AL SMITH AND FAIR PLAY

(By C. W. Tillett, of Charlotte, Prominent North Carolina Attorney.)

Hear the word of the near-iconoclast.

High moral ideas ought to be promulgated upon a high moral plane and solely by highly moral methods.

The leaders in the promulgation of high moral ideas ought to be those, and those only, whose lives are exemplifications, to some extent at least, of high moral ideas.

But you are indeed a provincial if you have not traveled far enough from the place of your nativity to learn that high moral ideas are often promulgated upon the lowest moral plane and that the leaders in great moral crusades are often men whose lives do not at all jibe with any standard of high morals.

Christianity is the only perfect embodiment of the highest moral idea ever conceived by God himself; and temperance is perhaps the highest embodiment of the highest moral idea ever conceived in the mind and heart of man.

Who, pray, is the most ardent temperance advocate in all the world? How many days, how many years have been committed to the name?

Pope Gregory XIII, with all the college of Cardinals, assembled in St. Marks cathedral, celebrated with a long Te Deum thanksgiving the news of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, a slaughter even worse than that of the church of vast numbers of Huguenot heretics.

John Calvin, one of the founders of the great Presbyterian church, joined with other eminent Protestant theologians and caused Michael Servetus to be burned alive at the stake because of his heresy in denying the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

I doubt not that Pope Gregory and John Calvin each verily believed that he was doing God service and was promoting the best interests of the church.

Precisely the same spirit—though in less degree—that prompted Pope Gregory and John Calvin to do what they did is animating many of our foremost ecclesiastics today. I need not challenge their good faith and sincerity of purpose because, to my way of thinking, the offense of a blind bigot who, refusing to be enlightened, goes forward in unholy earnestness in the perpetration of a grievous wrong, is scarce less than the crime of him who acts wittingly.

A third of a century ago, when many of us were endeavoring to promote the cause of temperance in North Carolina by securing, as our first step, certain mild legislation regulating the liquor traffic, there were many zealots who bitterly denounced us as being in league with the liquor interests because our proposed legislation did not contemplate complete prohibition. Bishop Galloway, the greatest bishop of Southern Methodism, happened to be in our state at that time and, being informed of the situation, he comforted us by uttering an apt aphorism: "Well, it's hard to tell who are doing the cause of temperance legislation more harm—the fools and fanatics who favor it or the rascals who oppose it."

In a word: The permanent success of Christianity cannot be promoted by unfair and unChristlike means, and the permanent success of temperance cannot be promoted by unfair and intemperate methods.

These trite observations are called forth by my contemplation of the warfare now being waged upon Governor Smith as prospective Democratic candidate for President—an opposition based either upon the fact that he is a Catholic or upon his attitude upon the prohibition question, or more frequently upon both grounds.

Unjust Attacks On Smith.

Some weeks ago one of the most prominent Democratic politicians in this state—a man considered by competent judges as one of North Carolinas leading statesmen—said this to me: "Mr. Tillett, I have been opposed to Smith for President, but the outrageously unfair attacks made upon him here in North Carolina, as elsewhere, have silenced me in my opposition to him."

Speaking for myself as a Democratic voter I will say that I had not selected Smith as my first choice for President, but recently I have experienced such a sense of the wrong inflicted by the methods used to defeat him that I have felt impelled to express my feelings as herein set forth, and it makes no difference to me that hereafter I may be classed as one of Smith's ardent supporters.

The slogan of some of the outstanding opponents of Smith seems to be:

"Beat Al Smith for President; beat him fairly if you can; but beat him."

That is, perhaps, a harsh saying, but before condemning me too severely, please read and inwardly digest what is here written.

And who is this Al Smith?

If knowing naught else you turn for your answer to the pages of some of the religious journals of the day, or if you listen only to the words uttered from some of the pulpits and platforms by many of the preachers and moral leaders, you may be led to say: "Al Smith is one of the most despicable characters that has ever risen in the public life of America."

Let me be a little more specific: The other day one of the great leaders of moral reform said in a speech made in this state:

"Al Smith is a traitor to Christianity and a traitor to his country."

Traitors to Christianity are deserving only of hell-fire, and traitors to their country are worthy only of the gallows of a Benedict Arnold.

Such, however, is the picture you get of him if you listen only to those who are what de Maupassant called "good haters," and there are many of these "good haters" of Al Smith here in North Carolina.

