stobey are not in your office?

Mr. Brennan: No, sir; they were there cooperating with us-- giving me this information. We were trying to run down this source.

Mr. Johnson: They were at your office when they talked to the Aluminum Ore Company?

Mr. Brennan: They talked from there, and also from the Stapleigh Hardware Company, I understand. They did call up from my office.

Mr. Cooper: That is when you were trying to run down these two men?

Mr. Brennan: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: You say you never thought, as the agent of the United States Department of Justice, that you had the slightest authority to send arms to one party

to an industrial dispute, did you?

Mr. Brennan: No, sir; I never considered that I ~~was~~ had any ~~higher~~ authority. I couldn't even try to relieve any impression or insinuation that I had. The fact of the matter is we are instructed not to at any time place ourselves in a position where we would have to take sides either way. That is the instructions and directions from the Attorney General.

Mr. Johnson: You may stand aside.

STATEMENT OF FRANK I. MARKS (continued).

Mr. Raker: Mr. Marks, will you just state to the Committee the method that has been pursued here in East St. Louis in regard to the arresting and handling of women and others through the police department and justices' courts; the method that was used, so that when they were arrested when they committed crimes, how they would get loose without paying anything?

Mr. Marks: This particular thing I have reference to is these robbery cases that have occurred for the last six or seven years down in the section of the city known as the "Black Valley".

Mr. Raker: Running right along during this time?

Mr. Marks: There were two black valleys in East St. Louis. One was a continuation of the white valley, which extended from St. Louis Avenue up to Summit Avenue; and the other was down on the old Rock Road. It is burnt out now. One of those women that were down there would

have a man, otherwise known as a pimp, who was usually an ex-convict, and he was allowed to stay with her by the police for the information the police could get out of him in regard to bad characters. They would use him as a stool-pigeon. That is the common term.

Mr. Raker: That is their claim?

Mr. Johnson: Did any characters worse than they were come to East St. Louis?

264

Mr. Marks: Not that I know of. When those women would commit a robbery they usually turned that money over to the pimp, the man there, and of course they expected to be arrested, because as a rule there was a complaint made.

Mr. Johnson: You mean the women expected to be arrested?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; and when the "sucker", as they call him, would go to the station to make the complaint, by the description of the women, the colored officers already knew who to arrest, because they were well known at the police station. They were old offenders; had been arrested time and time again, and they would go down there and pick them up. When they would be brought to the station they would be searched, and they never would find any money on them, of course, because they had already done away with that. Their man had already gotten the money, and he had already gone over to the bondsman, Tom Kyle or somebody else-- there were two or three colored saloonkeepers who would go the bonds. They would leave

the money there, and he would be at the station ready to sign the bonds, oftentimes before they were arrested. If they were marked "hold" when brought to the station-- sometimes they were marked "Hold for further investigation"-- if a charge was made against them for robbery, they were immediately filled and the bond was signed. Oftentimes they would be held for 24 hours for further investigation, and then a charge placed against them. They had to do that or turn them loose. Generally they placed a charge of robbery against them. Then the bond was fixed, and the bondsman, as a rule, usually had the case set a week off, or ten days, at the limit. They can't set justices' cases longer than ten days.

When the case would be called for trial at the preliminary hearing, of course they would usually have an attorney there. These women as a rule would stay in the attorney's office, and their man, who had the description of the "sucker", would go into the police court and see if the prosecuting witness was there, and if he was there, of course the attorney was instructed to get a continuance; they weren't ready for trial, and they usually got the continuance, oftentimes on the plea that he hadn't gotten his fee yet; and of course the State's Attorney was always kind enough to see that he wouldn't lose his fee, and they would continue the case for a week.

Mr. Johnson: It was run for the fee system, and not for the purpose of convicting the guilty? Is that the idea?

Mr. Marks: Well, that is probably part of the system. And when the case would be called, if he was a "home guard", of course he generally stuck with the case; but if he was an out-of-towner-- if he didn't live here, he would probably be gone and there would be nobody to prosecute.

Mr. Johnson: How do you mean by "home guard"?
A local pimp?

Mr. Marks: No; if the victim lived here in town, who had been robbed, he would sometimes stay with it and prosecute, but if he was an out of town man and didn't have the time or had to go some other place, as a rule he was usually gone, and the case would be called and there would be no prosecution, and of course the justice and the State's attorney couldn't do anything else but dismiss the case, and the case would be dismissed.

265

Mr. Johnson: They would encourage the non-appearance of the prosecuting witness by having continuance after continuance?

Mr. Marks: They would get all the continuances they possibly could, as long as the State's Attorney would stand for it.

Mr. Baker: If he was a home guard, unless an arrangement was made with him to return the money, he might accidentally prosecute?

Mr. Marks: If he was a home guard, they would try to give him back his money, so he wouldn't prosecute. That pimp or somebody else-- some friend-- would follow

the man up there, and if the amount wasn't too large they would settle with him. It was easier to do that than to take chances of going to trial with it.

Mr. Raker: Now this pimp, ex-convict and rogue generally, would hang around-- have his place of business in some particular saloon?

Mr. Marks: Exactly. He was, as a rule, a booster for the place, or ~~was~~ craps shooter.

Mr. Raker: Now did you ever have any experience in any particular case where the woman thought she had made a mistake in not having fixed the right officials?

Mr. Marks: About a year and a half ago John D. Minock come to my place of business and wanted me to go to Belleville with him to sign a bond for some well known keeper of a house of prostitution, who had been picked up by Mike O'Brien, deputy sheriff. She was picked up, and her two girls, and taken to Belleville there, and a complaint was made before Justice Binicke, police magistrate. I signed the bond for her. She said she didn't want to have anything to do with the girls-- let them go-- they finally got six months apiece. All she wanted was to get out herself. Coming back on the car to East St. Louis she said "Mr. Marks, I have been paying the wrong people. Do you think Mike O'Brien can be fixed?" "Well", I says, "you will have to see Mike O'Brien. I don't know. You will have to do your business with him." "Well", she says "I'll see about that. I've been paying for protection down there, and thought I could run that place all

right there; but I find that I have made a mistake."

Mr. Baker: At that particular time she had gotten into the deputy sheriff's hands?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; the deputy sheriff picked her up and Xr. filed the complaint in Belleville instead of ... here.

Mr. Baker: And under the circumstances, with that particular deputy, she hadn't evidently made prior arrangements?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; she didn't know the sheriff's office would pick her up.

Mr. Baker: She was preparing then to pick the ground so she wouldn't have any more trouble with the deputy sheriff?

Mr. Marks: Yes. She was fined \$100, and I think settled the case for \$50.

Mr. Baker: Now what has been the real history of the City Treasury of East St. Louis for the last fifteen years, up to date, as to practically every city treasurer being a defaulter at the end of his term?

266

Mr. Marks: Well, it has been commonly known that there was only two city treasurers that left their office clean, Frank Keith and Robert Thomas; The others were usually short.

Mr. Baker: Then if they were short, how did they fix it up?

Mr. Marks: I don't know. The bondsmen, I suppose, had to make good, or make some settlement.

4277

Mr. Raker: Do you know anything as to the rate of settlement, the percentage?

Mr. Marks: Well, I don't know. There was a rumor that one case was settled for 20 per cent. I really don't know what the city treasurer settled for. I don't remember who was corporation counsel at that time. I don't know the particulars of that at all.

Mr. Raker: But then they would get out on some low settlement?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Johnson: You spoke of this woman having been fined \$100 and settled for \$50. How could that be possible?

Mr. Marks: Well, her attorney threatened to appeal the case, carry it to a higher court. John G. Minock was the attorney at that time, and Mr. R. V. Gustin was assistant State's attorney, although he didn't prosecute the case. The case was prosecuted in Belleville by one of Mr. Webb's other assistants.

Mr. Johnson: But who could reduce the fine?

Mr. Marks: Well, he said he would take it up with the State's Attorney and see if he would agree to accept that, and they finally did pay fifty dollars and costs. The money was paid to Mr. Gustin in his office by the attorney and the woman.

Mr. Johnson: Had a jury returned a verdict of a one hundred dollar fine?

Mr. Marks: No, sir; she was fined by the Judge.

The justice could handle that case there. She was charged with keeping a house of prostitution.

Mr. Johnson: Who was the Judge?

Mr. Marks: Justice Binicke of Belleville, the police magistrate. He fined her a hundred dollars and costs, and she pleaded guilty to being a keeper of an immoral resort. I think they had some other charges against her, but they let one charge go. She was charged with vagrancy and also keeping an immoral house.

Mr. Cooper: Have you ever seen the books of the Justice of the Peace?

Mr. Marks: No, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Do you know what entry was made after he assessed the original fine?

Mr. Marks: I do not.

Mr. Cooper: If the fine was paid, his books ought to show it, oughtn't they?

Mr. Marks: I don't know anything about that transaction.

Mr. Raker: I understood from your testimony that the State's Attorney consented to the reduction of the fine from \$100 to \$50?

Mr. Marks: Mr. Gustin did. When the proposition was first made to him, he said they would have to see the State's Attorney.

Mr. Raker: Now do you know Judge Messick?

Mr. Marks: I have known him, like every other citizen.

Mr. Raker: He is county judge?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baker: And he appoints the election commissioners?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baker: Do you know Patrick Flannery?

Mr. Marks: Why, I know him. I have known him for a number of years.

Mr. Baker: Well, it is understood that Patrick Flannery can neither read nor write, isn't it?

Mr. Marks: That I don't know. I never had any transactions with him which would give me that information.

Mr. Baker Johnson: What was Judge Clark's business before he was justice of the peace?

Mr. Marks: Well, he ran a restaurant back of Frank Wyant's place on Main and Broadway.

Mr. Baker: Had he held any other official position?

Mr. Marks: Never that I know of.

Mr. Baker: Was he inspector of stock, or had anything to do around the stockyards?

Mr. Marks: If he had, I don't know it. I first got acquainted with him when he had that restaurant there back of Frank Wyant's. I used to eat there once in a while.

Mr. Johnson: Do you know whether or not Justice Ware had held a position in connection with the stockyards or with the United States, looking towards the inspection of stock to be slaughtered?

Mr. Marks: I do. I understand he was let out there. What he was let out for I don't know.

Mr. Cooper: There was an inspector out there at the stockyards, was there not, whose duty it was to look out for what is called "downers"? That is, bruised and trampled cattle?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: So as to prevent their being slaughtered and then put into shops to be sold, or sent in interstate commerce?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Well now, do you know about those bruised and trampled cattle, commonly called "downers" being permitted to be slaughtered in small slaughterhouses that were not in the packing plant?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; there was one case in Granite City where a Greek is alleged to have done that.

Mr. Cooper: That is true about cholera eggs too, wasn't it, sometimes?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: And these small slaughter houses were not under government inspection, because their business did not go into interstate traffic?

Mr. Marks: Exactly. There was one particular case I remember. The papers commented on it at the time there. It was a foreigner in Granite City, and he was a small butcher, and he had been going to the stockyards

and buying such cattle. That is, sheep and hogs there. And he was caught in the act by one of the Government inspectors, and it was stopped. I don't know whether there was any prosecution.

Mr. Cooper: Well, while Mr. Fane, William Kane, who is now justice of the peace in this city, was inspector over there to prevent such slaughtering and sale of carcasses of trampled cattle, bruised cattle, and so forth, the slaughtering went on and he was removed by Government inspectors from that position for that reason, wasn't he?

Mr. Marks: I heard he was. That was the rumor. But I don't know personally.

Mr. Cooper: Was he a State inspector?

Mr. Marks: Yes; he was a State inspector.

Mr. Cooper: A humane officer?

Mr. Marks: He was a humane officer, yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: And as a humane officer he let these bruised cattle be taken out and sold through this community?

Mr. Marks: I don't know through my own personal knowledge.

Mr. Cooper: Well, he allowed them to be slaughtered. That was the common report?

Mr. Marks: That was common at that time.

Mr. Foster: You went on this woman's bond in Belleville for keeping a house of prostitution?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Foster: At the request of John B. Minock, an attorney at law. How much did you get for going on that

bond?

Mr. Marks: He paid me five dollars. He engaged me and paid me.

Mr. Foster: were you in the habit of going on bonds for these prostitutes?

Mr. Marks: I did for some of them; yes, sir.

Mr. Foster: what was the usual fee?

Mr. Marks: In small misdemeanors, one dollar.

Mr. Foster: One dollar for a misdemeanor?

268

Mr. Marks: Yes. The fine was generally five dollars and costs.

Mr. Foster: are you still doing that?

Mr. Marks: No, sir; I haven't signed a bond for a prostitute for two years.

Mr. Foster: Why did you quit?

Mr. Marks: Some say I got in bad with the administration. They wouldn't take me any more.

Mr. Foster: You would have signed them if they would have taken you?

Mr. Marks: I probably would.

Mr. Johnson: You are worth just as much now as you were then?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir. The chief of police under the Mollman administration gave orders not to accept any of my bonds: but I did take the matter up with the police commissioner, and they did ~~xxxxxxx~~ finally instruct the chief of police that they were to take my bonds the same as anybody else. I did that because I thought I

had a right as an American citizen to sign those bonds. That was the reason I did it, more than anything else.

Mr. Foster: So you haven't quit signing bonds--

Mr. Mark (interposing:): I have.

Mr. Foster: I am not through: wait till I state the question. You haven't quit signing bonds because you were convinced it was wrong but because they wouldn't take them any more?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Foster: You would be signing them if they would accept them?

Mr. Marks: Well, no, in the last four or five months I quit altogether.

Mr. Foster: You wouldn't sign them?

Mr. Marks: No, I wouldn't.

Mr. Foster: Why?

Mr. Marks: I just quit it altogether.

Mr. Foster: Why?

Mr. Marks: I didn't want to be bothered with it.

Mr. Foster: There wasn't enough money in it?

Mr. Marks: Probably not.

Mr. Foster: Do you think that was a good thing, to be going on these bonds of these people?

Mr. Marks: No, it was a bad thing, but it was the system.

Mr. Foster: It was the system, and you went along with the system?

Mr. Mark: I went along with the system.

Mr. Foster: You didn't have courage enough to stop it?

Mr. Marks: Probably not.

Mr. Foster: You say that these people that violate the law ought to go to jail, and help to break it up?

Mr. Marks: Well, Doctor, if I had thought that I could, with other people, stop this traffic, I certainly would have done it. But it would have made no difference to me; the system was there.

Mr. Foster: But you could have stopped it yourself?

Mr. Marks: No, I couldn't, or even with others. If I had been asked at any time at all by anybody to stop signing those bonds, to better the moral conditions of the community, I would have done it regardless of any amount of money ~~you~~ I could have made.

Mr. Foster: Well, that is a good statement, a good principle. You were running a ~~pawn~~ pawnshop, weren't you?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; exactly. And I made a proposition to this Committee the other day-- I didn't know it was going to be enacted into law-- that if it would be enacted into law it would cost me \$700 a year.

Mr. Foster: But you were running a pawnshop, weren't you?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Foster: Doing business with a lot of these

people around here who brought in property for pawning purposes?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Foster: You didn't always take an affidavit or investigate to see where it came from?

Mr. Marks: As a rule I did not. I have been instrumental in turning over to the city thousands of dollars' worth of stolen property that has been stolen here.

Mr. Foster: You? What do you mean?

Mr. Marks: well, in one case I helped to catch the thieves that made a proposition to me to sell me in one case alone \$13,000 worth of property, eight or nine years ago.

Mr. Johnson: what kind of property was that?

Mr. Marks: One thousand dozen of Adler's gloves, worth \$18 a dozen. They were going to the manufacturers. They had been shipped over the Pennsylvania road, and were going to Sankey Brothers, jobbers, in Dallas, Texas. They were stolen in transit from the Vandalia road, and they were to be taken over to the Iron Mountain. Edward Benner at that time was in the employ of the St. Louis Transfer Company, and he was the man that stole them there and offered to sell them to me. I agreed to buy them. I reported the matter to the chief of detectives, Mr. Gill, who afterwards was killed. He sent over two officers and we laid for those two people for seven hours, and finally got them as they drove up with the goods to my place.

Mr. Johnson: You agreed to buy them really, or just as a pretence in order to get the police there?

Mr. Marks: Really as a pretence. All they left with me was a sample. I immediately took the sample over to the chief of detectives, and they put men on duty, and when the goods were brought up to my place they grabbed them. Edward Durham afterwards pleaded guilty at Belleville and got an indeterminate sentence or one to fourteen years.

Mr. Foster: Your reformation has been brought about through the refusal of the parties to this system to take your bond any longer? Is that it?

Mr. Marks: No not necessarily so. I signed bonds after that.

Mr. Foster: I thought you said they refused to take them any more.

Mr. Marks: I did, but I afterwards stated that the president of the Board of Police Commissioners instructed Payne, the chief of police, to take me or anybody else that could qualify on a bond.

Mr. Foster: Did you go and see about it and get them to reinstate you? Is that it?

Mr. Marks: No, I went to the board there, and followed it up there.

Mr. Foster: You took it up with the board because you were anxious to go on these bonds for a dollar?

Mr. Marks: Not exactly so, no; because I was deprived of my rights as an American citizen by a man who had no authority to do so. It was a matter of principle

with me, not the amount.

Mr. Johnson: The murderous robbing and thieving system in vogue here is calculated to reform a pretty hardened sinner, isn't it? (Laughter)

Mr. Marks: I think it is.

Mr. Raker: Your theory is that the chief of police and the policemen had arranged with other bondsmen because you wouldn't stand in with the administration?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Raker: They had got other men to do their work, who stood in with the gang?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Raker: And the witness felt as though, having done that, he was going to find out whether or not a real good bondsman could be accepted. That is the situation, isn't it?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Foster: And the further fact that you were deprived of the fees that come to you as a professional bondsman?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

270

Mr. Foster: How long have you acted in this city as a professional bondsman for these people?

Mr. Marks: A couple of years under the Chamberlain administration.

Mr. Foster: You commenced under the Chamberlain administration; then the Vollman administration, as I understand it, put you out of business?

Mr. Marks: No, they did not. They tried to, and I insisted upon my rights and stood up for them.

Mr. Foster: You insisted on your rights as being an American citizen?

Mr. Marks: On my constitutional rights.

Mr. Foster: And your constitutional rights as being a professional bondsman?

Mr. Marks: No, sir.

Mr. Foster: For prostitutes?

Mr. Marks: No, sir.

Mr. Foster: Or other violators of the law?

Mr. Marks: I will take issue with that statement. I was entitled to sign those bonds on those grounds, that I had the proper qualifications.

Mr. Foster: So-- this will be my last question-- you reformed? You have quit now, you say?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Foster: About four months ago you refused and stopped that, since the riot?

Mr. Marks: Oh, long before. I haven't signed any bonds for a long time.

Mr. Foster: Before the riot?

Mr. Marks: Long before. I haven't signed a bond for a prostitute for over a year-- and a year and a half-- two years.

Mr. Foster: So you have been good longer than that? That's all.

Mr. Johnson: Your failing to sign the bonds hasn't

lessened the number of prostitutes here, has it?

Mr. Marks: Not at all: Here is a list of a few that I could think of, about 42 or 44 on that list there (handing paper to Mr. Raker.)

Mr. Raker: These are professional bondsmen?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: I want to insert this in the record and read these names. These are the professional bondsmen in this city?

Mr. Marks: That have been. Not now. Some of them are dead. They are the ones that have signed bonds in the last five or six years.

Mr. Raker: What I want to know now is who are the recognized administration professional bondsmen?

Mr. Marks: I am not in with the administration, so I don't really know. I couldn't give you that information.

Mr. Raker: Who act as professional bondsmen now?

Mr. Marks: Morris Sternberger--

Mr. Foster (Interposing:) What is his nationality?

Mr. Marks: He is an Israelite.

Mr. Raker: And what is the other one now? Morris Sternberger, what is his address?

Mr. Marks: 138 Collinsville Avenue.

Mr. Raker: The next one?

Mr. Marks: Oh, there are so many of them.

Mr. Raker: Just give a few of the leading ones.

Could you look over that list and tell who are the real active ones? (Handing paper to witness)

Mr. Marks: George Magarin.

Mr. Foster: Is that the Magarin whose child was killed?

Mr. Marks: Well, he takes care of his people out there, if any of his people are arrested.

Mr. Johnson: Who are his people?

Mr. Marks: Armenians and Turks: Those are the only people he bothers with. Alexander Flannigan.

Mr. Raker: How can Alexander act as a professional bondsman?

Mr. Marks: Through his wife, Dora Flannigan, and through his son, Walter Flannigan.

Mr. Raker: Well, who signs the bond?

Mr. Marks: Walter or Dora.

Mr. Raker: And Alexander signs their names for them?

Mr. Marks: No. As a rule, where they have got to qualify, they go out to the house. If it is a bond that requires qualifications and the justice is particular, they make Dora sign it, or Walter.

271

Mr. Raker: Then Alexander attends to the case?

Mr. Marks: He attends to the case.

Mr. Raker: All right; the next one.

Mr. Marks: I understand that Gerold still signs bonds there.

Mr. Raker: Is that the ex-City Treasurer, the de-

faulter?

Mr. Marks: Him or his father. Sam Yociss. He is a saloonkeeper over in the 500 block on Collinsville Avenue.

Mr. Raker: Sam must be in the system clear up to his eyes, isn't he?

Mr. Marks: He has been signing bonds for fifteen years.

Mr. Raker: At present a saloonkeeper, is he?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; and quite a property owner here.

Well, I have got a number of colored bondsmen on here now. I don't know whether they are signing bonds now or not. Matt Hayes, here, used to sign bonds. He used to sign a great many bonds up before the riot. He is is city inspector.

Mr. Raker: You say they have a city employe acting as a professional bondsman for these thugs and rounders?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And yeggman, and ex-convicts, and pimps?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir. Matt Hayes took care of that for the last two or three years. He is one of the strong standbys of the Kollman administration; one of the main advisers. That is for the colored branch of that party. There are a number of saloonkeepers whom I really don't know now.

Mr. Raker: But you can give the main ones that you can remember.

Mr. Marks: Now, as I say, I don't go around there. I haven't been around there and haven't any way of finding out.

Mr. Foster: These are men you used to know when you were associated with them?

Mr. Marks: Those are on there, yes. That is only a partial list of them. There is only 45 or 50 on that list. There are some that are not on that list there, that I couldn't think of at the time I made out the list.

