Segregation

29

in equipment; that there were no funds for any more provisions; that though there was no law for such procedure, he was taking his orders from the School Board. The colored citizens are determined not to submit to the institution of segregation and are prepared to take court action if necessary to prevent it.

In addition to the cases mentioned above colored people have been confronted with school segregation in the following cities: Imperial, Calif.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Arma, Kans.; Boynton, Okla.; and Muskogee, Okla.

## OTEEN VETERAN'S HOSPITAL

In April the Association's Secretary visited Asheville, N. C., to fill a speaking engagement, and while there, a delegation of patients at the Veteran's Hospital at Oteen called on him and laid before him the complaint that certain white patients at the hospital were seeking to have them removed and sent to the Veterans' Hospital at Tuskegee. They also placed in the Secretary's hands sworn affidavits setting forth the unfair treatment which they were forced to endure.

The National Office took up this matter with the Honorable Frank T. Hines, Director of the Veterans' Bureau at Washington, asking that a thorough investigation be instituted and calling attention to the assurance given at the time of the establishment of the Tuskegee Hospital that this was not a move towards the segregation of all Negro patients on the part of the United States Government. A reply was received from the chief of the Inspection Division stating that the matter was being investigated. The Association also made an investigation and found:

1. That Ku Klux agitation at Oteen had produced a threat against one of the colored war veterans and a petition asking for the removal of twenty-nine of them to the government hospital at Tuskegee.

2. That twenty-six colored patients were segregated in one ward where

there was bad over-crowding.

3. That the attitude of Dr. Archie McAllister, white, associate medical officer of the Oteen Hospital had been intolerable and that he had let it be known that he wanted to get rid of all colored patients.

4. That Dr. McAllister had forced patients to pay for signing insurance blanks, which is contrary to government regulations, and that he had

accepted pay from colored patients in the government hospital, threatening them to keep them silent.

5. That Dr. McAllister charged a patient for the signing of sick blanks and threatened the patient for reporting the matter.

Upon completion of the N. A. A. C. P. investigation, the Association's report, supported by affidavits and other documents, was forwarded to General Hines. The outcome of the report of the Association and of the investigation by the Veterans' Bureau was given as follows in the Asheville Citizen of October 2, 1924, in a special dispatch from Washington.

"A letter from Dr. James Miller, Medical Officer-In-Charge at Oteen, advised Dr. McAllister that the central office at Washington had directed a discontinuance of his services after giving careful consideration to a report of an investigation of his case."

3

## V. DYER ANTI-LYNCHING BILL

On the opening day of the 68th Congress, December 3, 1923, Congressman L. C. Dyer re-introduced the Anti-Lynching Bill as H. R. 1. The Bill was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. On January 10, 1924, the Judiciary Committee reported the Bill favorably. On January 21 Mr. Dyer introduced a resolution asking for a rule to give the Bill immediate consideration. The resolution was referred to the House Committee on Rules and ordered printed. Action by the Committee on Rules was delayed for several months by other pressing matters before the House, and though in the spring of 1924 it was felt that sufficient pressure could be brought to get the rule and possibly to jam the Bill through the House, this course was not pursued for the following reasons:

1. The plan made by the leaders contemplated the adjournment of

Congress the early part of June.

2. There was absolutely no possibility of getting any action on the Bill in the Senate before the adjournment of Congress, even if it had been passed by the House. This was because of the disorganized condition of the Senate, due to investigations, etc. We felt that the passage of the Bill by the House and the adjournment of Congress before the Senate could act would have the effect of making the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill a fac-