Again: Who Is Al Smith?

Again: Who is this Al Smith?

Well, if you will let me, a moss-back Bourbon Democrat, a relic of Red-Shirt days, make answer, I will say:

"Al Smith is the great outstanding Democrat of the whole United States today!"

And as the United States is the foremost democratic government in the world, I must translate my encomium into international lingo, and say:

"Al Smith is the great outstanding Democrat of the whole world!"

But yet again: Who is this real Al Smith?

The son of a New York east-ender born in the humblest of environments; starting in life penniless; educated by almost every influence that tends to hold one down in life's race; an honest and hard-working boy, faithful in the discharge of every duty, however humble; reared by ardent Catholic parents in all the tenets of the Roman Catholic church and taught to revere its institutions. Smith he has been step by step, has he not, many times elected a member of the New York legislature, and in 1915 a member of the New York constitutional convention. He was colleague of Elihu Root, New York's great Republican statesman, and of him, tell all the men of the convention, Alfred E. Smith is the best informed on the business of the state of New York." George W. Wickersham, a former attorney general under Republican administration, said that he was "the most useful man in the convention."

In a brilliant article recently written by a former United States senator the immortal words of Rudyard Kipling were aptly applied to Smith as one who could "walk with kings, nor lose the common touch."

Four times elected governor of the state of New York, an honor never equalled but once in the political history of our country, although compelled to collaborate with Republican legislatures composed in large part of obstructionists, he has nevertheless, succeeded in procuring the adoption in the state of New York of more constructive legislation of high character than has been put through by any governor in the whole United States.

A native North Carolinian, who moved to New York 30 years ago and there worthily attained high position among the foremost of his profession, a man whom I have known for 40 years, one whose opinion is entitled to the highest consideration, not a politician and never a Tammany man, recently uttered this seemingly extravagant encomium: "Al Smith is, all in all, the best-fitted man in the United States for President."

More important than all: During all these years as governor he has lived under the fierce light that beats upon the gilded dome of the capitol of Albany, and yet—and yet—not a single serious charge against his personal or official character has ever been sustained, and, in fact, about the only charges that his enemies and opponents (diminutive Teddy being excepted) seek to establish are that he is a Catholic and an anti-prohibitionist.

From a New York East Side tenement house to the capitol at Albany! That beats Abe Lincoln a hundred fold. And yet, while you have heard scores of sermons and lectures holding up before the youth of America the life of Lincoln as a great example of what can be accomplished against great odds, who is there among you that has ever heard from a Prostestant pulpit or platform, where the speaker was opposed to Smith's candidacy, a single word of praise?

Why? And again I ask, Why?

How About a Roman Catholic For President?

Some weeks ago Dr. Wade Harris, the erudite and well-informed editor of the Charlotte Observer, in response to an inquiry from The Outlook, wrote that while there was strong objection to Smith upon the ground that he was an anti-prohibitionist, nevertheless "the liquor question is not so potent a factor against Smith as the religious issue."

This presents all in all, the most interesting and, perhaps, the most important phase of the whole situation.

There can be no doubt but that the feeling against Roman Catholicism is deep-rooted, even among those who are accounted as intelligent Christians and who are leaders in the Protestant churches. In my own opinion, this hostility—in some cases even hatred—of the Roman Catholic church is so ingrained that it has become a part of the sub-conscious religious life of a vast number of people in North Carolina and, indeed, in the whole South. To my way of thinking, this is one of the greatest blots upon Protestant Christianity of the present day.

But suppose you go out among intelligent patriots who are so bitterly opposed to Smith and ask them whether they deem it proper to oppose Smith solely because he is a Catholic. I will wager you that in nine cases out of ten your question will be answered "no". I will wager again that in nine cases out of ten your interlocutor will say: "Oh, but Smith is the protagonist of the 'wets' and that really is why I am against him."

In other words, Roman Catholicism and "wetness" constitute a two fold objection to Smith and in most cases are as closely connected with each other as were the Siamese twins, although the ligament that binds them may not be always visible.

I have, moreover, a feeling that most of the intlligent people who evince this hostility to a candidate for President solely because he is a Roman Catholic are really ashamed of it, and for that reason you rarely hear anyone of intelligence give as his outspoken reason against Smith that he is a Catholic.