Mr. Raker: Well, the closer the man is up to the police and the administration that is in power, the more business he gets?

Mr. Marks: I think so.

Mr. Raker: Then there are the professional bondsmen in certain localities for the negroes, and you say at times these bondsmen are at the station ready to go on the bond before they even get the defendant arrested and in there?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir. I wish to say that our last Legislature enacted a law regarding-- covering the bond business. It used to be in former times that all a man had to do to sign any kind of a bond was merely to qualify, hold up his hand and make a statement to the justice; but I understand now the practice is under the statute by the last Legislature, that he must give a list of his property, and that acts as a lien upon his property, and it is reported to the Recorder of the County, and this property really is mortgaged. It is a lien on his property until the bond

is satisfied. I think that is the statute that went into effect the 1st of July.

Mr. Raker: That wouldn't make much difference under the system?

Mr. Marks: Yes it would. It made a whole of difference, because a whole lot of these bondsmen who signed bonds were really not responsible. They had no property.

Mr. Raker: Oh, I see. They were really perjuring themselves in addition to being professional bondsmen?

Mr. Marks: Exactly. The bond wasn't worth the ink and time it took to sign it there. I have known cases where-- or here two or three years ago there was a police character by the name of Nyfong, about eighteen or nineteen years old, and who had a sister who was the biggest thief East-St. Louis ever had. He used to be down in the Valley there, and he signed quite a number of bonds, and sometimes qualified on them, and he didn't have a dollar in the world, and the justice knew it; and finally when the people started to comment on it there, they stopped taking him. I understand he finally left owing the justice some money, and other people around there, and never showed up any more.

Mr. Cooper: You say he was the biggest thief this town ever had?

Mr. Marks: The Nyfong people, yes. I guess she has robbed more people-- she got away with many hundreds of dollars.

Mr. Cooper: The biggest thief any town ever had,

is satisfied. I think that is the statute that went into effect the 1st of July.

Mr. Raker: That wouldn't make much difference under the system?

Mr. Marks: Yes it would. It made a whole of difference, because a whole lot of these bondsmen who signed bonds were really not responsible. They had no property.

Mr. Raker: Oh, I see. They were really perjuring themselves in addition to being professional bondsmen?

Mr. Marks: Exactly. The bond wasn't worth the ink and time it took to sign it there. I have known cases where-- or here two or three years ago there was a police character by the name of Nyfong, about eighteen or nineteen years old, and who had a sister who was the biggest thief East-St. Louis ever had. He used to be down in the Valley there, and he signed quite a number of bonds, and sometimes qualified on them, and he didn't have a dollar in the world, and the justice knew it; and finally when the people started to comment on it there, they stopped taking him. I understand he finally left owing the justice some money, and other people around there, and never showed up any more.

Mr. Cooper: You say he was the biggest thief this town ever had?

Mr. Marks: The Nyfong people, yes. I guess she has robbed more people-- she got away with many hundreds of dollars.

Mr. Cooper: The biggest thief any town ever had,

then, wasn't she (laughter)?

Mr. Marks: Well, I wouldn't say that. This is a pretty big country.

Mr. Cooper: Did you ever hear of 95 Broadway?

Mr. Marks: 95 is the trade-mark of the Schneider Wine & Liquor Company of St. Louis. The way they get that name, "95", the first place they ever had was at 95 Franklin Avenue, and since that time they have established about 20 places in East St. Louis. They registered that trade-mark, "95", and they had different places here and they call it the 95 saloon. That was the registered trade-mark.

Mr. Cooper: That was 95 Broadway; was that a barrel house?

Mr. Marks: There was a barrel-house there where bums and different characters-- although they kept good whiskey there. Schneider does keep good whiskey.

Mr. Foster: How do you know that?

Mr. Marks: I don't drink, but I was told you could get whiskey as high as 15 or 20 cents there.

Mr. Cooper: You can sell the cheapest kind of whiskey for 15 or 20 cents.

Mr. Marks: They had this "Twelve-block" whiskey too. You take a drink of that and walk twelve blocks and drop. That was five cents a shot.

Mr. Cooper: I have heard of "Sure-fight" whiskey, but I never heard of "Twelve-block" whiskey (laughter).

Mr. Marks: That is what they called it.

Mr. Cooper: Who owned that building in which that 95 Broadway, that barrel-house, was located?

Mr. Marks: Well, it was owned by a party in St. Louis. Sexton & Company were the agents. It was owned by a St. Louis party.

Mr. Cooper: Are you sure?

Mr. Marks: Positively. That is, when they were on the other side of the street. They have moved. The Mayor did make them move off of Broadway, and they finally moved over on Third Street.

Mr. Cooper: How long a franchise did the Street Railway or Electric Light Company get here?

Mr. Marks: That I don't know.

Mr. Cooper: Do you know whether any of these public utilities corporations in this city secured a hundred year franchise?

Mr. Marks: I don't know. I have understood that the electric company had a fifty-year franchise.

Mr. Cooper: Now when you signed a bond, you had property?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: And if the bonds had been forfeited and an attempt made to cover the amount, they could have recovered it from you?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Cooper: And many of these bondsmen didn't have any property?

Mr. Marks: It was understood so, and the justices

knew it at the time they took their bonds.

Mr. Foster: And the justices knew that many of them didn't have property when they signed the bond?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Now that kind of man is what I always understood to be a professional bondsman; a man that just simply signed bonds as a mere matter of routine, not having any property, and the court taking him as surety, knowing he didn't have?

Mr. Marks: They called them "straw bondsmen".

Mr. Cooper: Now when you signed, you say you had property?

Mr. Marks: I did.

Mr. Cooper: And the mere fact that you signed the bonds wouldn't have presented the punishment of the offender, would it?

Mr. Marks: Not necessarily. I want to make this statement to the Committee, that never at any time that I signed a bond did I ever go to a justice of the peace, State or city attorney, to interfere in the case. But I have been approached many times, and I told them "I am no fixture; I have got no pull with the police, with the justice or either the prosecuting officers. You will have to do the best you can and get yourself a lawyer." I never made any attempt to see anybody to influence the case at any time at all, in any case.

Mr. Cooper: Now take the case of those Armenians down there. You said you had an Armenian who went on

bonds regularly for them?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; George Magarin.

Mr. Cooper: Was he related to the father of the boy that was murdered?

Mr. Marks: He was the father of the boy.

Mr. Cooper: The boy that was kidnapped and murdered?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir. He also acts as interpreter for his countrymen in the courts when they get into trouble.

Mr. Cooper: Now it is in evidence here that your police system is very corrupt. A crooked policeman could persecute an Armenian, couldn't he, an innocent man?

Mr. Marks: He could.

Mr. Cooper: And pull him up before some court, and if that innocent man, under your infamous blackmailing system^{here}/obtaining among so many policemen-- if they got hold of that man he would go to jail and stay if this man didn't go on his bond, wouldn't he?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Cooper: And very often having a man with property who was willing to go on the bond in that way of those people might have saved innocent people from a great wrong; is that so?

Mr. Marks:

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Of course it could be used to defeat the ends of justice by securing the discharge or release of a guilty man.

Mr. Marks: Then I wish to make this statement, that

oftentimes a stranger is arrested here in this city, possibly for committing a small offense. He knows nobody here, and if he couldn't pay a professional bondsman to obtain his liberty, he might stay in jail two or three days-- four or five days-- not knowing anybody. He might be the best kind of a citizen who happened to be violating some of our ordinances that he wasn't acquainted with, and if he couldn't get a professional bondsman and pay him for signing that bond, he would lay in jail until his disposition was made of his case.

274 Mr. Cooper: Well, we have had other cases brought to our attention like that. See if this wouldn't cover the case where such a bondsman might do some good. A man, a good citizen, might come here and have a little money in his pocket. They get him into one of these thieves' resorts, and they can't make any charge against him, and so they inaugurate a fight, get him into it, beat him up, and then he is hauled up for being disorderly. They know how much money he has, and the fine and costs take all he has got, and then they notify him to get out of town and never come back. Now such a man as that, who wanted to make a fight, if there was a decent man who would go on his bond, might show them up, if they had an honest court here; is that so?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir. I have contended there was no harm in signing a bond for a thief if the bondsman only signed that bond and didn't go any further with it then.

Mr. Cooper: The lawyer takes a fee to defend him?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: All you did, you say, was simply to sign your name, and you had property?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir, I was perfectly good on the bond, and was willing to make good and intended to make good if the party defaulted on that bond. But the pernicious part of the system was this: That they allowed a lot of irresponsible people, people that were connected with dives of the worst kind, to sign those bonds indiscriminately, and then go to work and fix those cases; and many a time those people got that kind of a bondsman, knowing that he had the pull with the police or with the justice or with the State's or City attorney to fix his case, and they got him to sign the bond with that purpose in view. In fact he was told at the time that if he would see so and so he would fix his case for him. That was the pernicious part of that system.

Mr. Cooper: Has that been broken up here?

Mr. Marks: To a great extent it has. I think conditions are better here than they have been here for a long time. I think so. But under this present chief of police I think he has ruled out a whole lot of this. In fact, when he came in--

Mr. Johnson (Interposing:) What is his name?

Mr. Marks: Frank Feating. When he came into office, one of the first mornings he got there he found four or five dollars on his desk, and he inquired of the policeman what this money was for. He says "That's your money

for warrants." "Why", he says "I'm getting a salary here. I don't charge for serving warrants. Take that money back: After this let the justice charge for the warrant."

Under our system here, if you want to have a man arrested that beats you up, unless you go to the State's Attorney-- if you go to the Justice of the Peace he charges you \$1.20 for the warrant, and 60 cents goes to the police or constable serving the warrant, and if the police serves it, the Chief of Police used to take that money. They always turned it over to the chief, the money for the warrants. Of course for the bonds, the night chief took the money. He got fifty cents for the bond money, but the day chief as a rule got the money for the warrants, although they were served by the officers.

Mr. Cooper: Was it the understanding that the day chief took a percentage?

Mr. Marks: No percentage. He got the 60 cents. He got half of it. He claimed under the law that he had a right to take that.

Mr. Cooper: Did the officer who actually made the arrest and served the warrant get any of that?

Mr. Marks: No; it was the chief that got that money. He always did.

Mr. Cooper: All of it?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir; he got the 60 cents.

Mr. Cooper: And he absolutely did nothing about the arrest himself?

275

Mr. Marks: No, not at all. But by virtue of being city marshall he claimed he had authority under the law to take that money. That was the legal procedure. Frank Peating refused that money.

Mr. Cooper: That is the present chief of police?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir. He wouldn't take it.

Mr. Cooper: Witnesses on the stand-- or one witness at least-- has testified that there is a movement on foot here now to have him ousted from his present position by the 1st of January.

Mr. Marks: That is the understanding with the City Council. I don't know anything about the particulars of the case, but that is the understanding.

Mr. Cooper: Do you think it would be a good thing or a bad thing for the city?

Mr. Marks: It would be a bad thing for the city and a good thing for the system.

Mr. Foster: It is recognized, as Judge Cooper has said, that there are times when a stranger in town who might fall into the hands of Philistines, ought to be helped, and it is commendable in a man to help that kind of man whom he believes innocent, but that isn't the system. The system is to go on anybody's bond. You know some continual violators of the law, they get bond very easily, don't they?

Mr. Marks: Easier than anybody else.

Mr. Foster: Because they understand the system, and are willing to pay for it, or have a hold on some

individual by which they can compel him to?

Mr. Marks: They are a safer risk. They won't run away.

Mr. Foster: Did you ever have to pay any of these bonds in full?

Mr. Marks: No, sir.

Mr. Foster: And you don't know of any other bondsman that makes a business of doing that, that has ever had to pay a bond in full?

Mr. Marks: I do not.

Mr. Foster: Do you know whether this man Sternberger, I believe you say, who was one of these men acting now-- is he the man who has been attaching the wages of negroes?

Mr. Marks: I don't know.

Mr. Foster: Especially Hawkins, whose property was burned out here at the time of the riot and the fire?

Mr. Marks: He runs a furniture store on Collinsville Avenue. He sells on time payments there.

Mr. Foster: You don't know whether he is the same man?

Mr. Marks: No; I don't know whether he is the same man.

Mr. Foster: And what is the Empire Furniture Company?

Mr. Marks: That is the Empire Furniture Company, Morris Sternberger, proprietor.

Mr. Foster: You were here when Hawkins testified,

4303

were: t you?

Mr. Marks: No, sir.

Mr. Foster: He said he couldn't go to work because they would attach his wages, and kept him out of it-- his furniture was burned there and he didn't have anything to buy this with, and that^{if} he went to work immediately they would attach his wages and take it away from him.

Mr. Marks: No, I don't know anything about that. I might have read something about that in the paper, but that is all the information I have along those lines.

Mr. Foster: You don't know that?

Mr. Marks: No, sir.

Mr. Cooper: I want to ask you a question about that. You say this company/sells on time payments?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Have you ever seen one of their contracts?

Mr. Marks: I have not.

Mr. Cooper: Don't you know that it is customary in a contract of that kind that there is a provision that the title to the furniture shall remain in the selling company until the payments are made?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Cooper: Well then, if Hawkins had this furniture down in his house, it was still furniture of the Empire Furniture Company, wasn't it?

Mr. Marks: Yes, exactly.

Mr. Cooper: Yet they are garnishing him here, because he don't pay on their furniture that was burned

up?

Mr. Marks: I understand so.

Mr. Cooper: And the title to which he didn't have?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

Mr. Cooper: And property that was destroyed, not by his carelessness but by the act of a mob overthrowing the law. That is so, isn't it?

Mr. Marks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: And your courts permit that man to be garnisheed in season and out of season, and prevent him from securing honest work here.

Mr. Marks: Well, our courts here, I don't think, do. The justices might, but we don't consider them courts. They are not classified as courts in this community.

Mr. Cooper: Do you know any lawyer's raising that point in his garnishee suit?

Mr. Marks: Not that I know of. That might have been done without my knowledge.

Mr. Baker: Then, in other words, one of these poor unfortunate working men, a negro or white man, who gets into Sternberger's possession and in his hands for any kind of a debt, and gets over here before the justice of the peace, with the rounders that they can get, he has but little chance?

Mr. Marks: He has bad luck.

Mr. Baker: They have just simply got him foul?

Mr. Marks: He is just unlucky.

Mr. Baker: If he can get hold of any money, they have got him?

Mr. Marks: Exactly.

List of professional bondsmen furnished by Mr.

Marks:

G. Wash. Thompson	Dr. Leroy Bundy
Potts Nevins	Buddy Bell
Ed. Dowling	Addison King
Frank Molla.	Horatio King
Frank Wyant	Tom Kyle
Henry Albrecht	John Carmichael
Louis Goldberg	Matt Hayes
Woods Beckerman	N.W. Parden
Dora Flannagan	Mr. Lilly
John Shannon	Mr. Woods A.D.
Morris Sternberger	John Eubanks
N. Mercossan	Dick Barnett
Geo. Magarian	Kid Amos
Anthony Poppas	
Alexander Flannagan	
Walter Flannagan	
Chas. E. Watson	
John Loughlin	
Nick Rosseli	
John Jackson	
Max Sonsinsky	
Jim Schwab	
John Halihan	
F.I. Marks	
Mike Dempsey	
John Matt	
Fred Gerold	
Geo. Gerald	
Mike Murgie	
Sam Yociss	
C.H. Stewart	

Mr. Johnson: You may be excused. Mr. Johns, do you want to make a statement?

Mr. Robert E. Johns: I don't know, sir. I don't know as I want to take up the time.

Mr. Johnson: We are not insisting.

Mr. Johns: I would like to make a statement in regard to the labor movement.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT E. JOHNS,

501 North 58th Street, East St. Louis, Ill.

(The witness was sworn by Mr. Johnson.)

Mr. Johnson: Give the stenographer your name, age and place of residence.

Mr. Johns: Robert E. Johns; age 49. I am business agent of the carpenters. Residence 501 North 58th Street, East St. Louis, Illinois.

Mr. Johnson: Go ahead and make such statement as you desire to make.

Mr. Johns: The reason I want to make this statement is this: I want to make it clear to the Committee what the labor movement done in regard to the Aluminum Ore strike, separating them from that strike.

Now it has been inferred on the stand here that the labor movement in East St. Louis was responsible for lots of things, and I wanted to get before the Committee just what we done.

Along about March 22 I was elected business agent of the carpenters, and I got a message that a committee of Al Aluminum Ore men wanted to see some of the labor

277

representatives in East St. Louis. I met them in the Eagle Building, next door here. I think there was about five of them. They wanted to understand some way to work with the American Federation of Labor, and how they could organize. A representative of the Mill Men and Smelter Workers was here, and I think that night there was just two of us met them, and at that time they told me that the detectives from the Aluminum Ore Company were following them around wherever they met, and I told them to meet up in my office, the Labor Temple.

Mr. Johnson: When was that?

Mr. Johns: That was along about March 22. Well, we met up there, I think, at least four or five times. Brother Harry Kerr-- well, I think the last time we met up there we had a representation of maybe eight or nine different trades. One of our International men was here, and that night Mr. Wolf of the Aluminum Ore Company seemed to be anxious to pull off a strike at the Aluminum Ore Company. What his reason was for it, he gave it to us that they had been discriminating against men active in that movement, and we told him--

Mr. Johnson (Interposing:): Did he also seem anxious to organize those men?

Mr. Johns: Oh yes, he wanted to organize the men.

Mr. Johnson: He was in earnest about that?

Mr. Johns: Well, I think so. But that night the matter of a strike came up, and every man up there begged him and told him it was the worst thing he could ever do.

Mr. Johnson: They begged Wolf?

Mr. Johns: Wolf. And I remember distinctly that our International man told him, Mr. Wolf, he says, "You whipped the Aluminum Ore Company once, but just remember this one thing, that this company is preparing for you now, and don't ever do anything." And that night they had made arrangements for men as they came off of the shifts out there to meet at the Empress Theatre at 26th and Louisiana Boulevard, and they would try to organize; and I think, if I am not mistaken, that was on Thursday night. Next Wednesday night they pulled the strike.

Well then, of course after they got in operation they met at the City Hall and had addresses by the Mayor, and told them not to resort to any violence, which they didn't do that I know of.

Mr. Johnson: In these conversations with Mr. Wolf, he always showed an anxiety, did he not, to organize the Aluminum Ore Employees into a union?

Mr. Johns: He wanted to organize them into a union.

Mr. Johnson: And he succeeded in organizing them finally, didn't he?

Mr. Johns: He didn't organize them into a union.

Mr. Johnson: He got them in far enough to get the money, didn't he?

Mr. Johns: That protective association?

Mr. Johnson: Yes.

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; but we never called that

association an organization at all.

Mr. Johnson: But he did get them into that?

Mr. Johns: Yes, he was a pretty active member in that. Of course after that the different men from the Aluminum Ore works kept coming up to our hall, the labor temple, and Mr. Glover of the Mills, Mines and Smelter Men organized 400 of those men, colored and white.

Then it went along, I think, about may be the 10th of May, something like that, and we had a conference with the Mayor. We had two representatives of the United States Government here, Mr. Myers and Mr. Gill, Pat Gill of St. Louis, acting through some department they have here; and they were trying to get a conference with Mr. Fox in order to settle this some way or other, but they never could get it. The Mayor, I believe, had one or two conferences with Mr. Fox. Then we tried to intercede with the Mayor to get a conference through the Mayor with Mr. Fox, and we went down one day to visit the Mayor, and he sat there and looked at us kind of sideways, as much as to say we were intruding, and we couldn't get nothing out of him at all. But right after the strike the Mayor took a trip south. He didn't stay here, as I thought he ought to, to help along this strike situation. But anyway we couldn't get any conference with Mr. Fox at all. I don't think there is a representative of the American Federation of Labor ever had a conference with any of the officials of the Aluminum

Ore Company, not that I know of.

Then going right on down the line to this May 28th proposition, you have heard that same old story here, that the central body sent delegates up there. A motion was made that they would send delegates up there in a body, which we did, and we got up there and Mr. Fane, Mr. Curtis and Mr. Allegor, made addresses, and Mr. Flannigan. The addresses, all except Mr. Flannigan's, were appealing to the Mayor and the City Council to do something in regard to the influx of colored men to East St. Louis, and we had repeatedly before, on many committees, asked him to try and stop the influx of colored men if he possibly could. He showed no willingness to do anything at all whatever about that, and never did, as I know of.

Then after the meeting I think most of the men-- I know I did-- went just right straight to the street car line as I could and went home. And the speech of Alexander Flannigan everybody treated as a joke. I know I did, and paid no attention to it whatever, and as soon as I got out of the hall I went home.

Mr. Baker: It had its effect, though, didn't it?

Mr. Johns: I don't know whether it did or not.

Mr. Baker: well, after the joke, the riot started?

Mr. Johns: Well, you want me to be plain about this proposition?

Mr. Baker: It wasn't fifteen minutes after the joke was made until that started, was it?

Mr. Johns: No; longer than that.

Mr. Raker: Twenty minutes?

Mr. Johns: Possibly.

Mr. Cooper: Before it started there was a report that a negro had killed a white man, which proved not to be true. That is a fact, isn't it?

Mr. Johns: Those reports were coming in there every hour of the night.

Mr. Raker: I can't understand how you would allow a man to get up in your meeting and crack jokes, who said there was no law against rioting; that you could mob these people and prevent them from entering houses or getting furniture in; and you could hear that applause and hand-clapping a block and a half away from the people that were in the audience; and then within fifteen minutes after the speech was completed, rioting commenced on the streets. You know that is a very serious joke to me.

Mr. Johns: That probably looks serious to you, but it didn't to us. We had two meetings that night, one with the Council members, and one with the association of the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Raker: Why didn't you get Flannigan out of the meeting?

Mr. Johns: I would like to get him out of town.

Mr. Raker: Why didn't you get up there that night and say "We are running this meeting"?

Mr. Johns: We went up there with the best intentions in the world.

Mr. Raker: But this proposition, Mr. Johns, that

279

Flannigan was a joke, that has been repeated here so many times, it don't seem to me to be hardly fair to the Committee. If it was a joke, you people had charge of that meeting. Why didn't you pull him off the platform? Why didn't you say "That man don't belong here. He is interrupting our meeting. He is an interloper"?

Mr. Cooper: He was the last speaker, wasn't he?

Mr. Johns: I think the Mayor was the last speaker.

Mr. Raker: Why didn't you take him off the platform and cut that speech out?

Mr. Johns: Flannigan speaks about every time he gets a chance.

Mr. Raker: But it was your meeting. You had charge of it.

Mr. Johns: I didn't have charge of it.

Mr. Raker: But you people had charge of it and the idea that a man can come into your meeting and say things like that, and get away with it-- something must be wrong.

Mr. Johns: This was a combined meeting between the central body and the City Council.

Mr. Raker: That's all right, combined or otherwise, no man can come in and preach riot in a meeting that you are a member of, and you take it as a joke.

Mr. Johns: Certainly I took it as a joke, and never have taken it any other way, and I don't want to infer here that our meeting-- or get it inferred here that our meeting had anything to do with this riot, so far as

I am concerned.

Mr. Raker: Or that it was a joke?

Mr. Johns: We speak of Flannigan as a joke and treat him that way.

Mr. Raker: You don't want us to believe that the meeting was a joke, do you?

Mr. Johns: No, sir; I don't want you to believe it was a joke, because it wasn't a joke. It was called there on this serious business. It was called there to get the Mayor to intercede and keep the colored floaters and riffraff out of this town.

Mr. Raker: Then you heard Flannigan get up and say there is no law against mob violence?

Mr. Johns: Flannigan got up and told a story. He didn't say anything about mob violence.

Mr. Raker: There have been a dozen men that said he did.

Mr. Johns: Well, we all heard that story delivered, and I'll tell you just exactly how I heard that story. Flannigan says, as I understand it, that a certain gentleman very close to the administration, who comes from out in my neighborhood-- lives out in Alta Sita-- and says the colored element are getting pretty close to us, what should we do? Then he told this story about if they didn't get the goods in--

Mr. Raker (Interposing:) Tell the story.

Mr. Johns: He says "If they don't get a moving van to move him, he can't move in; if he don't get his goods

to the house he don't get in. Then if the house burns down, he don't live there; and there is no law against mob violence."

Mr. Raker: That is just what I said. That could have no other meaning than to mean that if the man's goods came there and if they were destroyed by people, he couldn't get in?

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Raker: And if his goods got into the building, you could get him out by burning the building and burning the property?

Mr. Johns: That is about what it meant.

Mr. Raker: Then he wound up his compliment by saying "There is no law against mob violence". Is that right?

Mr. Johns: That is what he said.

Mr. Raker: And the hurrah and the shouting and the clapping from that meeting were heard clear across a block and a half into the Y.M.C.A. building. Is that right?

Mr. Johns: I don't know whether it was heard over in the Y.M.C.A. building or not.

Mr. Raker: Well, there was a great hurrah and applauding?

Mr. Johns: Not so much hurraing and applauding.

Mr. Raker: There was a good deal, wasn't there?

Mr. Johns: Well, not so much.

Mr. Raker: Was there any?

Mr. Johns: There may have been.

Mr. Raker: There was no disapproval, was there?

Mr. Johns: Well, I know the next day--

Mr. Raker: Right there, was there?

Mr. Johns: Not a bit.

Mr. Raker: No man got up in that meeting and said "Alexander Flannigan has tried to incite riot here, and Alexander Flannigan knows the feeling of these people here in regard to this condition, and he has done it to inflame these people, and we ought to throw him out." Nobody dared do that?

Mr. Johns: No, because we had the full city administration there with us.

Mr. Raker: What did that have to do with it?

Mr. Johns: Well, it looked to me, if there was anything done to incite riot, they ought to take the matter up, not the audience.

Mr. Raker: Why, you people called the meeting.

Mr. Johns: Certainly we did.

Mr. Raker: And you let Flannigan come in and make that speech without saying one word; without giving one word of protest; isn't that true?

Mr. Johns: That is true.

Mr. Raker: In the neighborhood of ninety good, strong men went down there that night with a pre-arrangement to discuss with the Mayor the question of negroes coming in here, didn't you?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

4316

Mr. Raker: And then you allowed this man Flannigan to get on the platform to make that kind of a speech. Isn't that right?

Mr. Johns: I didn't see any other way out of it.

Mr. Raker: Isn't it true?

Mr. Johns: Certainly it's true.

Mr. Raker: And you made no protest?

Mr. Johns: Certainly not.

Mr. Raker: And none of the 69 men who were delegates, who went down there, made any protest?

Mr. Johns: There were at least 1200 men down there.

Mr. Raker: I am talking about the ones that went down there under this notice. They made no protest?

Mr. Johns: No, sir.

Mr. Raker: Nobody in the audience made a protest?

Mr. Johns: No, sir.

Mr. Raker: Instead of that, they were clapping and cheering?

Mr. Johns: Not so much.

Mr. Raker: There was clapping and cheering, wasn't there?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: Now if you people-- I mean that were there that night-- didn't approve of what Flannigan said, why didn't you get up, some of you, and have a disapproval of what he said, so that there would be no trouble?

Mr. Johns: Well, I don't suppose we thought of the matter at all.

Mr. Raker: You went there for the purpose of making arrangements to get the negroes out of town, didn't you?

Mr. Johns: Oh no, no sir.

Mr. Raker: Didn't you go there for the express purpose of seeing what could be done to have the negroes leave the town of East St. Louis?

Mr. Johns: Oh no, we didn't.

Mr. Raker: Didn't you go there to see what arrangements could be made to keep the negroes from coming in?

Mr. Johns: That was it exactly.

Mr. Raker: That they were becoming a menace to the city of East St. Louis?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: That was the purpose of the meeting?

Mr. Johns: Not to run them out.

Mr. Raker: The purpose of the meeting was to see what arrangements could be made to stop the influx, to keep the negroes from coming in here, and that they were a menace to the town?

Mr. Johns: Certainly they were.

Mr. Raker: Well, that is what you went there for?

Mr. Johns: Not to run them out.

Mr. Raker: No, for the menace proposition?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

4318

Mr. Raker: They were a menace to the town?

Mr. Johns: They were a menace to the town.

Mr. Raker: And you wanted to do something to avoid that menace?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And not a single one of you raised your voice in protest against the statement of Flammigan that there was no law against mob violence?

281

Mr. Johns: We didn't pay any attention to it.

Mr. Raker: Well now, of course I haven't the time nor haven't the patience to go over it, but I know you are a pretty active, intelligent man, and you don't pretend to tell this Committee now that a man got up in that audience and made that kind of a statement, on the very subject you were there for, and you paid no attention to it, do you?

Mr. Johns: We never treated it seriously at all whatever.

Mr. Raker: That's all: Go on with your statement.

Mr. Johns: Well, the question has been asked several of our witnesses what the Mayor of East St. Louis could do there towards the influx of niggers, and keeping them off the streets. I want to state to this Committee that in front of my office just before this riot, before the riot, I could count any time during the day at least from four to five hundred colored and white riffraff of this world passing up and down that street.

4319

I have went out-- I have been asked by different contractors in this town to find them men.. I have asked any number of colored and white men on the streets of East St. Louis to come to work, and they was always working nights or was going to take a job the next day. From Summit Avenue to Missouri Avenue you could count any time during the day from two to three hundred whites and blacks, with no means of employment at all whatever. Our mission to the Mayor was this-- under Chamberlain's administration a gang of riffraff like that would have been taken out before a justice of the peace and fined, and then put onto the road gang, and I want to tell you that about that time this was a very clean town, and vagrancy and lawlessness was pretty well controlled under the fore part of Chamberlain's administration.

Mr. Chamberlain: Then was that? what year?

Mr. Johns: Well, along about-- well, Chamberlain, I think, was elected in 1915-- no, 1913. Just as fast as one of those fellows would get arrested, they would put him in this weed gang, and sometimes I have seen as many as 50 or 75 men in the weed gang.

Mr. Johnson: What kind of a gang?

Mr. Johns: The weed gang. They cleaned up the streets and cut the weeds. There was some protest, that they were interfering with free labor, and the Aldermen got down there-- the Aldermen repealed that law. Now I went to any number of Aldermen here in town and talked to them and asked them if they didn't think it

would be a good idea to revise that ordinance. I couldn't see-- I knew that the town was getting in awful shape. Every man that lived in it knew it was getting in awful shape. It looked like it had got beyond-- in fact, had got beyond the Mayor, and I think got beyond all the civil authorities here that felt like they ought to enforce the law. They wouldn't-- the Mayor wouldn't turn over his hand, and the City Council could very easy have enforced the vagrancy law. We have one of the best vagrancy laws here in East St. Louis that I think there is anywhere.

Mr. Raker: On the statute books?

Mr. Johns: On the statute books now.

Mr. Raker: Unenforced?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; unenforced. After the new chief of police got in, he posted signs all over town, "Go to work or leave town, or the vagrancy law will put you on the rock pile." The law has never been enforced here, and after they got rid of the weed gang, of course as you have heard testimony before, the town was overrun with pimps and riff-raff element.

282

Mr. Raker: Is that true?

Mr. Johns: Absolutely true. The riff-raff element of East St. Louis were the men that defeated or elected their respective candidates. I will just give you a little illustration of how they defeated Mayor Chamberlain. They arrested a fellow here in town-- I forget just now what his name was-- he was running a resort

4321

here-- and he was turned loose the next day, and Mr. Mollman was only elected Mayor by about thirty votes, and all the next day on the streets you could here "Well, if they had just kept so and so all day in jail, Chamberlain would have been elected." The fellow got out, and he was antagonistic to Chamberlain's administration, closing up his resort, and got out and got very active amongst the riff-raff and pimps, and he elected Mayor Mollman.

Mr. Baker: Then Mayor Mollman was elected by pimps and riffraff and thugs?

Mr. Johns: Absolutely. Of course he had lots of good men. That was his first administration. He had lots of good men, but that is just what they would say on the street the next day, "If they had kept Nick Sorokell in jail all day, like former chief Purdy used to, they would have elected Chamberlain."

I am getting up to the riots of July. I witnessed some of them from my window up the street, and there was no chance whatever, it seemed to me, like nobody was making any attempt whatever to do anything with them. I saw the police up the street. They were trying the best way they could to defend a few fellows being beat up on the sidewalk, but that was all they could do. The soldiers were congregated down on Illinois Avenue and Collinsville Avenue, standing right out in the middle of the street in a body. I saw the colored man get shot upon the street that Colonel Tripp claimed

he took his revolver away from him. I don't think Colonel Tripp was within a block of that fellow or ever did get within a block of him. The fellow went right on up the street and mixed with the mob.

I don't believe I care to make any more statements. All this stuff is simply a rehearsal of what you have heard a hundred times.

Mr. Cooper: Who was the first speaker at the meeting?

Mr. Johns: I got on the stand for the main purpose of defending my action as a member of the Committee of One Hundred. I am going to tell you just exactly my activities, and why I done it, and all about it.

Mr. Baker: Do you think the Committee of One Hundred needs any defense now?

Mr. Johns: From my standpoint?

Mr. Baker: Do you think it needs any defense now, after the Committee has learned just exactly what they have done?

Mr. Johns: Well, you have learned what they done. It seems to be the inference on this stand here-- everybody got on here to infer that the Committee of One Hundred hadn't done what they ought to have done.

Mr. Baker: Well, they have done nothing.

Mr. Johns: Well, I want to tell you what I think they have done. I want to tell you that the committee of nine, called a committee of nine-- and I believe that every citizen who has the interests of the city at heart

283

ought to be actively engaged some way or other for the betterment of the town. They asked me if I would come down and meet on the committee of mine for two mornings, and all I could hear up there by the big capitalists of the industries in East St. Louis was when they were going to get the colored men back. The second day I was up there I got pretty warm under the collar and I got up and told them they were treating East St. Louis unfair.

Mr. Baker: What did you get warm under the collar for?

Mr. Johns: Because they were trying to make the same identical conditions here that there were before the riot.

Mr. Baker: You said something else. You got warm under the collar, and it was because they were trying to get the colored men back?

Mr. Johns: Just let me make my statement. I got up and told them "It looks a funny thing to me, a very funny thing to me, that the town was overrun with colored men; you have no place for them to sleep, and no place for them to go, to live whatever; no houses; and as many as eight or nine men in one room; they burned up 320 houses a few days ago, and now you want them right back. You don't seem to want to make any kind of conditions for them when they get here, and don't care anything about it. All you want them back here for 's labor. I realize the fact that you possibly need labor, but I realize the fact that you ought to make some kind of living conditions for these colored men." Well, that is all you could get

out of it.

Mr. Raker: What reply did they make to your statement?

Mr. Johns: Not at all whatever.

Mr. Raker: They were trying to get the negroes back?

Mr. Johns: They were trying to get their labor back. That was all they talked, they wanted to get laborers back.

Mr. Raker: And you were trying to see that they didn't get them back?

Mr. Johns: No, no. I told--

Mr. Raker (Interposing:): I understand from your statement, your theory was that you had enough labor here?

Mr. Johns: Oh no, I didn't say that.

Mr. Raker: And that those negroes ought not to come back, because they were shutting down labor?

Mr. Johns: No, I didn't say that.

Mr. Raker: Why didn't you want them to come back?

Mr. Johns: I didn't want them to come back under those conditions. I wanted to make some provision for those fellows to live here.

Mr. Raker: You didn't want them to come back unless conditions had changed?

Mr. Johns: Certainly not.

Mr. Raker: You and I understand each other then.

Mr. Johns: I don't want you and to understand that I didn't want them to come back here.

Mr. Raker: In other words, you meant that the conditions were such here, speaking generally as to the conditions, that the negroes ought not to come back?

Mr. Johns: Not here; no, sir.

Mr. Raker: To East St. Louis?

Mr. Johns: No, sir.

Mr. Raker: While you were working to see that they shouldn't come back because of the conditions, the rest of the committee and the great concerns were working to get them back?

Mr. Johns: Absolutely. That is all you could hear.

Mr. Raker: Just after you had had this riot, growing out of that trouble?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir. And I think about 20 minutes after that, there was a representative of colored men came in and asked--

Mr. Raker (Interposing:) Before this committee?

Mr. Johns: Before this committee, and asked--

Mr. Raker (Interposing:) That committee of nine of the Committee of One Hundred?

Mr. Johns: The Committee of Nine.

Mr. Raker: Who was chairman of that committee?

Mr. Johns: Not the Committee of One Hundred; the committee of nine. ~~They were not a committee of nine. They were not a committee of nine. They were not a committee of nine.~~ There were, you might say, committees within committees here. They worked in conjunction.

Mr. Raker: Wasn't this committee of nine made up of the committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: : No, sir; oh, no.

Mr. Baker: Well, that is a committee we haven't heard of yet.

Mr. Johns: well, that is just what I am telling you. They forgot to tell about it.

Mr. Baker: Who appointed that committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: They had a meeting at the City Hall. I think there must have been five or six hundred citizens there. Anybody that wanted to go could go. And in that meeting this resolution that you read here, was read by Reverend Allison, and right after that they voted on the resolution, and then somebody passed it around-- I don't know just exactly how it occurred, but anyhow they passed around slips of paper, and everybody in the audience signed this paper, and right after it there was a motion by Mr. McGlynn that 100 citizens be appointed.

Mr. Baker: That is the committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: Just wait. You and me ain't on the right track.

Mr. Baker: Well, let's ^{get} together.

Mr. Johns: There was, I think, about 600 citizens there, and they all signed their names on the different papers that went around through the audience. I think every man in the audience signed their name. Then they took this back over-- I don't know what committee-- they had four or five committees appointed there, and they had a committee that drafted this resolution, I think is the committee that appointed the committee of one hundred, that

drafted the first resolution.

Mr. Baker: Go on and tell us how the committee of nine was appointed.

Mr. Johns: I don't know anything about that. I just say that I was notified that I had been appointed on a committee, and I went up there, and there was I and Reverend Allison and a fellow by the name of Smith, the business agent of the painters here, and we were the only ones that I can think that were on that committee that didn't represent some big business.

Mr. Baker: Well, now, let's get that.

Mr. Cooper: Name the other five. You have named three.

Mr. Johns: Cooney Reeb. He is president of the bank down here; Dan McGlynn--

Mr. Cooper (Interposing:): What does he represent?

Mr. Johns: He is an attorney here.

Mr. Cooper: For what?

Mr. Johns: Oh, he is a practicing attorney here, attorney for the corporations, or anybody can hire him, I guess, if he isn't too busy. Maurice Joyce, Ed. Goedde, Robert Johns-- that's me-- and Reverend Allison. Mr. Nulsen, I think, from the Malleable Iron Works, and of course we had Mr. Rucker there.

Mr. Baker: That is the committee of nine that you speak of?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baker: That is the same committee that Mr. Pope spoke of?

Mr. Johns: Yes, the committee of nine.

Mr. Raker: That was a committee selected from this committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: No.

285 Mr. Raker: Here is the original list that you speak of, that was gathered that night-- slips of paper handed to us by Mr. Pope (showing)?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And from that they selected the other list, which I hold here, the committee of 100, of which you are a member?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: Then, as a matter of fact, Mr. Pope and you are speaking about the same committee?

Mr. Johns: No, the committee of nine had nothing to do with the committee of 100, without it was to select the committee of 100.

Mr. Foss: The committee of nine preceded the committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; possibly four or five days.

Mr. Foss: Who asked you to be there at that meeting?

Mr. Johns: I believe Mr. Leon Smith. They asked Leon if he knew any representative of labor that would serve on the committee, and he mentioned my name, and Mr. Smith's name.

Mr. Raker: Now was the committee of nine ^{appointed} before you met over there in the hall?

Mr. Johns: You mean before the committee of 100 was appointed?

Mr. Raker: Yes.

Mr. Johns: They met in the City Hall to get this list, yes.

Mr. Raker: The committee of nine met?

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Raker: And then you designated a time of meeting of the citizens?

Mr. Johns: I think that had been talked of before I went up there. They had met a couple of days before I went up there on the committee of nine. I don't know anything about the activity of the committee of nine, only just what I told you.

Mr. Raker: Well, you are a member of the committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: But this committee of nine wasn't-- didn't get out of the committee of 100. They are not a committee of the committee of 100.

Mr. Raker. I can't get that straight in my mind. I am going to try it once more. The committee of nine was appointed before you had the meeting in the City Hall?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: They just appointed themselves?

Mr. Johns: Well, I suppose so. I don't know.

Mr. Raker: Well, how else were they appointed?

Mr. Johns: I don't know anything about it.

Mr. Baker: You don't know how it was created, the committee of nine?

Mr. Johns: I don't know. They just asked me if I would serve on that committee.

Mr. Baker: Who asked you?

Mr. Johns: Leon Smith; and Mr. Smith, the representative of the painters, comes to me and says to me "You are on that committee up there. I met yesterday with h'im."

Mr. Baker: Some way, somehow, some time, the committee of nine was appointed, but you don't know how?

Mr. Johns: No.

Mr. Baker: Then that committee of nine arranged for a meeting in the City Hall?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baker: And at which time 500 men were present?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baker: At that time those men signed their names on slips of paper sent around, and then afterwards they were pasted to the sheets which I present to you. That is it, isn't it (showing paper to witness)?

Mr. Johns: The papers were something like that. Every man in the hall signed his name.

Mr. Baker: well, I want to know if that isn't the paper. There is your name on there.

Mr. Johns: well, it is a paper just like that. I guess that is the same paper.

Mr. Baker: Then that gathering through its work appointed the Committee of One Hundred?

4331

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: Out of that committee of 100 you were appointed on the executive committee?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: Now will you tell us what that executive committee-- what that committee of 100 has done?

Mr. Johns: Well, you have heard that half a dozen times.

Mr. Raker: No, I haven't.

Mr. Johns: Well, you have heard it several times.

Mr. Raker: No, I haven't.

Mr. Johns: well, I'll tell you what I thought they done.

Mr. Raker: Tell us not what you thought you done, but what you did.

Mr. Johns: Well, we done lots of things that we thought was doing good. The first thing after the executive committee was appointed, after the committee of 100, the Mayor was over there, and we invited the Mayor to stay to the executive committee meeting, and every man on the executive committee told him that they had the best feeling for him and would do anything they could to assist h'm; and we talked over the situation of a new set of police and fire commissioners, or possibly may be two on the board, or something like that-- but anyhow a new board. But just let me make a little explanation before this committee of the executive committee met him.

Mr. Raker: I would like to have you tell me now just what this committee of 100 has done.

Mr. Johns: They met him and asked him if it was possible for him to appoint a new board of police and fire commissioners. And he said yes, he says, "I think we can. I will ask those fellows for their resignations Monday night, and then we will get together and go over this situation", as near as I can remember, and so we waited around the week and nothing was done, and when we met him again, why, he said, his council absolutely refused to consider any proposition at all whatever with doing away with the board of police and fire commissioners.

Mr. Raker: Who was the Council?

Mr. Johns: I couldn't name them all. I only know four or five of them.

Mr. Raker: That is the City Council?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir. Then I don't know-- they kept talking with him, and I suppose-- that is about all the committee of 100 done with him in regard to getting a new board of police and fire commissioners. I don't know what outside pressure made the Mayor appoint those at all.

Mr. Raker: Go on and tell what the committee of 100 did.

Mr. Johns: Then after they got them appointed, they took up the matter of the home guard through the State Council of Defense. We have a law here whereby you can have a home guard under the State Council of De-

fense, ranging from 25 to 45 years old. I have been on several committees up there, but to tell you the truth about the whole activity, as I can readily see it, the whole activity of the committee, the powers that are at the head of the committee of 100, was to get conditions in East St. Louis where labor would be absolutely safe, and those big industries would get labor; and when they got that done they felt like adjourning.

Mr. Haber: what else did the committee of 100 do?

Mr. Johns: They appointed a committee to get up the home guard. They got a committee appointed then to help out the Red Cross, and that Red Cross committee reported from time to time, but up to date the home guards has never reported.

Then going along with the committee meetings, they got up-- I think 12 or 14 laboring men come up and enlisted-- you will find the names there in lead pencil-- they come up, and how that committee, they had two of our members of the labor organization, a fellow by the name of Tressant, and a fellow by the name of Crowell. You will find them on the white sheet. They went out and got a complete list of what it would cost to maintain a regiment or something here, of the home guard, and taken down to them, and when they got down there the first thing that come up was asking who was going to finance it. The other part of the committee had never made no report at all whatever, and the labor organizations, then we organized then what we call the East St.