A prominent and well-informed citizen of the state said to me the other day: "Mr. Tillett, vast numbers of our people who are giving as their reason against Smith that he is an anti-prohibitionist are really at heart opposed to him because he is a Catholic."

You will observe that I have confined the foregoing observations to the acts and sayings of intelligent Protestants. I have made no mention of the vast horde of ignorant illiterates who have been led to believe that the pope is anti-Christ and that the Roman Catholic church is the symbolic "beast" so bitterly anathematized in the book of Revelation. You need not reason with them. It is this class that will cast most of the votes against Smith because of his religion, although willing, actuated by this unworthy motive, will not by any means be confined to the ignorant, for much as the ostrich, vigorous and strong-minded ostrich often walks, stand in sand.

Setting At Naught the Federal Constitution.

One of the most plausible arguments against Smith, one that may make a profound impression against his fidelity to prohibition and the charge is boldly made that in trying to enforce his views on prohibition he is over-riding the federal constitution and is violating his oath of office.

Who is setting at naught the United States constitution, Al Smith or those who oppose him solely because he is a Catholic? Let's see.

The third section of the sixth article of the constitution of the United States contains this emphatic inhibition:

"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

That section plainly forbids setting up as a test of any man's qualification for the office of President of the United States the question as to whether he is a Protestant or a Catholic.

Your lawyer will probably tell you that that clause of the constitution was primarily intended to prevent Congress from enacting a law which would forbid a man to be elected to office solely because of his religion. For the purposes of this discussion, I need not take issue with that interpretation. That section of the United States constitution, which originated with Thomas Jefferson, the greatest of all Democrats, did not get into the constitution by way of an "amendment" but was, at the very first, laid down as one of the bed-rock foundations of government; and this section, as well as the declaration of religious freedom contained in the bill of rights, was most certainly enacted to prevent an attack upon any man for office under the United States solely because of his religion.

When you first exercised the elective franchise in North Carolina, you promised upon the holy evangelist of Almighty God to support the constitution of the United States. If, after taking that oath, you have opposed a man for President of the United States solely because he is a Catholic, then you may not have broken the letter of your vow, but certainly you have not only violated the spirit of the United States constitution but you have attempted to sap and undermine one of the pillars of our system of government.

A few weeks ago there appeared in a current periodical a discussion of this very question by Dr. Hough, one of the most prominent divines in the northern Methodist church, who has been pastor of the largest church in Detroit for ten years. That great preacher boldly advocated the election of a Catholic as President without any reference, however, to the candidacy of Al Smith. In the climax of his argument against the religious bigotry and intolerance that would defeat a candidate for office solely because he is a Catholic, Dr. Hough said:

"When Protestant refuses to vote for a Catholic whose character and abilities he admits and with whose policies he agrees, and makes that refusal simply because the candidate is a Catholic, that Protestant is not worthy of the name or of the privilege of American citizenship."

This language is perhaps too strong, but I will follow Dr. Hough far enough to say that, in my opinion, one who blatantly opposes a candidate for office solely because he is a Catholic, besmirches his American citizenship.

Vive Ben Lacy!

Mine heart did burn within me when I read in the papers two weeks ago an interivew given out at Raleigh by our venerable state treasurer, Honorable Ben Lacy, touching the very matter under discussion here. He said that he was against Al Smith for President solely because Smith is an anti-prohibitionist; but this patriotic citizen, supporter of the United States constitution both in word and deed, Presbyterian elder of long standing, father of the most brilliant young Presbyterian divine in the south, being against Smith on account of his religion. On the contrary, he disclaimed in the strongest language uttered this matchless sentiment:

"I have said that I would be pleased at the opportunity to vote for a Catholic for President; and have also said that if the Democratic party ever nominated a Catholic I hoped my state would vote strongly for him just to show how big North Carolina is."

When I read those glowing words I threw my hat in the air and, with glad acclaim, thrice repeated, I cried aloud, "Vive Ben Lacy!"

"Abou Ben Adhem! May his tribe increase!"

Loyalty of Catholics to Government.

I cannot pass from this phase of the discussion without making another allusion to the calumny frequently uttered against our Catholic citizens that they are not, and cannot be, perfectly loyal to our government because their church demands of them that their allegiance to the pope be regarded by them as superior to their allegiance to their country.