Louis United Labor Defense League.

Mr. Raker: Now you are getting out of the Committee of One Hundred, aren't you?

Mr. Johns: But this connects with it. They made a report, the first thing, one of the big captains of industry here-- runs the gas company over here-- I forget what his name is-- Quackenbush. About the first thing he thought about was how much activity a home guard would do in regard to a strike. That is about all they think of here, just about how soon they are going to have a strike, or when it is going to occur.

Mr. Raker: I want you to tell me what the committee of 100 did. Is that what you are trying to tell us?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir. Quackenbush took issue with the committee of 100. I can't tell this story like you would possibly tell it. Mr. Quackenbush took issue with our member, one of our members, a member of the Committee of 100-- in lead pencil there-- Crowell-- and Mr. Crowell and Mr. Quackenbush got into a heated argument, and Mr. Crowell took his data from the committee of 100, that he had furnished to the committee of 100, and that killed the home guard, and the fact of the matter is, I think it killed the committee of 100, because they didn't think that the labor organizations in East St. Louis could be very actively engaged with the committee of 100, because their conditions weren't identical. He got very sore up there and told them he thought it was a very funny thing that a committee of citizens would be appointed to work

out this salvation of the city, and just as soon as they got a few things done they quit-- and they did quit.

Mr. Baker: You are telling some very remarkable history that we have been trying to get out, and have been unable to get out. Now go on.

Mr. Johns: I am going to tell you the truth about it. I am going to tell it from the labor standpoint. I felt like the old story says, like Old Dog Tray, I had been caught in bad company; but I always felt I was giving enough to represent, in my way, the labor movement in this country, and I represented it, I guess, a little bit too strong for some of them.

Then I got a hurry-up call one day to come down to the Chamber of Commerce. The executive was going to meet. This was after the last meeting of the committee of IOC. I goes down there and sat down. I sat there awhile-- ~~that~~ thought they were going to rehearse this home guard proposition with me-- get me down there, you know-- and the first thing Mr. McGlynn says, "Do you know what is going to happen in East St. Louis?" Some fellow says "I don't know." "They are going to get Mother Jones here." And he says "when Mother Jones comes to this town there will be another riot." Now I says "Mr. McGlynn, Mother Jones, from the history, Mother Jones is a woman that has gone all over this country to benefit women and children and put some kind of starina into men to fight for what they thought was their rights, and I want to tell you smething, and all of you fellows something, if you don't

let Mother Jones speak that night you will have a riot." That's just what I told them, and Mother Jones came here and made a very able address. I didn't go, but from what I can hear she made a very able address, and I think they had all the police and the Federal officers and everything else up there to keep Mother Jones from inciting a riot; and Mother Jones didn't cause any riot, but she caused them to raise the pay of the packing houses two and a half cents an hour the next day, and I think it would be a good idea to get her back.

That was the last meeting of the executive board of the committee of 100 and all they done was to get a new board of police and fire commissioners, and after they were organized they got rid of the chief of police, and the chief of detectives resigned, and the night chief. And that is all that the committee of 100 done.

Mr. Baker: Now you have given us this statement, that there appeared to be a difference of opinion between yourself and your associates and the rest of the members of the committee of 100 after you had taken up the home guard and the idea that labor should be recognized?

Mr. Johns: That was it exactly.

Mr. Baker: You got into a real genuine difference and dispute?

Mr. Johns: It resolved itself into the proposition with me, if ever I am on any committee again and there is any big attorney for a corporation there, he and I ain't going to set on the same committee under the same

conditions. That is just the way I figure that thing, because if a man can't see far enough to get plants into operation and then see about some kind of housing conditions or working conditions for the benefit of his men, I don't claim that he is heart and soul in a committee, I don't care what it is on.

Mr. Raker: Then Mr. McGlynn was active as a member of the executive committee of the committee of 100, and was even present at their last executive committee meeting?

289

~~Mr. Johns: At the last meeting of the executive committee that we had.~~

Mr. Johns: At the last meeting of the executive committee that we had.

Mr. Raker: And made the contest you are stating here against you in regard to conditions?

Mr. Johns: No, not against me; in regard to Mother Jones.

Mr. Raker: In regard to Mother Jones. That is what I meant to say. There was a real, vital, fundamental difference between you and your friends, and Dan McGlynn and the rest of the committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; just as wide as it could be.

Mr. Raker: And it was so deep and strong and vital that the committee of 100 just practically ceased to do business-- went out of business?

Mr. Johns: They had done just what I thought they had been organized for.

Mr. Raker: What did you think they were organized

for?

Mr. Johns: To get conditions-- to get what they called a safe police force to domineer labor; to get conditions so that labor could be here. I think that a colored man was perfectly safe in this town next day after the riot.

Mr. Baker: What do you mean-- conditions so labor could be here?

Mr. Johns: Well, get a police board, you know. Now I'll tell you another story about that thing, so as to get this in your mind. Right after this morning that I had the talk with the captains of industry, a committee of colored people come over there-- come over from St. Louis-- and after I got through making this address-- and I want to tell you that I didn't use any very choice language-- I was awful sore. I could see conditions, being in the labor movement for fifteen years, and I know the workings of those big captains of industry. Although they appear to be your friends, they do that to use you. They brought in a committee of colored people. Well, the chairman that morning was Mr. Reeb, and this colored man-- a very fine looking colored man; I think a doctor from St. Louis-- asked him if he thought conditions were right then so the men could come back here and get employment. Reeb says "Why, we've got the soldiers here and the police department; and I guess it's all right"; and he turned around to me in kind of a sneering way, and says "What do you think about that as a representative of organized

labor?" Well, we had been very actively engaged in trying to get the colored men organized in East St. Louis, and in fact we had several indifferent organizations around here-- teamsters and hod-carriers, and in this Millmen and Smelter workers; and there had been no activity against the colored man from the labor movement here, because that is one of our principles, and it is one of the principles of the American Federation of Labor, not to let any creed or color interfere with organizing, and in fact, help them organize. I was pretty sore, and I told the colored fellows in about the same kind of language I told the others, that if they would do just as much missionary work among their colored brethren 364 days in the year as they did on election day, there wouldn't be any trouble. I told them Mr. Bundy had been before representatives of labor here and agreed that the town had an awful influx of colored people, and had been gotten here by the big industries, and he said when the State Council of Defense came to East St. Louis, he says "I'll tell them the same story." When the State Council of Defense come to East St. Louis, Mr. Bundy didn't tell them the same story. He said he thought the colored men all come here on their own accord.

Mr. Baker: Just switched his story?

Mr. Johns: Just switched his story; and I told them "You know Mr. Bundy double-crossed the labor movement." That is the way we term those things, and I think he did, and I haven't changed my mind. Well, they went away, and

I suppose they went away satisfied that they would be protected.

There hasn't been since that riot very much-- well, in fact, about five weeks after the riot the town thought they were in sort of a Sunday school; not a robbery committed, a murder or anything like that.

Mr. Raker: Of course since that time you had the soldiers here. Then the State's Attorney has been conducting a searching and wide examination.

Mr. Johns: I don't think the State's Attorney has.

Mr. Raker: I mean the Attorney General.

Mr. Johns: Oh yes.

Mr. Raker: You make the distinction. I meant the Attorney General. And trials are being had, and the Council of State Defense has been here; so there has been some public function going on ever since those riots.

Mr. Johns: Oh, yes. I would like to make a statement of something that occurred--

Mr. Foss (Interposing:) Before you get on to that, I would like to ask a question in connection with this conversation you had with this committee from St. Louis. Did you say anything to them about the unionizing of colored labor at that time?

Mr. Johns: Yes, I told them that I thought-- I believe I did. Now I wouldn't swear to that, but I believe I told them ^{that} at the colored men would be better off with the organization. In fact, he would. I remember here some twenty years ago when very nearly all the colored labor in

East St. Louis actively engaged was organized. They had representatives in our building trades council here. In fact, they were good men. The colored man-- if you can get the colored man organized, I want to state to you that he is a good union man-- a good organization man. We can depend on them when thoroughly organized. They can be depended on, but you people can readily see that the well organized colored man or well organized white man is not a very good man for the man that expects to control elections. You can readily see that, and I think that is one of the main things that is keeping the colored man from organizing here. In fact, a lot of white men--

Mr. Baker (Interposing:) It has a double purpose, doesn't it? They can use them for elections, and then to beat down wages and supply cheap labor? Isn't that right?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir. Organization educates them up; it educates them to what their rights are, and when a man is educated to what his rights are he is not so apt to go out and do just exactly what the petty politicians want him to do.

Mr. Foss: Wasn't that the main purpose of your meetings from time to time with the colored men?

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Foss: To get them to organize?

Mr. Johns: To get them to organize.

Mr. Foss: That was the real purpose all this time?

Mr. Johns: The real purpose, exactly.

(291) I have never learned how the thing is manipulated, because I want to tell you I don't monkey around these courts at all whatever. I don't believe-- they sometimes they catch me on the street going about my business and get me up on some jury, and just as soon as one of those fellows sees me and asks me my name-- "You are excused." But it seems like they have a way of manipulating things here just to suit themselves in regard to crime. Out on the Golden Grain out here, some time ago-- I think it is about a couple of months ago-- they had two fellows working out there, one superintendent of construction, the other superintendent of labor, white men, named Watson. They had colored hod-carriers on the job, and they wanted to put in a runway, and the labor boss says "Don't put it in that way; you'll interfere with some timbers I want to raise." They got into a wordy argument, and a colored fellow picked up a bar about that long (indicating), two inches wide and five eighths or an inch thick, an iron bar, and rapped John Watson over the head with it, and his brother run to his assistance to help him out, and the other colored fellow struck him and cut down through his hat and down into his head. He went down and swore out a warrant, as I understand, for assault with intent to kill: Now neither one of those Watson boys know today what ever become of those cases.

Mr. Johnson: Those court did they go into?

Mr. Johns: I think they went down and swore out a warrant in the police station. I never went into the

292

proposition very much. What I thought about it, they went down and pleaded guilty of assault and battery, and that was the end of it. Now these are conditions, you know.

Mr. Baker: what made you think that would bring on a riot?

Mr. Johns: Why do I think it would bring on a riot? If there was about ten or fifteen ^{white} carpenters around on the other side working, I know there would have been a free-for-all fight, not amob, not a riot, but a free-for-all fight. But instead, they spirited the two colored fellows away, and that ended it. But in order not to have any more riots, the Golden Grain Company decided to have no more colored men working on the job for two or three weeks, until the matter died down. ^{Then} they went back and went to work.

Mr. Baker: Then, getting back again to your statement as to the difference between yourself and associates, you were trying to give labor an opportunity, and you found that the majority of the committee were taking the ^{same} idea as the captains of industry here?

Mr. Johns: well, I thought so. ~~Yamnkman~~ Take any committee that is appointed in the city for the betterment of conditions in East St. Louis, it is going to tramp on the toes of the big captains of industry, because housing conditions in East St. Louis-- I suppose if you made a trip around town you never saw anything worse. I have in mind one investigation I made here-- not investigating, but a colored man that does some work for a real estate man in town here-- I went to the job one day, and I

thought he was a white man, and I said to him "Do you carry a card in our organization?" And he turned around to me and he says "No; you don't allow me to belong in your organization." I says "Why?" And he says "I am a colored man." So we kept on talking there, and he told me that he had two little houses some place out here-- I think he said on Colas Avenue; and he told me that he had rented them to two colored ~~ma~~ families, but the negroes had come in here so fast and so thick that right in his houses, little two-roomhouses, sixteen or seventeen colored men stayed in there. Now that was his statement to me. He said it was getting terrible. That is what he told me. He seemed to be an awful nice fellow. He told me conditions were getting terrible. And our activities with the Mayor here were just simply to enforce the vagrancy law-- You enforce the vagrancy law in any city in the United States, and you are going to get the riff-raff element ~~across~~ off the streets. There is no question about that. Now I will prove this statement to you by conditions in Belleville and Alton. You can't set on the street-- you can't take your tool box and go to Belleville and set on the street six hours. You can't set there five hours till the chief of police in Belleville wants to know where you are going. And if you are going to the aviation camp they will furnish you a truck; and if you don't want to go there, he tells you what car you want to take, wherever you want to go. It is the same

way in Alton: When a colored man or a white man loafs the streets there in Alton, they want to find out where he is working and why he ain't working. And they have got a pretty clean town in both those places, Belleville especially.

Mr. Raker: But the justices' courts here, the magistrates' courts and the police and general conditions here are just the other way?

Mr. Johns: Why, it is up to the Mayor to see that those laws are enforced, and the board of police and fire commissioners. I have saw men on the weed gang here in East St. Louis that previously, a year or two before, had been justice of the peace.

Mr. Raker: Do you know Patrick Flannery?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; I have known him for 25 or 30 years-- not that long-- 25 years.

Mr. Raker: Isn't he election commissioner?

Mr. Johns: I think so.

Mr. Raker: Appointed by the County Judge, Judge Yessick?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And do you know whether or not Mr. Patrick Flannery is able to read and write?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't know anything about it. He has carried on business here for years.

Mr. Raker: That isn't the question.

Mr. Johns: I don't know anything about whether

way in Alton: When a colored man or a white man loafs the streets there in Alton, they want to find out where he is working and why he ain't working. And they have got a pretty clean town in both those places, Belleville especially.

Mr. Raker: But the justices' courts here, the magistrates' courts and the police and general conditions here are just the other way?

Mr. Johns: Why, it is up to the Mayor to see that those laws are enforced, and the board of police and fire commissioners. I have saw men on the weed gang here in East St. Louis that previously, a year or two before, had been justice of the peace.

Mr. Raker: Do you know Patrick Flannery?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; I have known him for 25 or 30 years-- not that long-- 25 years.

Mr. Raker: Isn't he election commissioner?

Mr. Johns: I think so.

Mr. Raker: Appointed by the County Judge, Judge Yessick?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And do you know whether or not Mr. Patrick Flannery is able to read and write?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't know anything about it. He has carried on business here for years.

Mr. Raker: That isn't the question.

Mr. Johns: I don't know anything about whether

he can read and write or not.

Mr. Raker: Do you know his politics?

Mr. Johns: Democrat, supposed to be.

Mr. Raker: He votes the republican ticket?

Mr. Johns: Well, there is a whole lot of men in this town it would be pretty hard to put your hand on them when it comes to politics. They will get out once in a while and vote nationally, if they think they have a good chance to elect a democrat, because they want something out of it.

Mr. Raker: But the reason you think the negroes don't organize, join the unions and make the conditions better, is because of political conditions?

Mr. Johns: I would say that that is the condition; but I say it looks to me like there is some other influence on the colored man other than himself, or he would organize; because I think if a man won't organize to better his condition, there is something wrong with him.

Mr. Raker: Well, you spoke about the political conditions.

Mr. Johns: I say I feel that they were keeping them from organizing, because when a man becomes organized he becomes a little bit better educated.

Mr. Raker: Are you through with the committee of 100?

Mr. Johns: I have told you all I want to tell about the committee of 100.

4347

Mr. Baker: In other words, it practically quit because there was such a fundamental difference of opinion?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't think there is much difference of opinion. They quit when they got what they wanted.

Mr. Baker: They quit when they got what they wanted?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; and that was the assurance that the labor would be properly taken care of in those big industries.

Mr. Cooper: What do you mean by "properly taken care of"?

Mr. Johns: No rioting or trouble about it. A lot of the colored men-- it was a very pitiful sight the morning after the riot to see colored men and women and children having to leave this town. It was a pitiful sight, and of course they have a hesitancy about coming back. I don't blame them much for that. They wanted to be assured that they would be protected, and I don't blame them for that. But after we got a new chief of police and a new board of police commissioners, and all good men-- I think the head of the present board of police commissioners is as good a man as I ever met in my life-- I believe he is absolutely honest.

Mr. Johnson: That is Mr. Zeating?

Mr. Johns: No, the Board of Police and Fire Commissioners, Dr. Reed. If there is anything being pulled

over on Dr. Reed, it is justly simply because Dr. Reed don't know it. That is all there is to it. And after that was all done and we got a new chief of police in there-- and of course he, like all other new officers, was going to make a heaven out of this in about two days. They thought they had done their duty and I guess they had, so far as they were concerned. But I know when we would go up to meet in our hall, you would see some of their political henchmen around there, that didn't want conditions changed, standing across the street, and then when we would come down some fellow would say "what in the hell are you doing today?" Making all kinds of remarks to get you sore.

I don't suppose you have ever been in contact with anything like this here, but if you try to do anything in this town and it don't set well with a certain element here, and some man comes up to you and says "I don't believe you are doing any good up there", don't never figure it is that fellow; it is the other fellow higher up that is telling him to come to you.

Mr. Cooper: who is the man higher up?

Mr. Johns: The fellow that regulates politics.

Mr. Cooper: who is the man that runs the politics?

Mr. Johns: we have Fred Gerold.

Mr. Cooper: Is that the man who used to be City Treasurer?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: City Treasurer at the time all that

money was lost?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: He is a republican, isn't he?

Mr. Johns: well, yes, nationally, I guess.

Mr. Cooper: He belongs to my party (laughter.)

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Are there any of them that belong to the Chairman's party? How is Tarlton?

Mr. Johns: Tarlton is a democrat, I believe.

Mr. Cooper: Well, he is pretty well up, isn't he?

Mr. Johns: Yes; Tarlton is a politician.

Mr. Cooper: well, he controls things some, doesn't he?

Mr. Johns: well, I think he does.

Mr. Cooper: well, you know it, don't you?

Mr. Johns: Yes, I know so well that if I want to get any favors I would go to Locke, as a politician.

Mr. Raker: This democrat and this republican, Tarlton and Gerold, they pull in double harness, don't they, a good deal?

Mr. Johns: As I told a fellow once, if Barnum wanted to get some tumblers, he could get them right in East St. Louis.

Mr. Cooper: They work together, don't they?

Mr. Johns: Hand in hand. They are likely to be working against one another next year.

Mr. Cooper: They are politicians for revenue only?

Mr. Johns: I don't know what their idea is.

Mr. Cooper: Now go on and tell what you mean by "the men higher up" who run things in this town, as you think, in their own interests. Name four or five of them, or any number of them, and tell how they do it.

Mr. Johns: Oh, they would just meet you-- simply meet you on the street and tell you "Hell, you fellows can't do any good; they'll never appoint anew board of police and firecommissioners or anything like that." I'll tell you the truth about it, the absolute truth about it, if it hadn't been for the committee of 100 you gentlemen would have been under the old regime all right in East St. Louis. Now that is one thing they done.

296

Mr. Johnson: What do you mean by that?

Mr. Johns: The old board of police commissioners, the night chief and the whole shooting match. You would have been under the old regime. You would have seen the city of East St. Louis in its glory, if it hadn't been for the committee of 100. I'll give them that much credit. They did that much, and that is all they did do. I think that is a good deal.

Mr. Johnson: They haven't killed anybody here since last night, have they?

Mr. Johns: I don't know whether that fellow got killed or not. No, I don't think they have. Things have been right peaceable in the last few months.

Mr. Johnson: They killed two men in the last two days is all, haven't they?

4351

Mr. Johns: I don't know. I don't think this fellow got killed. I'll tell you, you take a town as big as East St. Louis is, they can pull off anything here without the police getting hold of it.

Mr. Cooper: Now name the men that you say are "higher up" here, and that run things.

Mr. Johns: Well, I just named them to you.

Mr. Cooper: You named two, Gerold and Tarlton.

Mr. Johns: Well, I tell you about every other man in East St. Louis is a politician, to tell you the truth about it.

Mr. Cooper: But they are not all high up. I want the men who are higher up.

Mr. Johns: Well, we have John Charberlain-- he is kind of a back number now. He used to be up in politics around here.

Mr. Cooper: Well, who are up now?

Mr. Johns: Well, Mr. Canavan and Tarlton, they claim, are the politicians in town now.

Mr. Cooper: What is your opinion about that team?

Mr. Johns: I think it is a pretty good one.

Mr. Cooper: You think it is true, don't you?

Mr. Johns: I think it is; yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Well, that is three, Canavan, Tarlton and Gerold. Who else?

Mr. Johns: Well, it is pretty hard to determine, you know. You start out a pretty good politician here and if things don't go-- if you don't go just their way,

they clip you off.

Mr. Cooper: Now Canavan is at the head of this board that has to do with special assessments?

Mr. Johns: Now, I don't know-- he is a member of the Board of Public Improvements.

Mr. Cooper: Well, he is a member of the board of public improvements.

Mr. Johns: He is a very good man for that place, too-- that is, so far as the board of public improvement is concerned.

Mr. Cooper: Now who makes the special assessments?

Mr. Johns: Well now, I couldn't tell you that. I don't know whether he does that, or whether the city attorney does that.

Mr. Cooper: How many are on this board of special assessment?

Mr. Johns: I don't know that. I think I could name-- I think they have five on the board of local improvements. There is the Mayor and the City Engineer, the President of the Board of Fire and Police Commissioners. I think the Street Commissioner is one of them, and I think the special tax collector is another. That composes the board.

Mr. Cooper: Did you hear that report read here, a portion of it, the other day, of the expert accountants who reported on conditions in this city?

Mr. Johns: No, I didn't hear that.

Mr. Cooper: Well, that board of expert account-

297

ants reported to the Mayor, Mayor Charberlain, that delinquent taxes and the sale of property for delinquent taxes, were so manipulated, and the records so kept, and such a constant failure to make proper entries occurred, that prominent interests here didn't pay their special assessment taxes. Have you ever heard that?

Mr. Johns: I have heard that lots of times.

Mr. Cooper: Well, how long have you been hearing that?

Mr. Johns: well, that is common-- well, I will just illustrate to you about the personal tax proposition here.

Mr. Cooper: No, that is another matter, about personal property. This is special assessment taxes against property for public improvements.

Mr. Johns: I don't know anything about that, only what you can hear on the street. A lot of them don't pay it.

Mr. Cooper: That report was filed hereby these expert accountants some years ago, in which they said that prominent interests here were escaping the payment of their special assessment taxes.

Mr. Johns: I have heard that. I don't know whether that is true or not.

Mr. Baker: That was reported to the city government. Now if they failed to pay their special assessment taxes, it means that public improvements are made here that affect this property, and they don't pay anything for it. That

is what it means, doesn't it?

Mr. Johns: It means that exactly.

Mr. Cooper: And it means, if analyzed down, that other people do pay for improving their property?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: And it means that the average property owner and the little property owner, who can't escape paying, pays for the improvement of the property of the big people who don't pay their taxes?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: That is what was reported to your city government. Do you know whether there has been any change in that or not?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't. I know it has been reported here time and again that the men run saloons without licenses. In fact I heard the mayor in one of his speeches before the committee of 100-- I think it was a colored man by the name of Lee, if I am not mistaken-- that they arrested him every Saturday night for selling liquor without a license, and finally the chief of police asked him why he didn't give the fellow a license, because he would sell it anyhow, and it didn't do any good to arrest him. That is the report he made.

Mr. Cooper: The Mayor of the City made that statement in a public speech?

Mr. Johns: Before the Committee of One Hundred.

Mr. Cooper: Was there any reason why they didn't send that fellow to jail each time for the limit, and keep him in jail?

Mr. Johns: They come out in the newspapers here and tell you about closing up those different places. They never close them up. That is just as far as it goes. That is newspaper talk. It has been reported here-- I don't know how true it is-- if your name was John Nicholas and you run a disorderly house here and they closed you up, all you had to do to get a new license was just to say that your name was Nicholas John, and keep on running the saloon.

Mr. Johnson: The "Nickel" figured in it?

298

Mr. Johns: I guess so. There was a fellow run a saloon out on what we call the "Chute", by the name of Al Steiner. He run a very respectable place, as respectable places go, along the Chute-- in fact, he run the best saloon on the chute. Everybody said so, and it was a nice, clean, respectable place.

Mr. Raker: Whiskey Chute?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir, on the Chute. And they taken his license away from him for some of his activities in last spring election, and I understand-- I don't know the man, but I understand that a man, one of the lowest dive saloonkeepers in East St. Louis, is running that place now. I have never been up there. That's just what you hear on the street.

Mr. Johnson: What is his name?

Mr. Johns: I don't remember his name.

Mr. Johnson: Who owns the property?

Mr. Johns: I don't know that, either.

Mr. Cooper: How about Alexander Flannigan, how long have you known him?

Mr. Johns: I have known him ever since I have been in town, about 28 years.

Mr. Cooper: What is his general reputation?

Mr. Johns: I don't think he has got any. He is a pretty good old soul, I guess; a mighty good fellow to get hold of if you want to get clear of anything-- that is, in justices courts.

Mr. Cooper: He is a lawyer?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Why do you say that they treat him here as a joke? What did you mean?

Mr. Johns: Well, every chance he gets, he butts into every place he can and butts in and talks before any audience at all. It is generally in a joking way, and telling stories, singing songs, or anything like that.

Mr. Cooper: Did he sing songs on the stage?

Mr. Johns: He can sing a song any place.

Mr. Cooper: Well, didn't it strike you as strange that at a time like that, when the conditions in this city were so critical, so dangerous, and in view of the purpose for which this meeting was called, that a man should arise in that meeting and begin to tell funny stories?

Mr. Johns: Well, I don't think-- you asked me why we treated him as a joke. I don't think he told any funny stories that night. He got very sore there. Some fellow hollered out in the audience that he rented his

flats to colored people and he got angry about that.

Mr. Cooper: Flannigan got up to speak on May 28th, and some fellow in the audience called out "You rent your flats to colored people?"

Mr. Johns: He says "who rents Flannigan's flats?" or something like that. He called him a liar.

Mr. Cooper: Flannigan called this man a liar?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson: That was all this joking?

Mr. Johns: I guess it was all a joke. The joke was from him to the other fellow. Flannigan said he never rented his flats to colored people.

Mr. Cooper: Well then, what was the next thing that happened. Was that soon after he arose?

Mr. Johns: That was right after he told this story - he told this conversation he had with some fellow out in Alta Sita, about the colored man encroaching into that neighborhood.

Mr. Cooper: Then right after that, somebody shouted from the audience "Who rents Flannigan's flats?" And he called the man a liar?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: Called him a liar simply because he had asked the question?

Mr. Johns: He inferred he rented them to colored people, I guess.

Mr. Cooper: Flannigan knew what he meant?

Mr. Johns: I guess he did.

Mr. Cooper: And called him a liar?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper: After he had called him a liar, then what did Flannigan say?

Mr. Johns: I think he went along there and talked a little bit on general things. I don't remember what he did say. About all I do remember is that. Then he went on to tell about one thing or another. I don't believe I can tell you what he did say.

Mr. Cooper: What was this talk of Flannigan's about? He got mad, and then he stopped joking when he was angry, didn't he?

Mr. Johns: He wasn't joking that night. I just simply answered your question. You asked me why we treated him as a joke. He didn't joke any that night.

Mr. Cooper: You treated a man that talked in a serious vein and called a man in the audience a liar, as a joke?

Mr. Johns: No, I didn't say that was a joke.

Mr. Cooper: No, but you treated him as a joke.

Mr. Johns: Oh, everybody treated him as a joke.

Mr. Cooper: On general principles Flannigan is a joke?

Mr. Johns: On general principles he is a joke, without you want to get-- except in the courts, and that is a joke.

Mr. Cooper: In other words, the advice or talk of Mr. Flannigan don't count much with the general citizenship of this town?

Mr. Johns: No, sir; they don't pay much attention to it.

Mr. Cooper: Soor after the people came out from that meeting, there was a report on the street that a colored man had held up a white man?

Mr. Johns: There was a report that they had held up and robbed a man about 19th and College Avenue.

Mr. Cooper: witnesses have testified here that a report came not only of the robbery but that he had killed a man or hurt him-- fatally injured him.

Mr. Johns: I didn't hear that that night. I heard it the next day.

Mr. Cooper: But the man was not fatally injured. He recovered.

Mr. Johns: I don't know anything about that. I only know part of the riot-- well, what I know of the riot, a colored man came running up the street with his hat off, and a lot of white fellows got after him, and Charlie Caschel, ex-sheriff of the county, and I think a fellow by the name of Brockman, took him over to the police station. I didn't see no rioting that night, because I took a car just as soon as I could, to get home, because I don't believe in those things. I wouldn't be a party to them at all.

Mr. Cooper: That's all.

Raker:

Mr. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Now Flannigan was on the platform, before he commenced to talk, while the rest were talking?

Mr. Johns: I think there had been about two

speakers-- none of them talked very long. I think there had been about two. I was on the platform for awhile.

Mr. Raker: But Flannigan was on the platform before he commenced to talk?

Mr. Johns: Yes, a few minutes, I think.

Mr. Raker: You were on the platform?

Mr. Johns: I was on there a few minutes. I got off. I am not seeing any conspicuousness, you know. I would rather be back in the audience.

Mr. Raker: Well, you didn't get very far from him?

Mr. Johns: Well, I suppose I was back 25 or 30 chairs, back.

Mr. Raker: Tell us who preceded Flannigan now.

Mr. Johns: I think Mr. Curtis, Al Curtis-- if I ain't mistaken.

Mr. Raker: Who is Al Curtis?

Mr. Johns: Al Curtis is a member of the Brotherhood of Carpenters.

Mr. Raker: And what did Al talk about?

Mr. Johns: Well, Al, as near as I can remember, just talked about general conditions of things, and how that the town was being overrun by colored people, and that there was no way that the Mayor and the city-- the Mayor had made no conditions whatever at all to stop it.

Mr. Raker: Well now, "General conditions", is very indefinite-- means nothing to one that wants to know what occurred there, and I believe that term "general conditions"

ditions" should be explained. Will you just tell now what he was talking about? What did he say, as near as you can remember?

Mr. Johns: well, I couldn't tell you what he said.

Mr. Baker: well, he wasn't talking about the trees in East St. Louis, and the climatic conditions?

Mr. Johns: No; he was just talking about general conditions.

Mr. Baker: Now that general conditions meant what?

Mr. Johns: It meant the influx, the enormous influx of the colored man from the South. That is what it meant.

Mr. Baker: well, that answers the question. He was discussing the fact that large numbers of negroes were coming into East St. Louis from the South?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baker: They were overrunning the city in great numbers; is that right?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baker: He was discussing the conditions following their coming here, as to the squalor and poverty and crime?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; I think he discussed that.

Mr. Baker: Did he discuss the conditions, the effect that it had upon the men that lived here?

Mr. Johns: He went into the general discussion about general conditions here.

Mr. Baker: I am trying to get some of the conditions now. Did he discuss about the effect that the conditions

had upon the people that lived here, by virtue of these large numbers of colored people coming in from the South?

Mr. Johns: Oh yes, he took that up.

Mr. Baker: He discussed that?

Mr. Johns: He discussed that, yes.

Mr. Baker: Well, did he say it had a good effect upon the people that lived here, or a bad effect?

Mr. Johns: A bad effect.

Mr. Baker: It had a bad effect upon the unions-- the waitresses' union?

Mr. Johns: The waitresses' union? He didn't say anything about the waitresses' union.

Mr. Baker: Did he say anything about the laundry workers?

Mr. Johns: No, sir; I don't think union conditions entered into the argument there at all.

Mr. Baker: That isn't what I mean at all: I just wanted to keep as far from any question of organization or union as I possibly can in my question, and my purpose-- and I am going to tell it frankly to you in advance-- is not to connect any organization or union with what I am trying to get at. It is just facts that occurred there.

Mr. Johns: I can tell you, as near as I can remember, but I tell you I have got a very poor memory. I heard J. Ham. Lewis talk the other night, and I can't tell you anything he said. I've got a poor memory.

301

Mr. Baker: well, let's not discuss that speech.

Mr. Johns: But I am just telling you I've got a poor memory.

Mr. Baker: well now, he was referring to the fact that the more laborers-- I mean the more negroes-- that came here, the worse effect it would have upon the people that lived here.

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Baker: It would affect wage conditions?

Mr. Johns: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Baker: It would affect living conditions? Is that right?

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Baker: Did he refer to the fact that the negroes that were brought here, were infesting the residence part of the city as well?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't think he alluded to that at all.

Mr. Baker: He just alluded to the fact that they were getting in. Did he say anything about these houses of prostitution?

Mr. Johns: I don't think he alluded to the houses of prostitution either. It was just the conditions on the streets.

Mr. Baker: what were those?

Mr. Johns: Well, any time during the day you could see four or five hundred men up and down these streets, around these different places.

Mr. Baker: Colored men?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir. I tell you conditions were so bad here--

Mr. Baker (Interposing:) Now just hold on. What did he say about it? Did he refer to these conditions?

Mr. Johns: He just referred to these conditions, just like any other citizen would.

Mr. Baker: Not what like any other citizen would do. Did he refer to the conditions that there were four or five hundred negroes on the streets, walking up and down the streets?

Mr. Johns: I don't know whether he mentioned the number or not, but he told about the enormous influx of colored men into town.

Mr. Baker: And were on the streets?

Mr. Johns: And were on the streets.

Mr. Baker: Obstructing the sidewalks and shoving men and women off the walk? Did he refer to that?

Mr. Johns: I don't know whether he did or not. I know he referred to this pawnbroker's proposition down here.

Mr. Baker: About having a sign there, "Buy a gun and protect yourself"?

Mr. Johns: That was in there two or three days.

Mr. Baker: He referred to that?

Mr. Johns: Yes, he referred to that, I think.

Mr. Baker: Did he refer to the fact that these large number of negroes that were supposed to come from the

South, were laying around these houses of prostitution?

Mr. Johns: I think he referred to that.

I wouldn't be sure.

Mr. Raker: Now remember as near as you can.

That was discussed, wasn't it?

Mr. Johns: Everything was discussed to lead up to the trouble here.

Mr. Raker: He discussed the fact that they were running saloons also?

Mr. Johns: Oh yes.

Mr. Raker: That these men were hanging around the saloons?

Mr. Johns: General conditions; yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: He discussed the further fact that there were ten or fifteen or twenty living in one little house in squalor?

Mr. Johns: I think he did; yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: In other words, the condition then in existence, so far as the negro was concerned, the lawless element--

Mr. Johns (Interposing:): The whites too. He discussed the squalid arrangements with the whites too.

Mr. Raker: That is what I asked you, Mr. Johns. I want to be particular about this. Did he discuss the squalor of the white and the drunken whites here that night?

Mr. Johns: I think he discussed the general conditions.

Mr. Raker: Now answer the question.

4366

Mr. Johns: I can't remember.

Mr. Raker: Did he refer to the fact that large numbers of the white people were coming here, that night?

Mr. Johns: No; he had nothing to say about that.

Mr. Raker: Then the whole address was in relation to the large influx of negroes, and the resultant effect from that large number?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir; and who were bringing them here.

Mr. Raker: And who were bringing them here?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: He charged the Capitalistic bunch with doing that, the packing-houses here?

Mr. Johns: And the Aluminum Ore Company.

Mr. Raker: And others, as being responsible for bringing them here?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: Then he referred to the fact that they were committing crimes here?

Mr. Johns: Well now, I don't know whether he referred to that or not.

Mr. Raker: Well, that was referred to that night?

Mr. Johns: I think it was.

Mr. Raker: It was discussed about these negroes running saloons and getting drunk and harboring criminals, pimps and prostitutes, wasn't it?

Mr. Johns: I believe that was discussed.

Mr. Raker: It was discussed that they were taking

practically the bread from the mouths of the men that were living here and had families here?

6 Mr. Johns: Oh, yes, especially the packing houses and the Aluminum Ore.

Mr. Raker: The men were here with their homes and their families?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And these colored men coming in would take their places, and therefore practically leave this man, this working man, and his family, without anything to live on?

Mr. Johns: It resulted into that; yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: That was presented there that night so the Council would understand it?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't think it was brought down that-- not brought down that close.

Mr. Raker: well, was that subject discussed?

Mr. Johns: The subject was discussed of some way to better those conditions.

Mr. Raker: was the subject discussed about the large influx of negroes?

Mr. Johns: Oh, yes.

Mr. Raker: Having the effect of depriving the men who live here and have families, of making a living?

Mr. Johns: Well now, I don't know whether that--

Mr. Raker (Interposing:) Well, now, let's see. You went there for the purpose of determining whether something couldn't be done to prevent the negro from coming?

Mr. Johns: Yes, to stop the influx of the negro coming here.

Mr. Raker: Now you wanted to stop him because those that came here, you believed, were being employed in the place and in the stead of the men that lived here?

Mr. Johns: We knew that.

Mr. Raker: You knew that?

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Raker: And you were discussing that matter before the Council that night?

Mr. Johns: Well now, I don't know whether that discussion came up or not.

Mr. Raker: Then you had no purpose for meeting, did you?

Mr. Johns: Yes, we did.

Mr. Raker: Well now, let's get back again. You knew the large number of negroes coming here and being employed by the Aluminum Ore Company, Morris & Company, the packing-houses and the others, was taking the wage from the man that was living here with his family?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: That's right, isn't it?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: You wanted to do something to prevent him, or assist in preventing the negro coming here?

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Raker: You were discussing there that night ways and means that would prevent the negro from coming

here, so that the work of the man that lived here would not be taken from him by importing negro immigrants?

303

Mr. Johns: Oh, yes, we had that matter in view, certainly.

Mr. Raker: And that was being discussed?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: That was the real, prime object and purpose of that meeting?

Mr. Johns: To stop the influx of negroes to East St. Louis; yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And for the purpose designated?

Mr. Johns: Certainly.

Mr. Raker: That is very plain. That is what you called the meeting for, isn't it?

Mr. Johns: We called the meeting to go before the Mayor and City Council, to see if we couldn't devise some ways and means of stopping the influx of the colored men to East St. Louis from the South. You would meet dozens of them on the street inquiring, "Mister, where is the Morris Packing Company", or "Mister, where is the Swift Packing Company?"-- any number of them during the day.

Mr. Raker: You wanted to stop them because they were a detriment to your white citizens?

Mr. Johns: Well, not necessarily the white citizens. They were a detriment to the community, a detriment to everybody.

Mr. Raker: Now ~~you~~ didn't ^{you} want to stop them be-

cause they were a detriment to your white citizens?

Mr. Johns: Well, that matter wasn't taken into consideration.

Mr. Raker: Wasn't that the main object and purpose of that meeting?

Mr. Johns: Well, the meeting was called, as I have told you before, to stop the influx of colored men.

Mr. Raker: But now I am putting another question. Wasn't the main object, or one of the main objects of that meeting, to devise means to prevent the negro from coming here, because of the detriment to white citizens?

Mr. Johns: Well, he would be a detriment to both. He would be a detriment to white citizens, certainly.

Mr. Raker: Well, wasn't it discussed, and wasn't it directed particularly to white citizens?

Mr. Johns: I don't think the white citizen proposition entered into the argument; only about the influx of the colored man.

Mr. Raker: The influx was one thing; but after he got here was another thing. I want to separate them now. You wanted to stop it because the negro was coming here in large numbers?

Mr. Johns: Certainly. There was no work for him.

Mr. Raker: Then you wanted to stop him because he was a detriment to the white citizen?

Mr. Johns: Well now, I don't know whether that

matter of the white labor proposition, the white citizens, was discussed.

Mr. Baker: I didn't say white labor. I said white citizens.

Mr. Johns: I don't know whether that was discussed or not.

Mr. Baker: Wasn't that what you were meeting there for?

Mr. Johns: We were meeting there to stop the influx of the colored men from the South.

Mr. Baker: Now to be very plain, to give you an opportunity-- these men are being used to the detriment of your white citizens?

Mr. Johns: Well, they were.

Mr. Baker: I have been trying for at least a dozen questions--

Mr. Johns: You asked me if that entered into our discussion. I said I don't think it did. That is simply a letter you are reading now, and what we discussed that night-- I don't suppose that letter was referred to in any way, shape, form or fashion.

Mr. Baker: Then you called a meeting for one purpose and turned it into another purpose? Is that right?

Mr. Johns: Not necessarily so.

Mr. Baker: Then you carried on your meeting for the purpose for which you called it?

Mr. Johns: To stop the influx of the colored man.

Mr. Raker: And to prevent him being a detriment to the white citizens?

Mr. Johns: Well, I know it is a detriment. He would be a detriment.

Mr. Raker: Well, isn't that the purpose of it?

Mr. Johns: Well, if you want to put it that way.

Mr. Raker: Isn't it true?

304

Mr. Johns: Well, if we had stopped the influx here, it would have been true.

Mr. Raker: If you had stopped it, but the more you did stop it, it would be that much more advantageous to the white citizens here, wouldn't it?

Mr. Johns: Oh, that is natural.

Mr. Raker: Well, coming back again, the meeting was called to prevent the influx of negroes first, and the second purpose would be so that he wouldn't be a detriment to the white citizens when he got here?

Mr. Johns: Well, yes, you can put it that way.

Mr. Raker: Then following this speech of Mr. Curtis, Mr. Flannigan got up?

Mr. Johns: I think Flannigan got up afterwards; I wouldn't be sure now.

Mr. Raker: I would like to have you give me that exactly, if you can.

Mr. Johns: I can't remember now. There were four speakers, and I don't know whether Flannigan talked after Curtis or after Kane.

Mr. Raker: He was the last speaker that night?

4373

Mr. Johns: I don't remember whether Flannigan was the last, or whether the Mayor was. I am not sure, but I think the Mayor made the last address. I wouldn't be sure about that-- where he said that they were getting together on a proposition. I think he said he and the Corporation Counsel were.

Mr. Raker: well, you were there for the purpose of discussing and preventing the shipment of negroes here in East St. Louis?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And there is no doubt about that, is there?

Mr. Johns: No doubt about it at all.

Mr. Raker: Now isn't it a fact-- to refresh your memory-- that Flannigan was called on just before the meeting was adjourned, and just as Flannigan was winding up his sentences, the audience began to leave the hall?

Mr. Johns: Well, I don't know whether the audience began to leave the hall or not. I know the audience called on Flannigan to make a talk, because we didn't have Flannigan on the list of speakers at all whatever.

Mr. Raker: You had finished your program?

Mr. Johns: We had finished our program.

Mr. Raker: Then after you finished your program, Flannigan followed?

Mr. Johns: The audience hollered "Flannigan".

Mr. Raker: After you had finished your program, the audience called for Flannigan?

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: Now Flannigan didn't talk about the trees and the climate?

Mr. Johns: Oh, no.

Mr. Raker: Flannigan didn't talk about the pure atmosphere in West St. Louis, did he? He didn't talk about whether the sky was light or dark, did he?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't think that entered into it at all.

Mr. Raker: Flannigan didn't talk about the surf along the Atlantic Ocean, did he?

Mr. Johns: No.

Mr. Raker: Flannigan talked about the negro, didn't he?

Mr. Johns: He done just as I told you, that story.

Mr. Raker: Well now, he didn't just tell that story and quit, did he?

Mr. Johns: Well, I couldn't tell you anything else that Flannigan said.

Mr. Raker: Did he say anything else except that story?

Mr. Johns: Well, after these people hollered at him in regard to the flats, then I think they began to leave the hall. I know I got out of there as quick as I could.

Mr. Raker: Flannigan told a story about if a man buys furniture and moves into a place of business, and the furniture don't get in there, he can't use it?

4375

Mr. Johns: Yes, sir.

Mr. Raker: And if he gets into the building and the building burns down, he can't use the building?

Mr. Johns: That is what he said.

Mr. Raker: Then he further said there is no law against mob violence?

Mr. Johns: No; he said the mob knows no law-- something to that effect.

Mr. Raker: Well, now, you have stated awhile ago, and I was just trying to complete your language, that there was no law against mob violence?

Mr. Johns: Something like that. I don't know just exactly his words.

Mr. Raker: Then following that, somebody in the audience said, "Who rents Flannigan's flats?"

Mr. Johns: Yes.

Mr. Raker: And Flannigan says "It's a damn lie?"

Mr. Johns: Something like that.

Mr. Raker: Then the meeting adjourned?

Mr. Johns: Well, they began to get out of the hall-- in fact, some of our fellows left there as soon as Flannigan got on his feet.

Mr. Raker: Now you have told us practically all of Flannigan's speech?

Mr. Johns: All that I remember.

Mr. Raker: But what you do remember, he talked about the negroes?

Mr. Johns: Oh, yes.

Mr. Baker: He talked about the influx of negroes here?

Mr. Johns: I believe he did.

Mr. Baker: He talked about the detriment it would have upon the white citizens here, the negroes coming here?