Whatever abstract theories of papal supremacy in temporal affairs may be deduced from the dogmas and circums of popes, cardinals or others, we who live surrounded by our Catholic fellow-citizens, observing them every day in every relation of life from the highest to the lowest, know full well that Catholics are just as loyal to this government and to their country as are the Protestants. I cannot express myself in more temperate language than this:

He who avers that the American Catholics are less loyal to their government than are the Protestants, is either a willful maligner, an ignoramus or a blind bigot.

The story of the loyalty of American Catholics is written in blood in Argonne forest; and, "In Flanders field where poppies grow," row on row of white crosses, precious symbols of our Savior's death, stand sentinels watching over the bodies of our heroic Catholic dead, pointing toward heaven where the God of Justice reigns in little Private Gallagher's last manner that Catholics are and every whit as loyal to the American government as any citizens that ever lived under the stars and Stripes.

"Religion and Beer."

Now to the second objection against Smith that he is an outspoken anti-prohibitionist.

Let's keep clearly before us the question that is up for discussion viz: Should the Democrats refuse to nominate, and if possible, to elect Al Smith as President solely because he is an anti-prohibitionist? If he is the fittest and most available candidate of the Democrats from all other standpoints, should the Democrats refuse to nominate him solely because of his prohibition record and that, too, in the face of the fact that he may be found to be the only Democrat who has the slightest chance of being elected?

To those questions, if I make reply, I will answer in loud tones: "No!"

I grant you that I, claiming to be nothing but an erring mortal, and being greatly desirous of seeing one more Democrat in the White House before I die, may be influenced, to some extent at least, by my confident belief that if Smith is nominated he is just as sure to be elected as the sun is to rise on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, 1928, while, on the other hand, the nomination of any other Democrat except Smith will be a useless formality.

But back to my point. It gives me great cause of satisfaction that I am in good company in demanding that irrespective of the candidacy of Smith, the Democrats ought not to make a candidate's opposition to prohibition a bar to his nomination provided he is in other respects entirely competent. Hon. Josephus Daniels, one of the few nationally known Democrats in the state of North Carolina, a man who has held for nearly 40 years foremost places in the councils of the church and of the state, withal, one of the most ardent prohibitionists in the United States, gave utterance recently to a striking epigram that has been quoted in practically very newspaper in the United States, viz:

"The Democrats should let religion and beer alone."

By that cryptic saying I understand the former secretary of the navy to give it as his opinion that in the forthcoming Democratic primary, the matter of a candidate's religion or the matter of his stand on prohibition should not bar him from the nomination, provided, of course, that the qualifications of the canddate be otherwise such as to make him worthy of this high honor.

When President Wilson was governor of New Jersey and certain Democrats were trying to inject the prohibition question into the platform of the Democratic party of New Jersey, this patriotic Christian said:

"I do not believe that party programmes of the highest consequence to the political life of the state and the nation ought to be thrust to one side and hopelessly embarrassed for long periods together, by making a political issue of a great question that is essentially non-political non-partisan, moral and social in its nature."

Please note carefully that President Wilson and Mr. Daniels, as well as thousands of high-minded leaders in the Democratic party, do not think that "party programmes of the highest consequences to the political life of the state and nation ought to be thrust to one side and hopelessly embarrassed" by making the prohibition question the dominant issue in the councils of the Democratic party.

President Wilson and Prohibiton

What place, you ask, has "President Wilson and prohibition" in a discussion of "Al Smith and fair play?" Let's see.

I yield to no one in admiration of President Wilson, and I most heartily approve of the glowing encomiums bestowed upon him by prohibitionists who laud him in unmeasured terms as the outstanding Christian among all the Presidents of the United States, nowithstanding his record on prohibition.

But President Wilson was not a prohibitionist and, while he never espoused the cause of liquor if he were here today, he would not vote against Al Smith in the primary solely because of Smith's opposition to prohibiton, but instead he would severely censure the Democrats here in North Carolina who are doing that very thing, some of whom are now loudest in their praise.

More than that: President Wilson vetoed the Volstead act; did all in his mighty power to kill it dead and, if he could have had his way the Volstead act would not be on our statute books, the vexatious cause of all this bitter and acrimonious controversy.