Mr. Johns: No, I don't know whether he talked anything about the white citizens or not. He just got up and talked a few minutes.

Mr. Baker: Now listen. He talked about the negroes coming here because of the detrimental effect he would have upon the negroes that lived here, did he?

Mr. Johns: I don't know whether he did or not.

Mr. Baker: He was talking, and the whole purpose of his talk was to show the evil effect, the criminal effect, of bringing criminals here, the congestion of living, filthy conditions surrounding the conditions of living; the fact that they were surrounding these houses of prostitution, and robberies were being committed by the negroes and negro prostitutes; that men who had been laboring at these plants had been cut out of their jobs, and they and their families were not getting enough to eat; and you folks wanted to prevent-- to see if some ways and means could not be devised by the Mayor and the City Council to prevent the further influx of negroes. Isn't that right?

Mr. Johns: I don't know that that entered into the discussion that you have just said.

Mr. Raker: But that was the purpose; that was the particular purpose, to stop the influx of negroes?

Mr. Johns: Exactly, because there were too many here, about four or five for every job-- may be more! The fact of the matter is, there were about 500 both whites and blacks here, who wouldn't work at all, and we wanted the Mayor to do something to rid the town of that class of citizens. It had been done here before and could be done again. We had ~~the~~ chief of police one time that would take them, both white and black, in droves, hundreds, and take them out of this town.

Mr. Raker: Well, were you also interested in this meeting-- there ought not to be any fear of the meeting because I refer to it, because it is so prominent, called for the purpose of trying to better conditions-- you discussed the question as to getting rid of the negroes already here, in this large number that had come here?

306

Mr. Johns: We wanted some laws enforced to get them off the streets, both white and black. Of course I don't think the whites entered into the consideration, but to enforce the vagrancy law as it ought to be enforced on both.

Mr. Raker: Well, I know, but the further discussion was that they were here, thick on the streets, they were around, as you stated they were, at these various houses and saloons, drunk, robbing and committing offenses, and you wanted to get rid of them if you could?

Mr. Johns: Yes, we would have to.

Mr. Raker: And wasn't one of the matters you were presenting to the Mayor, suggesting ways and means for getting rid of them?

Mr. Johns: I don't think the discussion was entered into of getting rid of them. It was to stop them from coming here.

Mr. Raker: You were perfectly satisfied with those already here?

Mr. Johns: If they would go to work.

Mr. Raker: That isn't the question.

Mr. Johns: Well, that was our idea, to put them to work or get them out of here.

Mr. Raker: You were perfectly satisfied with all the negroes here at that time before that night?

Mr. Johns: Oh no, we wasn't perfectly satisfied.

Mr. Raker: I understodd you now to say that you were.

Mr. Johns: No, we wanted him to enforce the vagrancy laws, and get the negroes off the streets; either make them go to work or get out of town.

Mr. Raker: Do I understand you to say that you ^{not} were satisfied with the negroes already here at that time?

Mr. Johns: The good, hard-working negroes were all right, certainly.

Mr. Raker: That isn't the question. I put the general question; do I understand you to say now that you weren't satisfied with all the negroes here at that time?

Mr. Johns: Certainly we weren't-- not with all of them, no, sir.

Mr. Baker: And you say now to the Committee that your object and purpose was to see the Mayor and see the Council to see if you could devise ways and means to get rid of some of those negroes?

Mr. Johns: Either get rid of them or make them go to work.

Mr. Baker: And you think that was presented to the Mayor and Council that night?

Mr. Johns: Well, that is the only way they could get rid of them.

Mr. Baker: Do you think it was presented to the Mayor and the Mayor's Council that night?

Mr. Johns: No, the matter was just simply asking him if he could devise some ways and means.

Mr. Baker: Then you met the Mayor and you didn't tell him what you wanted?

Mr. Johns: It wasn't necessary to tell what we wanted. He knew exactly what he could do. He knew he had those laws and could enforce them.

Mr. Baker: You went there for a purpose--

Mr. Johns (Interposing:): We didn't go there for a purpose, only to stop the influx of these negroes.

Mr. Baker: You had this purpose to accomplish, and you didn't go there for any purpose?

Mr. Johns: We went there for the purpose to stop the influx of the colored man.

Mr. Baker: And further, you were overrun with negroes at that time, five men to one job, wasn't there?

Mr. Johns: Well, just about that, yes.

Mr. Baker: You have just said that. I am using your language. That is true, isn't it?

Mr. Johns: Four or five men to one job.

Mr. Baker: And you wanted to see if ways and means couldn't be devised by which the further influx of negroes could be stopped, as well as the extra surplus disposed of; isn't that right?

Mr. Johns: That was our aim, certainly.

Mr. Baker: That's all.

Mr. Johnson: You may stand aside.

The Committee will take a recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 o'clock p.m., the Committee recessed.)

307
~~207~~-E

11/14/17

After recess.

The committee reassembled at two o'clock P. M., pursuant to request.

Statement of M. R. Bevington.

The witness was sworn by Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson: What is your name and residence?

Mr. Bevington: M. R. Bevington, St. Louis, Missouri.

Mr. Johnson: What is your occupation?

Mr. Bevington: I am the attorney for the government in this section of the country in national matters.

Mr. Raker: Mr. Bevington, state to the committee what your business is relative to dealing or coming in contact with men engaged in the saloon business.---how you do it---in a short way.

Mr. Bevington: Our service has the supervision of the naturalization law, and therefore the investigation of all applications that may be filed for citizenship. After a petition for naturalization is filed, the government is given a period of at least ninety days in which to investigate and ascertain the true character of the candidate. It is the business of the branch of the government in which I am employed to ascertain those facts with respect to each man who makes application, and then to later appear in the court, and if any cause exists why he should not be granted citizenship, to present those matters to the court. And in that way I have come in contact with the saloon element of this city, investigating applications for citizenship.

Mr. Raker: You have found men who have taken out their first papers and applying for second papers, and you have had to make that investigation?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir. I may say that I have not made that investigation personally, but my subordinates have made it; but I have reviewed these cases and I have conducted hearings before the courts over here to a greater or less extent, and in that way have become familiar with the facts. I have had charge of this district now for about eight years.

When we first took charge of this work with respect to all of this East Side, we found that the saloonkeeping element ignored absolutely the laws with respect to Sunday closing, and in addition, the laws with respect to eligibility for licenses. For instance, under the laws of Illinois an alien can't procure a saloon license. Furthermore, under the statutes of this State the keeping open of a saloon on Sunday is made a criminal offense. We found the saloons running wide open and paying no attention to the Sunday closing law; and the very fact that the saloonkeepers were seeking citizenship showed that they had violated the other law, which prohibited them from running a saloon at all; and we raised the question with the courts whether or not these men in violating the law as they had were persons of good moral character, and whether they were entitled to citizenship. At first the courts were very much inclined to disagree with the view that we took, that the men should not be

308

naturalized, they contending that we could not expect the greater grade of morality from these men than existed in the community, and that it was open and notorious that everybody kept their saloon open on Sunday, and that the state and county and city officials condoned that fact, and therefore it was not right to bar them from naturalization. We carried up one of those cases from the city court here of East St. Louis to the supreme court of this State in 1908, I think, and the cases reported in the 88th Northern, 1051 to 1053, U. S. vs. Hraski. The Supreme Court brushed aside all these objections raised down here and held that any man who violated the Sunday closing law was a man of bad moral character withⁱⁿ the meaning of this statute, and therefore should be excluded from citizenship.

As soon as we got that decision, then of course we began raising objections in all of these cases, and from our objections these matters came to our particular notice in this way: the saloonkeepers would come across the river to my office in St. Louis and ask that I either not raise the objection in their case, or make specious excuses why we should close our eyes and let them get through. The most general excuse that they made was that the entire community was rotten and that they were no more to blame than anyone else; as a matter of fact they were tools rather than the guilty persons; that those that instigated them in this business and in the violation of the law were all Americans, native born, and that they were more or less hirelings and followers of these men. Of course that didn't influence us.

Then they raised another complaint, saying that the breweries were responsible for the whole thing, and they were corporations and natives of this community, and that they would go out and hunt up these men and establish them in the saloon business here.

Mr. Baker: The breweries would?

Mr. Bevington: The breweries would. And that no saloonkeeper was anything more than a bartender; that while the license was in their name and ostensibly they were the owners of the place, in fact the breweries owned and absolutely controlled them.

Mr. Boss: Did they say that the breweries paid the license fee?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir; they did everything; rented the building; paid the rent and paid the license fees, and moreover owned the buildings in addition.

Mr. Baker: Just before you pass that---and that is the condition here in about 80% of the saloons?

Mr. Bevington: I would not be able to say definitely as to that, but all of the saloonkeepers---and I have talked with hundreds of them---have told me without variation that that was the case in their cases, so I should say that the condition is absolutely general.

These men further confirmed the running of their saloons as they did with the statement that the breweries put many of these saloons in existence that unless they tendered to vice and crime, that they couldn't attract custom and would starve out. When I first came

to this St. Louis district I think every saloon without exception that the government investigated was not only a saloon but a gambling house and a house of prostitution as well. It might not have been devoted chiefly to prostitution, but prostitution was connected with all of these saloons. They were about as vicious and depraved places as any one could possibly ask for. And these men laid the whole blame on the breweries whom they said required those sort of things to attract the evil element from ^{East} St. Louis, and that Sunday was the big day.

309

I think I should tell this committee also that in spite of the decision of the supreme court of this state, the government received very little sympathy or helped--- in fact none---from any state official in either ascertaining the true facts or in helping us secure the dismissal of these cases. At first the courts when they saw that the government absolutely insisted ^{on} the dismissal of these cases, and where we had the absolute proof, would apologize to these saloonkeepers.

Mr. Raker: The dismissal of applications for citizenship?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Raker: That denied him the right to become a citizen when the ^{case was} dismissed?

Mr. Covington: Yes sir. In doing that they would absolutely apologize to the man. I had one judge--- I don't just recall now which one it was of the judges over here---

Mr. Cooper: (Interposing) A judge or justice?

Mr. Bevington: A judge. Only a court of unlimited jurisdiction can naturalize aliens. The judge would tell the man, "I am absolutely helpless. Here is the government man, and if I admit you he will run right to a government attorney and cancel your citizenship." I might say by way of digression, that the government has the right to review in federal court, by way of cancellation proceedings, any judgment contended to be illegally procured, and the supreme court in construing the words "illegally procured" has held it to mean ^{"procured"} /contrary to the right of law."

Mr. Cooper: So you have ~~you have~~ got the right of review of the judge's decision if wrong?

Mr. Bevington: Yes, and can review facts as well as law in this cancellation proceeding. That was the decision and we pretty nearly had to quarrel with the courts and create a disturbance to secure at first the dismissal of these cases. But eventually they were all worked around, and I want to say to this committee that at the present, so far as East St. Louis is concerned and the judge in this city, Judge Browning, we have received the strongest of support. In fact, he has been absolutely fearless, and the only judge in the whole eight years that I have been here that has supported the government in these proceedings and has helped us fight the vice conditions here. Of course our fighting it was limited absolutely to these naturalization applications.

Mr. Cooper: Who is Judge Browning?

Mr. Bevington: One of the judges of the city court.

Mr. Cooper: Which has the same jurisdiction as a circuit court on naturalization?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir. I may say for your information that the city court of this city, under the laws of the state, has concurrent jurisdiction ^{with} of the circuit court of a county, only its jurisdiction ^{only} extends to the city limits. But within the city limits it is a court of concurrent jurisdiction with the circuit court of a county.

Mr. Cooper: It has general jurisdiction within the city limits?

Mr. Bevington: So far as naturalization is concerned, yes sir.

Mr. Cooper: And this city court can hear naturalization applications and admit the men to citizenship?

Mr. Bevington: Yes, and it does. And Judge Browning, the judge of that court, has, since his elevation to the bench, been in charge of this work and has given us wholehearted support.

510-H

I think possibly I can make clear to this committee just exactly what we have had to contend with if I take one specific case that has been adjudicated, and if the committee cares I will tell you.

Mr. Cooper: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Bevington: Possibly as good a case as I can cite is the case of one John Fiezel. Fiezel was a Hungarian,

a miner, a man of magnificent appearance physically, and one that would command influence just from that appearance among his countrymen. He told me he was a coal miner and never had had any thought of following any other occupation, and that an agent of a brewery here in East St. Louis came to him at his mine and induced him to come here in East St. Louis and open up a saloon, they furnishing the license and the buildings and everything. Piezel in due course filed an application for citizenship/^{here}in the city court, and it became necessary then for us to investigate it. In that investigation I suppose Piezel called on me a dozen times, sometimes in company with his wife, and other times in company with friends; and he told me his whole story. This brewery that procured his license in the first place---

Mr. Cooper: (Interposing) What is the name of the brewery?

Mr. Bevington: Without access to my records I couldn't tell you what the brewery was. This case was disposed of sometime back. But they had a way of what you might call promotion among the saloonkeepers. For instance, a man had a good stand and going out of business, and someone else was in on their license, they would turn that stand over to him; and he changed to four or five different locations here before the time of the filing of his application. One of those, it developed, that he had gotten out of, and turned over to another man, he claimed had been run as an assignation house---that is, to run a

saloon down stairs and was keeping ostensibly a boarding house, but it was nothing more than a house of prostitution, and after he left it, it was continued to be run in the same ^{way} it so happened that the federal authorities had a case coming within the white slave law, and our federal court here sent both the principal and the bartender to Leavenworth penitentiary as white slavers; yet they did nothing more than Fiezel had been doing, although it had never been proved that any of his customers had come across the river.

Tell now, after I had informed him what the law was here, and that he had no chance of becoming a citizen, he began abusing the officials and breweries, to a certain extent, laying all the blame on them, and he brought his wife over to my place, to my office. This woman was a big magnificent looking woman like Fiezel himself, and said she had two children, and in explaining---in trying to explain away one of my objections to a saloon which Fiezel had run, she made this statement that she was oppressed no. to herself to Fiezel conducting this saloon; that he had made enough to get out on, and that she didn't want her children around it. Then she admitted to me that this was ^{the} sort of a place that he ran; that this saloon was in a district in which his principal custom was steel workers, and she said that according to the general practice that prevailed, Fiezel kept, or permitted to hang around this place negro prostitutes, and in explaining why she wanted to take her children

311-W away from this saloon, she said these women were so abandoned that while they had an old shed at the back end of the lot that was used as a ^{urinal} place of that character, and while generally they would go back to have sexual intercourse, some of them were so depraved that they would simply step out of the saloon and lay down in the back yard and have sexual intercourse there, and the children seeing that she thought was not fit for them morally.

A while after this woman had told me this story I began receiving letters from more or less prominent people over here in East St. Louis, giving Fiezel a fine reputation, among them Ransome Payne, chief of police. I questioned Fiezel further, and he told me that he was represented in his case by a lawyer by the name of Alexander Flannigan, and that Flannigan had told him that he could get him through if he would pay the requisite fee; that he would see that he passed by the court; and I supposed this campaign of letterwriting was properly engineered by Flannigan, although I don't know. I took police chief Payne to task about his letter, and he positively declared that he knew just what sort of a place that Fiezel had run, and that the place was clean and moral, and there was no objection whatsoever to it; and this was after Mrs Fiezel had told me in my office that these negro prostitutes were around there and would have sexual intercourse under such degrading conditions.

Now Fiezel's case ^{is} /xxx, I think, ~~show~~ a fair sample.

although a very of these men have had lawyers representing them, but the most of them have here been represented by unscrupulous practitioners of some sort or other, or ward healers, or men who claimed to have political influence over here.

In the federal court this morning we had a case styled United States vs Kauffer, in which the testimony was---my assistant advised me a verdict of guilty has just been rendered in that case. The testimony in that case was to this effect: that this ward healer, Kauffer had gone to this man, a man by the name of Chneiwick, a Jew, and told him he had influence with the judge's court and could get him naturalization. The defense offered an affidavit to the jury in that case they tried Chneiwick, a part of which reads as follows: It is fairly interesting. If you will permit me, before I read this, I would like to make this explanation. The first of the present year the mayor here refused to any longer issue licenses to aliens who were operating saloons--- that is, foreigners. They were not entitled at any time under state law, but ^{that} ~~it~~ has been the practice here, and it was in connection with that feature that this affidavit was offered by the attorney for Kauffer:

312-N

"That after January 1, 1917, it was at the suggestion of Mayor Hollman that ^{the} licenses ~~were~~ ^{were} taken out under the name of George B. Kauffer, as this would enable the affiant to continue the operation of his saloon without being a citizen of the United States." That was testimony

offered in this Kauffer case this morning.

Mr. Raker: Kauffer was running a saloon?

Mr. Bevington: He would just lend his name. Kauffer was a real estate man who owned the building in which this saloon was located. As soon as the mayor refused to license it any more, as it had been licensed for four or five years, according to the testimony this morning, then the place would have become vacant if Kauffer couldn't have filled it up. So he loaned his name as a straw man for the license, and the license was issued, and Chneiwick ran the place as he always done before. Now there is a rather funny turn to that. Chneiwick testified the same as I have read you here before Judge Browning, and it is one of those cases which we have under indictment---he will be tried this afternoon. He testified that Mayor Mollman suggested a scheme by which they could beat the statute, and I was told that immediately after his testimony he was advised that he would no longer be permitted to run a saloon here. How true that is. I don't know, but he was responsible for it, and I understand that since the first of July the saloon actually did pass from his custody and control.

Mr. Cooper: This particular saloon?

Mr. Bevington: Yes, this particular saloon. And this man Chneiwick is only one of a considerable number that told my office in connection with their applications that they were advised by the mayor here to put up some straw men after the first of January, and that he would

issue them a license in that straw man's names, and they could go on running the place just as they had before. Of course I only have the ex parte statements of the saloon-keepers to that effect, and the only reason that I reported it was that they were applying for citizenship here.

Mr. Cooper: Who paid for the license? Now the straw man?

Mr. Bevington: The alien would pay for the license. He would put up the money.

Mr. Cooper: That is the point.

Mr. Bevington: The alien would not either; the brewery did all of that. The alien was simply a bartender---nothing much more than that.

Mr. Raker: And the straw man was used by the brewery, and then the saloon man used the straw man?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Raker: He could get the license that way, and then the alien, this Chneiwick here would run the saloon?

Mr. Bevington: Exactly.

Mr. Raker: And he was told, as he says---and others--- that the mayor suggested that he do that so as to avoid the statute?

Mr. Bevington: Well, they went even further than that. They stated that this was a political game; that the administration was playing both the good and bad elements of society, and that while openly they were denying saloon licenses to the these men who ran saloons illegally, yet they were telling them to quietly come

513-11

around and get their licenses the same as usual. Now that testimony of course is subject to certain discount, because they were interested parties, and they were telling their side of the story.

Mr. Baker: I don't think you need to discount it any.

Mr. Bevington: Well, I have usually done so.

Mr. Cooper: Well what do the facts show? Let me see now if there is any discount on it. This man was running an illegal saloon?

Mr. Bevington: He was.

Mr. Cooper: In open violation of the law?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Cooper: He knew that, and the mayor knew it?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Cooper: And the mayor knew that this man was running a saloon in violation of the law, and the man himself knew it, and the mayor suggested a way by which this man could continue to evade the law and run an illegal saloon, didn't he?

Mr. Bevington: And in a way that the public would think he had been put out of business, while as a matter of fact he was still continuing as he always had.

Mr. Cooper: Instead of discounting, I think it is 100% fraud.

Mr. Baker: The records would show that it was in another man's name?

Mr. Bevington: Exactly.

Mr. Baker: If any question was raised by the good

citizens or women, they would say, "why, this man is out of business. He doesn't have a business license, but here is a license issued to Mr. so and so, a pretty fair fellow as sayings go."

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir:

Mr. Raker: Now who defended this man in here?

Mr. Bevington: The city council, or, Jerry Sullivan.

Mr. Raker: The city attorney?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Raker: Defended this man that you have just convicted?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Raker: And the fact of which you have told the committee?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir. He is the man that offered the affidavit that I tell you about, about Mayor Kollman, in evidence, that Mayor Kollman put this man up to getting the license in that way. I believe it is the business of the city attorney also to close up these illegally run saloons.

Mr. Raker: You expect that under the law?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir; that is the situation.

If I am not wearying this committee, I can tell you another funny angle to these cases. I went at great length in describing this Fiezel case, wherein Alexander Flannigan had told him he could get his citizenship. A few days ago a lawyer came to my office and stated

that he came from Fiezel, and that Fiezel wanted me to consider a proposition that he had to make, and that was this, that he would turn evidence against Flannigan so that we could prosecute Flannigan for the fraud in this case, provided we would withdraw our objection to his being naturalized. This attorney, I may say, was one Martin Weiss. He had an office in the Chemical Building over in St. Louis. He told me then that this man Fiezel had offered first, I think, \$3000 to anybody that would get him naturalized---some large sum---and he paid ~~down~~ Flannigan \$25 down on account when the case was taken, and on the same assurance that he could get him through. He explained to me that Fiezel's confidence in Flannigan was gained in this way, that Flannigan had acquired the reputation---or has given himself the reputation---that he controlled every jury in which he appeared as counsel, and always secured the verdict in favor of the man that he appeared for; and Fiezel naturally supposed that he had some influence with the judges and could actually get what they bargained for; and he says that Flannigan concocted this scheme: that Fiezel, of course, knew as a saloonkeeper and a man who had habitually violated the Sunday closing law, that he couldn't become naturalized, regardless of any feature of running a house of prostitution for years, and Flannigan of course knew that, and they concocted this scheme, they got up a fake bill of sale of Fiezel's saloon, selling it to somebody that nobody ever heard

314-N

of, and that bill of sale then was to be used as evidence that he was no longer in the saloon business, and Diezel was to come in and file his petition and give his occupation as that of a coal miner. All of which he did, and he was instructed that he ^{should} contend and maintain at all times that he was a miner; that he had nothing to do with the saloon at the time he filed this petition, and that therefore he was not to be debarred under this **supreme** court decision. And if our investigations were purely formal, you can readily appreciate on the testimony of an interested party petitioner and two willing witnesses that we would never discover this situation; but it so happened that in this particular case the bombardment of letters that I got recommending Diezel so highly excited my suspicion, and about that time a social worker over here came to me and made a complaint against him, saying that he had heard that he had filed his application, and that if ~~we~~ we could do anything to defeat it, we would be doing a public service. Then he went ^{on} to say that some of the young men that he had in his parish, I guess you would call it, had contracted venereal disease in this disreputable saloon of Diezel's, and he thought if we could knock him out on the petition for citizenship, possibly he would close that saloon and this evil influence would be removed from these young men. I have no objection to giving you the name of this minister. I don't know his first name, but his last name is

Kardof, Rev. Kardof. He is a worker among the Hungarians here, and I have known the gentleman for seven or eight years. Everything I know of him is very favorable. He works among a very low class of people---that is, low in that they are immigrants here and they are under very discouraging circumstances. They don't speak our language; they have no place to go except among those who do speak Hungarian, and most of those places are saloons and dives. There is no meeting place like the Y. M. C. A., or any decent place of that kind that they can go to.