You may call my attention to the fact that, in his veto message, President Wilson referred to the "salutary object" sought to be accomplished by this act, but I call your attention to the fact that he also said in that veto message that the law regulationg the "personal customs and habits of large numbers of our people" (Meaning thereby the drinking customs and habits) "ought not to be changed except by established processes of law" and that the Volstead act did not comply with this condition. But after all, the important point is: President Wilson vetoed the Volstead act and thus tried to kill it dead.

Now to the point: By what law of fairness do those who profess to oppose Smith solely—mark the word "solely"—because of his record on prohibition, laud Wilson as a model President notwithstanding his record on prohibition?

Some weeks ago, there appeared in a religious journal in North Carolina, an editorial condemning Smith in unmeasured terms, calling on all the preachers of the state to rally in a supreme effort to defeat him because of his objections to the Volstead act. In the same editorial, and almost in the same breath, the editor praised Wilson to the skies as the prototype of a Christian President. Not a mention of this editorial of Wilson's record on prohibition. Nor did the editor attempt to explain why opposition to the Volstead act was sufficient in and of itself to damn Smith to political perdition while opposition to Volstead act of President Wilson's part in no way affected his high position as an outstanding Christian President.

Do you call that fair? Does that tally with your standard of Christian ethics?

In the same catagory of unfair attacks is the onslaught that the "good haters" of Smith make upon him because he is backed and supported by that wicked organization, Tammany hall, while at the same time they receive with sincere though silent satisfaction the backing and support of the Ku Klux klan, the "hooded monster," the great terrorizing law-breaker.

Is that right? Is it fair?

How About Judges Stack And Sinclair?

Also: How about ostracizing from the church and from the prohibition party the thousands of men in North Carolina who are acceptable members of Protestant churches and pronounced prohibitionists, but who have come out boldly for Al Smith for President?

Let me illustrate by singling out two of North Carolina's most useful and distinguished citizens.

Every one will admit that no two men in the state of North Carolina, in public or private life, are rendering more effective practical service in enforcing prohibition than is being rendered by two of our Superior court judges, Stack and Sinclair. Each of these eminent citizens has decalred himself unequivocally for Al Smith for President, and each of them will vote for him in the primary. Each of them is a staunch and loyal member of a leading Protestant denomination.

I ask you this: Should either of these patriotic Christian officials be put under the slightest ban, either civil or ecclesiastical, for exercising his right to support Smith for President?

I am of the opinion that there cannot be found in any conference, synod or convention that has already met or that will meet before election day next year, a single man or woman who has rendered such effective and practical service for the temperance cause as has been rendered by each of these judges, although I admit there will be found in all these religious gatherings and "resoluted" about the enforcement of the Volstead act far more than has either Judge Stack or large numbers who have "mouthed" Judge Sinclair.

Now to the point: Doesn't it seem to you a bit ridiculous for a lot of men or women—none of whom has rendered service to the prohibition cause a hundredth part as effective as that rendered by either of these judges—to meet together and publish a denunciation of Al Smith—brutum fulmen at most—couched in language which necessarily stigmatizes Judges Stack and Sinclair because of their support of Smith?

Enforcement of Volstead Act.

But you ask: Will Smith, if elected, enforce the Volstead act?

I cannot tell you that he will, but I can tell you with confidence that he will enforce it just as well as any President has enforced it since it was enacted.

The other day, Judge Florence Allen of the Supreme court of Ohio, perhaps the most noted woman jurist since the day of Portia, speaking before a national organization of women in Washington, said: "The United States is the most lawless country in the world."

A prominent judge in Illinois expressed practically the same sentiment last week when he said: "The United States is the most lawless of countries."

Whether these pessimistic statements are true or not, I cannot tell you; but I will ask you this simple question: Suppose Al Smith had been President of the United States continuously since the passage of the Volstead act down to this time, and then suppose that the state of lawlessness as to the enforcement of law, particularly the prohibition laws, existed just as it does at present, is there a shadow of doubt but that the failure to enforce the Volstead act would be attributed by all of our great anti-Smith moral leaders to the fact that Smith had been all the time President?

Will Smith enforce the Volstead act?

Unquestionably, if elected, he will enforce it every whit as well as it has been enforced under President Coolidge, and as well as it will be enforced under Hoover, Lowden or Dawes, if any of them is elected.

They say the ease with which a drink of liquor can be obtained in New York city is due to the laxity of law enforcement there, for which Governor Smith is mainly responsible, and that this is a legitimate argument against his candidacy for President.