Mr. Johnson: What is the denomination of this man?

Mr. Bevington: I don't know that they have a denomination. It is an off-shoot, I may say, of what is known as the Markham Memorial Mission, run over in St. Louis, where it is located I don't know. Rev. George W. King is the head of that movement, and he has been interested in the Hungarians for many years. He used to make a trip every year over there, and he has carried on this mission for the benefit of the Hungarians. I think possibly it may be said to be undenominational.

215-X

Mr. Baker: Now go right on with that.

Mr. Bevington: I think that is about all there is. As soon as Mr. Kardof made this statement, and knowing him to be reliable, I assigned members of my office to make a thorough investigation, and as a matter of fact this man's character was so open and notorious, and the facts were so above board that there was no trouble in finding out the true facts, and I sent for Piesel and

told him what we had found, and then he himself told me most of the other. He was very frank about it.

Now this man Fiesel is not in St. Louis now. Accordingly to this---you will have to locate him through his counsel, Martin Weiss, this lawyer in the Chemical Building.

Mr. Baker: This is the second lawyer now.

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Baker: Weiss is the lawyer that has stated to you that Fiesel would tell just ^{how} and what Flannigan stated to him if he, Fiesel, could obtain his papers.

Mr. Bevington: Yes, he was trying to bargain with me, in other words. I may say that he probably ^{was} induced to do that by a course I have followed here. I found that dismissing these petitions, even with prejudice over here, these saloonkeepers, were not discouraging the filing of applications, and that they kept on under various subterfuges trying to get in; and on top of that I will go further and say that a lot of these men that have actually been naturalized, I have received letters from reputable people informing me that they had procured citizenship through perjury; that they were not entitled to it; that they ran dives and saloons, but through perjury got away with it, and my force is so limited that I haven't been able to investigate those cases. I have got them all my file, and will take them up whenever I can get around to it, and take whatever action is necessary. Though we were facing this condition and having this trouble

until Judge Brownings ^{turn} ~~came~~, in getting any action at all, and I switched my practice and am bringing every one in the federal court here and prosecuting them for perjury. And that, I believe is having some effect.

Mr. Raker: Now on this case of Weiss, if Weiss knew that Fiezel had filed an affidavit which in itself was perjury, stating that he was ^e coal miner when as a matter of fact he was a saloon man, and desired to procure the admission of Fiezel, knowing the fact as you have stated, he would be violating a federal statute to illegally procure admission to citizenship.

Mr. Bevington: I guess I haven't made it quite clear; Fiezel's case has been dismissed and there is nothing pending in court now; and what Weiss was trying to do was to bargain with me to let Fiezel file a new application, and as the government representative to keep my mouth shut and let Fiezel go through.

Mr. Raker: That is what I say, that if it is---if those are the facts under the law---anyone who through fraud assists in obtaining one to be admitted to be a citizen commits an offense under the federal statute.

Mr. Bevington: I would think so.

Mr. Raker: That is clear. No doubt about that. Now the same way with Flannigan, the lawyer, the first lawyer, who was representing Fiezel, who advised Fiezel to file this affidavit alleging that he was a coal miner, when as a matter of fact he was a saloonkeeper, for the purpose of committing fraud upon the government in ob-

taining his final papers, would likewise be committing a crime under the federal statute.

Mr. Bevington: Yes.

Mr. Raker: Well as subornation of perjury; as well as to illegally to procure---to obtain a final certificate of citizenship. So there is a clear case of violation of the federal statute by Weiss, the lawyer, and a clear violation---and you have got the records of most of these other things?

Mr. Bevington: Yes.

Mr. Raker: A clear violation of the statute, a subornation of perjury, as well as the other crime, which makes it a felony against Flannigan, to try to procure final papers for Fiezel.

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Johnson: Are you going to prosecute those people?

Mr. Bevington: Well, I haven't the final say so on that. These criminal cases I have to refer them to the Department at Washington and get their sanction first. It seems that there is a lack of funds for prosecution.

Mr. Johnson: To what particular officials at Washington do you refer these matters?

Mr. Bevington: I refer these cases to the Commissioner of Naturalization, Richard K. Campbell; and I think the practice there is to consult the Department of Justice, and then I am authorized to go ahead out here.

Mr. Johnson: Do you know what officials in the

Department of Justice he consults?

Mr. Bevington: Well, I don't know. The Department of Justice when I was in Washington had sort of an informal arrangement whereby one assistant United States Attorney General would represent---

Mr. Raker: (Interposing) Densmore, isn't it?

Mr. Bevington: No, Densmore is Solicitor for the Department of Labor, and would not have anything to do with it. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, who is now out, was the man who handled these things up until the time of his resignation. The various Assistant Attorneys general handled the work for the various departments.

Mr. Johnson: What was that man's name?

Mr. Bevington: Wallace, William Wallace, he has now resigned and practicing law in New York.

Mr. Johnson: I am after his successor now.

Mr. Bevington: Mr. Wallace reviewed ~~all~~ all the legal business for my department, and we have had to get his authority to proceed in many of these cases.

Mr. Raker: Have you presented these two cases, Alexander Flannigan and Martin Weiss to the Attorney General's office?

Mr. Bevington: I haven't as yet.

Mr. Raker: Well now, will you?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Raker: And in that letter, will you say to them that if they don't take those two cases up immedi-

317-M

ately, the matter will be taken up by the Congressional committee---at least I will, and I think the rest of the members will---to see that ~~that~~ justice is done for the people of this country.

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir; I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. Raker: Will you get at that right away?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir. I want to say to this committee that I am very much handicapped in my work through this feature: I have a district that takes in six full states and 700 courts with naturalization cases to look after, and I only have eight men including myself, and one of those is a clerk. Only seven are lawyers, to look after this. One man has a hundred courts, and I have supervision of all these, with something like ten thousand cases a year to review. That is a pretty tough job for one man to do.

Mr. Raker: We have been trying to get more money every time there has been an opportunity for this department to investigate and handle matters in relation to the naturalization department of the government, and from your statement on it you say that you are absolutely handicapped for want of money.

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Raker: And guilty men are going free and others are not being prosecuted because you can't get at it?

Mr. Bevington: I venture to say, gentlemen, that I have a file of papers in my office that high (about four inches), come to me through the mails in the last few years, charging ^{certain} ~~these~~ men here in East St. Louis

with having committed perjury in naturalization, and I can't take time to investigate those cases for this reason: the applications for citizenship that are filed and that are coming on for hearing from day to day are so great that I can fairly take care of the hearings that come up, let alone making any investigation of back cases. And the only way we can get cases of this kind is to work nights and Sundays and every other time; and we do it simply because---particularly here in East St. Louis I have done it because I have been appealed to by the religious workers and others to help them in their fight to better conditions here; and I have done more in East St. Louis than any other place in my district.

Mr. Raker: You have been working overtime, at nights and Sundays?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Raker: Your force is short handed?

Mr. Bevington: It is very much so. I need at least twice the number of attorneys ^{that} I have to reasonably take care of the work.

Mr. Raker: You will write that letter, will you?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir; I will do that within the next day or so. I can't do it today because I have another case coming on for trial.

Mr. Cooper: You say you have so many cases that it is impossible for you to catch up with them?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir; I can't begin to do it.

Mr. Cooper: Don't you think if you would select as important a case---or rather a case in which the defendant is so prominent an individual as Mr. Flannigan depicts himself to be and is so well know a man as he, that the prominence of that defendant, and his incarceration, if you can incarcerate him, would do more than fifty little cases to put a stop to these things?

318-E

Mr. Bevington: Possibly so. But it is very hard. If you ~~have~~ ever served in a position like I am in, you would meet up with this situation. I have had cases as good as Alexander Flannigan's---or a great deal better--- and have gone to district attorneys and asked for their assistance and help to indict them---

Mr. Cooper: (Interposing) You mean state's attorneys?

Mr. Bevington: No, I mean United States attorneys. We don't have anything to do with state's attorneys. And they would argue with me, raising all sorts of objections why action should not be taken, consume more time than would have been taken in presenting the case to a grand jury and the trial of it. It is very hard unless you have got an open and clear cut case; and while I am not venturing to speak for the Weiss case or the Flannigan case, I have had stronger cases where I couldn't receive any attention at all.

Mr. Cooper: Then does it look, Mr. witness, as if these people interested in this sort of work, not only saw that the state's attorney in the county was all right, so far as they are concerned, and the sheriff was all

right, but they/^{now}and then looked out for the appointment of the United States district attorney?

Mr. Bevington: I wouldn't like to go that far, but I would say that it has appeared to me sometimes that the district attorneys have been so in sympathy with that--- with the point of ~~of~~ view entertained in their community--- that they felt it would be a persecution rather than a prosecution to take any action under those circumstances.

Mr. Cooper: In other words, they seemed to be rather sympathetic with the offenders, as you have narrated the offense to them.

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Johnson: If you find a disposition of that sort in the districts attorney to whom you take the two cases ^{that} you have just mentioned, will you bring it to the attention of this committee?

Mr. Bevington: I will be very pleased to do so.

Mr. Johnson: We will be very glad to have you do so. We will see that he does his duty or is impeached.

Mr. Bevington: Now let me show you the district attorney's side of the game too. I will take this case this morning because I can state without being in contact of court. The jury has found a verdict of guilty and the man is, I suppose, ^{sentenced} ~~executed~~ by this time.

This man Muller was represented to us---and I believed it to be the truth---as one of the biggest rascals in East St. Louis; one of the most notorious

of all of the foreign element here in rascality and crock-
 edness ~~too~~. This man Chneiwick, for whom he appeared as
 a witness, testified that this man put him up to coming
 in and giving false testimony as to his occupation, and
 to representing himself as being a laborer and not a
 saloonkeeper; and the testimony showed that this man
 Kauffer knew for years and years that the place ran by
 Chneiwick was in open and notorious violation of the law,
 keeping open on Sundays, he himself claiming that he had
 visited it every day for years, which would include
 Sundays. In addition to that, he owned the building,
 rented it for this saloon purpose, and he tried by his
 perjured statements to get this man naturalized, on the
 ground that he was not engaged in any unlawful occupa-
 tion, and hadn't been for five years. I finally got
 all the facts in this case and went before the city
 court, Judge Browning, and the judge became so indig-
 nant that he wrote a finding of fact and made it a part
 of the application, finding that this man Chneiwick had
 openly and notoriously violated the law for years, and
 he entered an order for ever disbarring this man Kauffer
 and another witness who ^{was} an agent for the Star Brewing
 Company here and sold Chneiwick his liquor---

Mr. Johnson: (Interposing) Do you know his name?

Mr. Livingston: Seieruth. He entered an order
 disqualifying those men from ever appearing ^{again} in his
 court as witnesses in naturalization cases. That is
 the case we tried in here and the city counsellor of

this city represented the man, and he put up the plea to that jury that this man Chneiwick had done nothing more than anyone else in East St. Louis had done, and which everybody conceded was the regular and ordinary thing; and that matter having the approval of all the officials here, it looked very much like he was convincing the jury as to the reasonableness of that sort of a defense. In other words, that a demand for citizenship was to be judged by the standard of the lowest member of the community and law violator, rather than by the moral standards prevailing in decent society. And I believe if the judge hadn't given a very ^{strong} instruction on that particular point, that he would probably, if he not gotten an acquittal, would have had a hung jury.

Mr. Cooper: Well, what you say now, Mr. witness shows, doesn't it, to this committee and to the people of the community the exceeding importance of not recommending for appointment ^{to} the United States district attorneys office, or to the office of a United States District or circuit judge, any man whose character is not absolutely above suspicion?

Mr. Bevington: Undoubtedly.

Mr. Cooper: And free from all local entanglements?

Mr. Bevington: Unquestionably. If you have a District attorney who is interested in any of the elements that are likely to violate the law, he is going to be exceedingly friendly, and he is going to interfere

in the enforcement of law, if it in any way trespasses upon the rights or supposed rights of those parties.

Mr. Cooper: The rights of the people at large in the enforcement of law and order, administration of justice, ~~say~~ ^{weigh} nothing, do they, when it comes to an opportunity for an official of that kind to ^{serve} ~~serve~~ what he thinks is his political or personal interest.

Mr. Bevington: I think you have correctly summed up the situation.

Mr. Cooper: That's all.

Mr. Johnson: Do you know who prepared the bill of sale of which you spoke for the saloon?

520-1

Mr. Bevington: I do not. All I know is that this man Weiss said Fiezel told him---now it comes to me third hand---Fiezel came before me at least half a dozen times by himself, once or twice in company with his wife, and three or four times in company with others, and he never told me this story, but his visits to me were prior to the hearing on his application, and before I had the order of the court entered dismissing the case; and it is only since this dismissal that he has agreed to testify against Flannigan. Of course he told me that Flannigan was representing him, and that Flannigan had drafted the petition, and he laid the burden on Flannigan in the first place of getting in this occupation.

Mr. Johnson: Was an affidavit made by Fiezel?

Mr. Bevington: A petition for naturalization is a

recital of the personal history of the candidate from the time of his birth down to the time at which he filed his application.

And

Mr. Johnson: That is sworn to?

Mr. Bevington: That is sworn to.

Mr. Johnson: And this petition of which you speak was prepared by Flannigan?

Mr. Bevington: Not exactly. This petition for citizenship becomes a part of the original record of the court in which it is filed, and a duplicate ^{of it} is made and sent to my department in Washington for record; but there is a form provided known as a "facts" form, which is nothing more than a skeleton of the petition, or a memorandum form which is furnished to any candidate or any one interested, as a guide to them in filling out the things that should be said in the petition; and it was one of those memorandum forms that Fiezel claimed to be Flannigan filled out, and which was turned over to clerk Veach of the city court here, and he copied it from that memorandum and made the original and a duplicate petition for citizenship of this man.

Mr. Johnson: If an attorney would take a man like Fiezel and knowingly prepare that false petition which is to be sworn to, would it make him *particeps criminis* to the fraud---the attempted fraud.

Mr. Bevington: The naturalization act provides that ^{any} person who advises, aids or assists the person

not entitled thereto to become a citizen, commit this prescribed felony, the penalty for which, I think, is \$5,000 fine, or five years imprisonment, or both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. Johnson: Well, if the facts then be established to be as Mr. Fiezel has said they are, then Mr. Flannigan would come within that statute, wouldn't he?

Mr. Devington: Yes sir. But here is the difficulty that I as an officer to enforce that law have met with in such cases: Fiezel wouldn't give out this information to me until after he saw he couldn't possibly get citizenship; that I was opposing it, and he wanted to make it a bargain. Now in dealing with foreigners of all nationalities, and particularly Hungarians---which he happens to be---I found that as long as they are interested in the thing, and they think they have got something to gain, they will testify fluently and pointly, and are very willing witnesses. But the minute that you begin to make use of their testimony as affecting their interests or anyone in which they are interested, they can't understand your questions; they half the time can't speak English, and other times they become such poor witnesses that they will defeat your case. And while I have no doubt the district attorney here would file an information against this man Flannigan in a minute, we will be dependent absolutely on Fiezel as the prosecuting witness, *and* if he runs true to his colors, he very likely will be

such a witness that no jury on earth could convict anybody on his testimony.

Mr. Johnson: But Fiesel has got to swear that he gave Flannigan this alleged fact, or swear that Flannigan gave it to him, hasn't he?

Mr. Bevington: Yes sir.

Mr. Johnson: He can take his choice in that respect.

Mr. Bevington: But it takes exceedingly strong evidence, we have found, to secure conviction in these cases. Now I have had ~~quite~~ a number of them, and so far only lost one case; but you will be surprised at the way juries will sometimes hang, and how terribly hard it is to state these perjury cases. They don't want to convict a man.

Mr. Johnson: You may be excused.

Statement of Rev. Father Christopher Goelz.

Edgemont Station, East St. Louis, Illinois.

The witness was sworn by Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson: Give to the stenographer your name?

Mr. Goelz: Christopher Goelz.

Mr. Johnson: Where do you reside?

Mr. Goelz: At the eastern part of East St. Louis---
Edgemont Station.

Mr. Johnson: Is that a postoffice?

Mr. Goelz: Yes sir.

Mr. Johnson: What is your calling in life?

Mr. Goelz: I am a Catholic clergyman.

Mr. Johnson: And the name of your church?

Mr. Goelz: St. Phillips church.

Mr. Johnson: ^{Barring} ~~Nothing~~ whatever you may have gotten through the confessional, Father, I wish you would state whatever you may have from actual knowledge or from hearsay concerning a cock's pit that is said to have existed out somewhere in the locality of your church.

Mr. Goelz: In my capacity I am obliged to take charge of a mission at Caseyville. There is a street car line running from Edgemont Station to Collinsville, which passes through Caseyville, and I use this car frequently. At one occasion I went to Caseyville on a Saturday evening, and there were a number of coops on the rear platform---or leather cages---and some of the roosters started to crow.

Mr. Johnson: There were roosters in the cages of which you have spoken?

Mr. Goelz: There were roosters in the cages, and I noticed where they took off the roosters at the "Godland" bar, a saloon or road house.

Mr. Johnson: Kept by whom, do you know?

822-2

Mr. Goelz: I don't know positively, but it is said to be a man by the name of Ducrag. On my return I found the place lighted up very brilliantly and a large number of people there, and this aroused my interest and I made inquiries of different parties whose names I couldn't recall all at once, and I found that cock fights were being conducted regularly.

Mr. Johnson: About how often, Father?

Mr. Goelz: Every Saturday night for a while. One

of the boys, one of my school boys, told me that he had heard that they had bulldog fights and rooster fights, and had killed sometimes as high as twenty-one cocks at one night.

One Sunday morning especially do I remember that some of my parishioners coming to the early morning services, stated that the car had been crowded and that there car frequently was very crowded by those ^{that were} coming back from these all night carousals.

Mr. Johnson: That time in the morning do you have your first mass, Father?

Mr. Coelz: At 7:30. Some of them came on a car that comes at 6:30, and other at 7:30 cars; and either one of them they found that they were disturbed in their piece of mind by the boisterous men that piled on to the cars and took possession, and were talking of the sport they were heving. And later on I made further inquiries, and then I resolved to present the matter to the state's attorney :

Mr. Johnson: What is his name?

Mr. Coelz: Hubert Schaumleffel. I met him one time on the street car and I intended to talk to him about it, but then I found him in a condition that I couldn't well broach the matter to him.

Mr. Johnson: What sort of a condition?

Mr. Coelz: He appeared to me to be intoxicated. And then I listened---from his conversation I concluded that he would do nothing in the matter, and dismiss the case as other cases had been handled, because in the

conversation ^{with me} he expressed his surprise at the narrow
 mind ^{laws} ~~that~~ we had in the State of Illinois,
 where there was no privilege given and no sport allowed.
 He was then on his way going to St. Louis to attend a
 prize fight or boxing match at the coliseum. I thought
 then that the case was hopeless, and I called on a good
 friend and asked for advice, and this friend told me,
 "Why don't you get a good newspaper reporter?" Then I
 presented the matter to this newspaper reporter and he
 did the rest of the work. He gave the matter publicity.
 He went to the cock fights, attended them as a witness,
 and gave a good description of them, so as to arouse
 public opinion. But he reported to me afterwards that
 he had failed to get prominence---in fact, he had been
 handled quite roughly. He then called upon Mr. James
 Ewing, the game officer of that St. Louis, and to-
 gether with Mr. Ewing he presented the case a second time.

323-1

Mr. Johnson: Presented the case to whom?

Mr. Goetz: To the state's attorney's office.

Mr. Johnson: To Mr. Schaumleffel?

Mr. Goetz: To Mr. Schaumleffel. Then another cock
 fight was to have been pulled off the following Saturday
 night. Mr. Ewing went there---I have this on the state-
 ment of Mr. Hendry---and there was no cock fight.

A few days of the next week---about Tuesday or
 Wednesday---I got the information that there was to be
 another cock fight in defiance to the publicity that

had been given, and I called on Mr. Hendry, and Mr. Hendry made inquiries, and he tells me that he called up the state's attorney's office and told him that a cock fight was to take place on that particular evening. The rest of it has been written by the Star reporter, and one of the experiences that they had was he told me that their newspaper man was driven away at the point of a gun and told to beat it. After the first exposé at least two more cock fights were held, and then finally an appeal was made to the governor's office, so I was assured by Mr. Hendry, and then came the peremptory order from the Governor of Illinois to the sheriff of St. Clair county to close those places. Then there were no more cock fights, and since that time I have never been receiving any more complaints concerning the place.

Mr. Johnson: And the state's attorney, Mr. Schaumbelffel was in an intoxicated condition?

Mr. Goelz: He appeared to be.

Mr. Johnson: He complained to you of the lawlessness of the law which prevented sport?

Mr. Goelz: Exactly.

Mr. Johnson: And I suppose you know that his oath of office required him to enforce those laws?

Mr. Goelz: It did..

Mr. Johnson: rather, do you know of any other *official* recognition of lawlessness in this community?

Mr. Goelz: I am not so well acquainted with the conditions in the city part of East St. Louis, as I

live more in the rural part of the city. However, having ^{been} born and raised in the city of East St. Louis, and they say that the city has always had an evil reputation, and there were always reports of lawlessness; yet very few such occurrences have ever occurred to my notice.

Mr. Johnson: The committee ^{is} authorized, Father, to take hearsay testimony, if you know by hearsay of any such a condition as we have just referred to, we would be glad to have you relate it.