Well, if that is true, pray tell me whether the ease with which a drink of liquor can be obtained in Charlotte is due to the law enforcement of the law here for which Governor McLean is mainly responsible; and tell me whether, if Governor McLean is nominated for President (as some think not impossible,) you will use the enforcement of the prohibition law as an argument against his election?

If not, why not?

If Al Smith should advise anyone to violate either the letter or the spirit of the 18th amendment or of the Volstead act so long as they are parts of our organic law, I, for one, would regard him as a law breaker and unworthy of holding any office of trust; but I challenge you to show me a single word that he has ever uttered advising anybody to resist any law of the United States or of the state of New York. If it is mere verbal pyrotechnics as to law enforcement that you are demanding, then I challenge you to find anywhere any stronger utterance than the proclamation issued by Governor Smith urging obedience to the New York enforcement act, while it was on the statute book, and warning the sheriffs and other executive officers of the state that proof of a failure on the part of anyone to do his duty in enforcing that act would be treated by the governor as just cause for dismissal from office.

Moreover: Mere opposition to an existing law is not an offense. The man who tells you he is in favor of every law on the statute books is a snivelling hypocrite, and one who tells you that he obeys all the laws is a prevaricator.

Smith violated no law of God or man when he procured the repeal of the New York enforcement act, although I do not at all commend or approve his course in that respect.

Smith Doesn't Favor Intemperance.

It is grossly unfair to Smith to say that because he is an anti-prohibitionist he is, therefore, in favor of intemperance.

I am in favor of the 18th amendment and of the Volstead act, but I would regard myself as an intolerant bigot or a blantant fanatic if I denied to others of my fellow-citizens, many of whom are far wiser and more patriotic than I, the right to believe that the 18th amendment and the Volstead act did not promote temperance but, on the contrary, have bred lawlessness, and that in the promotion of the best

(Continued on page 3.)

Christmas Money for You

Search Your Attic for Fortunes in Old Envelopes

Among the old letters of many families are hundreds of very rare stamps and envelopes. Many have been found and sold for fortunes. Single envelopes have been sold for as high as $6,000, and many have brought upwards of $100 each. It sounds "fishy," but it's true. They are valuable because they are rare. And they are rare, not because there are only a few, but simply because most of them have remained stored away and forgotten, in old trunks, family chests and closets.

Make a thorough search through your attic or store room for such old letters—anything mailed from 1845 to 1865. Fortunes in rare stamps have been found in old trunks which no one ever dreamed contained anything of value. Keep the letters if you wish, but send the envelopes to Mr. Harold C. Brooks, Box 223 Marshall, Michigan, and he will immediately write you, stating their value. In sending them to him you are not obliged to sell unless his offer meets with your approval. Anything not purchased he will return in good order. Mr. Brooks, who is mayor of his city, is a private collector and has paid thousands of dollars for old envelopes bearing stamps. Although the rare issues are especially desired he also buys many of the commoner kinds. Many people in this way are getting Christmas money with very little trouble and no expense.

The First National Bank of Marshall, Mich., writes: "Mr. Brooks has been in business here for twenty years. You will make no mistake when you recommend him to your readers as worthy of the fullest confidence, both financially and personally."

Mr. Brooks states that there are so many different stamps which are similar in appearance he cannot quote values from written descriptions, but must see the envelopes. Furthermore, he is not interested in buying loose stamps or stamp collections, but only the old envelopes bearing postage; so do not cut the stamps from the envelopes. It is not necessary to write dates on envelopes as Mr. Brooks is fully acquainted with all issues even though the postmark shows no year date. Those especially wanted are United States issues, but he also buys Confederate, Canadian, Hawaiian, and certain foreign stamps provided they are on the original envelopes and mailed not later than 1865.

If envelopes are sent in a bunch they should be carefully packed in a cardboard box to protect them from damage while in the mails. If you have reason to believe your envelopes are of special value send them by registered or insured mail. If you have no old letters written during or before the Civil War, show this notice to your friends—especially those whose families have lived in the same home for several generations. Many old families, old banks, and law firms still have stored away hundreds of letters, waiting to be burned or sold for large sums. Before destroying such envelopes or folded letters investigate their value. Mr. Brooks' address is as follows:

HAROLD C. BROOKS,
Box 223 Marshall, Mich.