Mr. Goelz: I have these statements merely as a result of newspaper reports---of newspaper men---and things that are perhaps already public. I have never come to any personal knowledge of evil conditions in this part of the city beyond that. I have always realized ^{that} in the territory where I live there are ^{always} enough of troubles and evils that a person must try to ^{keep} ~~stick~~ in his own locality and do his best as a citizen; and it isn't a good policy to extend his activity to other fields.

I may say in that district which we call Edgemont there has been good, fair obedience of the law. I only remember one particular instance where I took a very active interest, and that was about three or four years ago. One of the saloons of Edgemont with a dance hall attached conducted an all night carousel or dance for the benefit of the inmates of the valley.

Mr. Johnson: What is the "valley"?

Mr. Goelz: The valley is the district which is

supposed to be located along Third street, and which is the red light district of East St. Louis.

Mr. Johnson: And this dance hall was conducted for their attendance?

Mr. Goetz: No, this dance hall was conducted by--- for the general public, but a special dance had been arranged by the owner for the inmates of the red light district, and a special car arrived at Edgemont after midnight. Some of the inmates came on the regular car. This report came to me from several parties, and I went to the trouble to get their statements, and I presented the facts to the chief of police.

Mr. Johnson: What was his name?

Mr. Goetz: If I am not mistaken, it was Sam Overmyer. He fully agreed with what I said, and he promised me that inside of a very short while, he says, "the saloonkeeper will not bother you any longer." And in less than six weeks that saloon-keeper left. He is no longer in Edgemont. He didn't remain beyond that period of time. That was the only incident of real lawlessness that occurred within the precinct that I lived in, that I know of; and I felt that ^{the} city officials had acted very promptly and satisfactorily---at least as far as I was concerned. The saloon was conducted by a man by the name Louis Oldenburg.

Mr. Johnson: Do you know what became of him after he left your place?

Mr. Goetz: He afterward came to East St. Louis and

established a saloon right near the Federal Building on Seventh and Missouri Avenue and called it the "Federal Bar".

Mr. Johnson: Do you know whether or not he had a dance hall in connection with that?

Mr. Goelz: No sir.

Mr. Johnson: Do you know whether or not he had rooms there for immoral purposes in connection with it?

Mr. Goelz: I never heard of it.

Mr. Johnson: He just simply transferred his activities and his saloonkeeper from your neighborhood to another neighborhood?

Mr. Goelz: He did.

Mr. Johnson: And he received a license from the same authority at both places?

Mr. Goelz: Probably he did.

Mr. Johnson: And he left your neighborhood because he was conducting a saloon with an indecent dance hall in connection therewith, and transferred his licence to another part of the city, and there operated ^{his} saloon.

Mr. Goelz: The saloon remained there. He probably took out a new license for the new location.

Mr. Johnson: Somebody ^{else} just stepped into his saloon and took that?

Mr. Goelz: Yes sir.

Mr. Johnson: Have you any knowledge or information concerning the statement sometimes made that the breweries own a number of saloons and have different places to operate them?

Mr. Goelz: Of my own knowledge I don't know it. I have heard it by ~~hearsay~~; and I have strong suspicions that it is so, from the fact that all the different agencies want to get a saloon in a ^{certain} location.

wlm

Mr. Johnson: All the different ^{brewery} agencies, you mean?

Mr. Goelz: In Edgemont there are four different saloons closely together, and every one of them represents a different brewery. Four saloons within one block, and even less.

Mr. Johnson: How many people are there in that neighborhood that would be served by those four saloons, probably?

Mr. Goelz: Within the distance of half a mile I would say--- or within the distance of a mile--- there are not more than 300 bona fide residents. However, it is a junction point for the street car, and there are very many transients going to and fro, transferring from one division of the street car line to another. So therefore the statement that there are 300, would not do justice, because the transients would have to be considered.

Mr. Cooper: Are those four saloons in that block all the saloons in Edgemont?

Mr. Goelz: There are others along State Street, but these four are grouped together.

Mr. Johnson: We are much obliged to you, Father. You may be excused.

Mr. Anderson, will you take the stand?

STATEMENT OF PAUL Y. ANDERSON (RESUMED)

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Anderson, you have just heard the statement of Father Goelz?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson. He testified as to a saloonkeeper by the name of Oldenberg leaving Edgemont and opening up a saloon in another part of the city?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson. Do you know where Oldenberg is now?

Mr. Anderson. I do not.

Mr. Johnson. Do you know where he opened and conducted a saloon after he left Edgemont?

Mr. Anderson. It was on the northeast corner of 7th Street and Missouri Avenue, almost directly opposite the Federal building.

Mr. Johnson. In the place indicated by Father Goelz?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson. Did you have an opportunity to observe the character of his place?

Mr. Anderson. I have, yes.

Mr. Johnson. Please state what it was.

Mr. Anderson. Well, it was common street talk that there were rooms upstairs, and that women stayed up there all the time.

Mr. Johnson. You mean prostitutes?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, I mean prostitutes. They come into the saloon and solicited men to go upstairs. I have seen women in the saloon, and I have seen women take men

in the side door. There were many reports--- I remember one particular case where one man was robbed--- taken upstairs by a woman and robbed of several hundred dollars --- I believe seven hundred dollars.

Mr. Johnson. So then it happens that this man Oldenberg, upon the complaint of Father Goelz, had his saloon license taken away from him out at Edgemont, and he immediately thereafter transferred his saloon to the place which you have just indicated?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson. And that he conducted a dance hall, an immoral dance hall, at Edgemont, the place from which he moved to the Federal Court Saloon, and that there he opened the same kind of a place?

Mr. Anderson. I didn't know the nature of the place at Edgemont. I had not heard that, but I do know *that the nature of* this other place at 7th Street and Missouri Avenue.

Mr. Johnson. Well, putting your testimony with that of Father Goelz, that is a correct statement of the facts?

Mr. Anderson. Yes.

Mr. Johnson. And that the authorities-- the local authorities who responded to Father Goelz' complaint at Edgemont permitted him to open this resort down here opposite the Federal building?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper. How long did he conduct ^{that place} there?

Mr. Anderson. He went out of there-- I don't know exactly how long ago. The place was opened after that

by a man named Charles Burkey, who is said to have operated a similar sort of an establishment, and who was also a professional bondsman and spent a great deal of his time down at the police station. Burkey previous to his taking charge of this place up there had operated a wine room down on Broadway which was raided several times. It was also after that that he became a bondsman.

Mr. Cooper. How far is that from where we are holding this hearing?

Mr. Anderson. Two blocks.

Mr. Cooper. And that is on Missouri Avenue?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper. Opposite where they are putting an addition on the Federal Building up there?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper. Right in the heart of East St. Louis?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir. On the corner of the next block up is the saloon of Charles instead, the man who cashed the warrants for the city employees at rather a profitable discount.

Mr. Cooper. How much discount?

Mr. Anderson. Well, I heard it went as high as 25 per cent. I have heard something about it two or three times. I think the standard scale was 10 per cent. The men who cashed their warrants there mostly were these street sweepers.

Mr. Johnson. And do you know how long a time it

would be between the time that he scalped these warrants and the time of their payment?

Mr. Anderson. Well, I don't remember that.

Mr. Cooper. What did the street sweepers get a day?

Mr. Anderson. I don't know that either.

Mr. Cooper. Were they colored or white?

Mr. Anderson. White. The pay is very low. I think it is less than \$60 a month.

Mr. Cooper. Less than \$60 a month, and he discounted them at 20 per cent, I suppose, and if a man got \$60 he would get \$48 a month?

Mr. Anderson. Yes, and they spent a good deal of the remainder in the saloon.

Mr. Cooper. That follows, of course. Then what they had left went to support their families in these times of high prices.

Mr. Anderson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Cooper. As the Christian suggests, they had that left if they got away from the women they kept upstairs?

Mr. Anderson. Well, I don't know whether Orstead kept any women upstairs or not. That was the next block down.

Mr. Cooper. If they got past the Federal Bar.

Mr. Anderson. However, there were plenty of other places there women were soliciting men.

Mr. Cooper. Could such places as that Federal Bar exist without the knowledge of the local police force, the chief of police, the State's Attorney and the other

officials?

Mr. Anderson. Not unless they were deaf, dumb and blind.

Mr. Cooper. Well, you haven't any deaf, dumb and blind officials, so they all knew it, didn't they?

Mr. Anderson. I am sure they did.

Mr. Raker. How many women are running saloons in East St. Louis?

Mr. Anderson. I don't know that.

Mr. Raker. Do you know Fannie Volluez?

Mr. Anderson. Yes.

Mr. Raker. It is 2151 St. Louis Avenue?

Mr. Anderson. Well, she is running a place at two or three different spots.

Mr. Raker. Does she keep a place where women come to, and men?

Mr. Anderson. No, I don't think so. I lived five doors from her saloon for awhile. I heard reports that women came there, but I didn't know much about it. I stayed away from the place.

Mr. Raker. Do you know Mrs. M. Applegate? She appears to have a licensed saloon at 438 N 26th Street?

Mr. Anderson. No, I am not familiar with that.

Mr. Raker. Who is Cleve Kirk? She has a license for a saloon at 311 Missouri Avenue.

Mr. Anderson. I don't know him.

Mr. Raker. You don't know his place of business?

Mr. Anderson. No.

Mr. Raker. Who is Ed Clark. He runs a saloon at 205 Missouri Avenue.

Mr. Anderson. I don't know. It seems to me--- I seem to have a vague impression that he is some relation to Justice Clark. I may be wrong there. I have understood that.

Mr. Raker. Clark's son is running a saloon?

Mr. Anderson. That was the impression I had. I think he signed some bonds for some woman down at court the other day.

Mr. Cooper. A witness testified that he was the Justice's son.

Mr. Raker. That's all.

Mr. Johnson. You may stand aside.

Mr. Raker. Mr. Chairman, so there can be no question about it being a fact, there has been delivered to me after I requested Mr. Kelly to present it, a list of the names of the men conducting saloons, with their places of business in West St. Louis, for the quarter ending--- this is entitled "Drum Shop Licenses Issued for Fourth Quarter Year 1917". I would like to have it go into the record.

Mr. Johnson. Without objection that will be done.

(The paper referred to follows:

DRAMSHOP LICENSES ISSUED FOR 4th QUARTER YEAR 1917.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
H. C. Reithmann	716 N. 19th St.
Anton Hozil	332 Exchange Ave.
Jas. Schwab	201 Exchange Ave.
J. Keseranskis	134 St. Clair Ave.
A. E. Walzendorf	224 St. Clair Ave.
J. A. Blackburn	300 E. Broadway
A. Burkhaus	1003 Figgott Ave.
Howard Thompson	1746 Missouri Ave.
J. D. McKinney	1901 St. Louis Ave.
Archie Holeman	528 Converse Ave.
T. P. Driscoll	15th & Nectar Ave.
Mary Mandville	52 St. Clair Ave.
Jones & Hulbert	418 Collinsville Ave.
J. Szablowski	417 Illinois Ave.
J. A. Bennett	10th & Trendley Ave.
John Butler	204 N. 5th St.
L. A. Hall	403 Missouri Ave.
A. E. King	1433 Boismenu Ave.
Fat Mulqueeny	700 Collinsville Ave.
Christ Ferrenoud	321 E. Broadway
D. Prindable	3232 State St.
E. J. Schwind	701 Missouri Ave.
Wm. Walker	927 S. 16th St.
Joe Ganschnitz	Collsv. & Ill. Aves.
L. Twerkaus	1032 N. 9th St.
Sam Croft	400 Collsv. Ave.
H. Albrecht & Co.	328 E. Broadway
Dunn & O'Keefe	503 Missouri Ave.
W. F. Gray	459 N. "B" St.
Thesieres Catering Co.	222 Collsv. Ave.
A. Denker	301 Missouri Ave.
Louis Menges	100 St. Clair Ave.
A. Mueller	2105 E. Broadway
Z. M. Nagle	234 Collinsville Ave.
Frank Wyant	518 E. Broadway
L. C. & J. J. Wies	301 E. Broadway
Burke & McQuillan	138 St. Clair Ave.
J. Pierron	1230 State St.
Roy Bowman	107 Missouri Ave.
Cleve Kirk	311 Missouri Ave.
Jas. Murphy	243 Collinsville Ave.
Wm. J. Schaefer	200 Missouri Ave.
Andy Schaffer	94 St. Clair Ave.
John Kardas	1201 N. 8th St.
Ed C. Hotz	1100 Colas Ave.
David Jones	925 State St.
A. E. Coddington	28 S. 4th St.
Kreitner & Co.	226 Collinsville Ave.
Chas. Anstedt	601 Missouri Ave.
John Boland	15th & Brady Ave.
Thayer & Pettit	24 Collinsville Ave.
Geo. Janner	122 St. Clair Ave.
J. Poulosky	169 Collinsville Ave.
John Foley	981 N. 18th St.
Tim Foley	1300 St. Clair Ave.
Jas. J. Whalen	200 S. Main St.
F. Joazayt	1201 N. 9th St.
T. Smiloski	404 Bowman Ave.
W. Davis	527 S. 6th St.
Ed Clark	205 Missouri Ave.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
Jos. LePage	2622 State St.
Walter Perkins	4 St. Clair Ave.
J. H. Shean	2500 State St.
Con Rehg	1810 Lynch Ave.
Jos. Kurtz	2117 Monroe Ave.
Thos. Boston	214 St. Clair Ave.
Wm. Cook	8817 State St.
A. Marticzus	1034 N. 13th St.
Fred Dupfeld	1267 Division Ave.
A. D. Woods	1842 Market Ave.
Clyde Bettice	1301 State St.
Geo. Lewis	2100 Bond Ave.
Anton Moser	800 St. Louis Ave.
Geo. A. Simon	204 Missouri Ave.
Con Sullivan	429 Collinsville Ave.
H. Bauer	2400 Louisiana Blvd.
Jas. Gentry	2601 Kansas Ave.
Mike Mros	545 N. 6th St.
Louis DeWolf	307 Collinsville Ave.
Coyne Bros.	325 N. 18th St.
John Chalros	333 Exchange Ave.
F. Cerensoer	2447 Missouri Ave.
Dahmer Bros.	628 Missouri Ave.
H. Lahmer	493 N. 22nd St.
Jos. Ochus	601 Ohio Ave.
John Cavanaugh	212 Missouri Ave.
John Maravee	1133 N. 2nd St.
Sam Malinee	427 S. 4th St.
Mike Kizileski	1200 N. 8th St.
Mike Meehan	1648 St. Clair Ave.
John T. Desmond	327 S. 4th St.
Wm. Pegg	1000 Trendley Ave.
P. Repplinger	2744 Bond Ave.
Wm. Fabek	2107 Kansas Ave.
J. Hrabusicki	1133 N. 9th St.
J. Alminowicz	1015 N. 3rd St.
A. Adamick	232 Bowman Ave.
D. Connelly	1000 Illinois Ave.
T. J. Kickham & Co.	121 N. 10th St.
M. Kovachich	1009 Tudor Ave.
S. Jenniserson	1600 N. 23rd St.
Joe Peters,	18th & Lynch Ave.
Chas. D. Haeffner	1924 Lincoln Ave.
Schreiber Bros.	100 S. 4th St.
Geo. M. Keefe	600 West Broadway
B. R. Mathes	68 St. Clair Ave.
Mrs. Wm. Ganey	2600 State St.
F. Lingerson	1442 Brady Ave.
S. Hynes	1700 Gaty Ave.
C. Carmichael	2520 Bellevue Ave.
F. McAteer	394 N. "A" St.
E. W. Kearns	1637 St. Louis Ave.
A. Recklein	325 Collinsville Ave.
Geo. Hraskey	1101 N. 3rd St.
Sam Yocis	537 Collinsville Ave.
F. Florian	131 Winstanley Ave.
James Chodora	1236 N. 9th St.
Ditzenberg & Greenwood	758 Collinsville Ave.
Mrs. James Gleason	French Village
J. J. Barry	Collsv. & Ohio Aves.
Joe Burris	2nd & St. Louis Ave.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
H. J. McGee	201 Missouri Ave.
Frank Contratto	4318 Forest Place
Chas. Stewart	307 E. Broadway
Hy. Zittel	16th & State St.
Illmo Hotel Co.	Collsv. & Missouri Ave.
John Hofer	2151 Kansas Ave.
C. E. Watson	110 N. Main St.
Al. Steibel	13th & St. Clair Ave.
F. P. Kaltenbach	833 St. Clair Ave.
Geo. Lawler	711 St. Clair Ave.
Geo. Deksat	701 Baugh Ave.
J. F. Riegel	110 St. Clair Ave.
J. Felsen	96 St. Clair Ave.
J. Vonnahme	38 St. Clair Ave.
W. H. Purtycher	#2 St. Clair Ave.
F. D. Hauss	100 Exchange Ave.
V. Korba	1116 N. 3rd St.
Andy Zagorke	7th & Exchange Ave.
Henry Vogel	1029 N. 9th St.
Frank Weick	922 Missouri Ave.
Jas. Healy	100 N. 4th St.
J. J. Fishbein	13th & Broadway
P. Vogt	500 Missouri Ave.
Frank Waller	319 Missouri Ave.
Banner W. & L. Co.	319 Broadway
E. Carr	Broadway & Collsv.
F. W. Leckel	901 S. 11th St.
Chas. Klein	927 Piggott Ave.
Jno. Jackson	729 Trendley Ave.
J. T. Sullivan	301 Market Ave.
Wm. Linder	5th & Converse Ave.
Clem Genteman	400 E. Broadway
Con Frawley	600 West Missouri Ave.
Kate Dissett	474 N. "B" St.
Wm. Sullivan	5th & Trendley Ave.
J. E. Duffy	1243 Missouri Ave.
Jesse Stewart	1140 St. Louis Ave.
Louis Goldberg	447 Collinsville Ave.
J. Shimkus	471 Collinsville Ave.
J. Sadowski	555 Collinsville Ave.
J. McElligott	1402 Gatz Ave.
J. Keasburg	1121 State St.
Fergus & Kayser	417 Ill. Ave.
L. E. Lesh	429 St. Louis Ave.
Silas T. Grattan	600 Collsv. Ave.
Al. Wallace	634 Collsv. Ave.
F. W. Clover	17th & Missouri Ave.
Tom Reay	18th & State St.
Hy. Loewe	1901 State St.
Mrs. E. Applegate	458 E. 26th St.
Elzo Saunders	3018 State St.
John Luenterfering	3700 State St.
O. Enderlin	1570 St. Clair Ave.
Thos. Janosky	1035 E. 13th St.
J. Bros	1452 N. 13th St.
Dan Gilles	18th & Natalia Ave.
Burt Anderson	18th & Parsons
A. R. Reynolds	130 N. 13th St.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
Geo. Zeman	1825 Natalia Ave.
L. F. Pickering	1828 Broadway
Mike Murgie	21st & Kansas Ave.
S. Shea	2122 Kansas Ave.
Simeon Nicoloff	22nd & Kansas Ave.
Hy. Hohnadel	2146 Missouri Ave.
Frank Stelzer	2149 Missouri Ave.
L. Schutzenhofer	2341 Missouri Ave.
Fannie Volluz	2151 St. Louis Ave.
G. Levenson	18th & Broadway
Jno. Ewertowski	17th & Broadway
H. L. Krudwig	1739 Market Ave.
Chas. Tessmer	1843 Market Ave.
Robt. Entemann	2046 Piggott Ave.
A. H. Steiger	2745 Market Ave.
Louis Turak	2630 Missouri Ave.
Thos. J. Butler	4th & Trendley Ave.
P. L. Bauer	69 Weber St.
Emil Dohl	2101 E. Broadway
Andy Easton	Edgemont Sta.
Felix McGurk	4200 Forest Blvd.
Frank Korrecky	Washington Park
Harry Kurdock	Verlie & B. & O. R. R.
I. Lieberstein	556 Collsv. Ave.
H. Petrowicz	1000 N. 9th St.
Gidney Martin	307 N. 16th St.
Jacob Anhauser	303 N. 13th St.
Coddington Bros.	18 St. Clair Ave.
Andy Brown	125 Collsv. Ave.
Gnade Liquor Co.	129 St. Clair Ave.
John Walters	#9 Main St.
J. F. O'Connell	Broadway & Front St.
Ben F. Latham & Son	8742 State St.
Jack Keefe	216 E. Broadway
O. E. Sheetz	29th & Bond Ave.
Sam Overmire	900 Baugh Ave.
Jos. Marre, Jr.	516 E. Broadway
B. J. Syparse	407 Collsv. Ave.
L. Remmler	340 E. Broadway
Joe Brzostowski	451 Collsv. Ave.
Nickol & Bauer	755 Collsv. Ave.
G. L. Scott	432 N. 3rd St.
A. E. Hicks	1508 E. Broadway
B. Levenson	1817 E. Broadway
O. Totsch	2101 Kansas Ave.
J. Ledbetter	1900 State St.
Geo. Schneider	1650 E. Broadway
F. M. Watkins	601 Brady Ave.
F. Kidd	2100 State St.
J. R. Head	710 W. Broadway
W. Gygorowich	7th & Bowman Ave.
H. J. Hayes	8th & Bond Ave.
Alex Forhetz	801 S. 10th St.
F. A. Geary	126 N. Main St.
Frank A. Geary	201 E. Broadway
Harry Carpenter	400 Missouri Ave.
F. H. DeWolf	#1 Missouri Ave.
A. Smith	1820 E. Broadway
J. Wilkson	100 E. Main St.

4431

- 5 -

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
O. Brandt	2048 St. Louis Ave.
J. Garvey	500 S. Main St.
Geo. Distler	7200 State St.
Nehrkarn & Fitzgerald	3rd & Missouri Ave.
Tim O'Donnell	1129 St. Clair Ave.
Wm. Garvey	1435 E. Broadway
J. C. Dankliff	413 Missouri Ave.
Andy Hupcik	429 Winstanley Ave.
Tim Moroney	St. Clair Ave.
Frank Hrasky	1200 N. 3rd St.
Hillgamayer & Dodson	2120 State St.
Nancy P. Mullady	#6 St. Clair Ave.
Jno. Rhodhan	31st & St. Clair Ave.
J. H. Dullanty	2208 State St.
H. E. Walsh	101 Missouri Ave.
John Hershfield	417 Collinsville Ave.

4432

Mr. Johnson. The committee is adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock ~~A.M.~~

(Whereupon, at 3 o'clock p.m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, November 15 1917).