

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS, BUSINESS CARDS, AND NOTICES

FOR SALE

FOR SALE—Closing out our oil stoves and refrigerators and felt base rugs at very low prices. Call at once if you want a bargain. Sprague Furniture Co., Monroe St. Phone 199. (b) 152-6t

FOR SALE—Used 3-piece living room suite, \$20; short davenport, \$6; rocker, \$3; heating stove, 18-in. fire-pot, like new, \$18; dining room table, \$7; organ, \$1. Sprague Furniture Co., Monroe St., Phone 199. (b) 152-3t

FOR SALE—Gooseberries and currants. Mrs. Ray Smith, phone 5621. (b) 153-3t

FOR SALE—Entire stock of glassware at 25% off. Buy now and save. Schafer Hardware Co. 153-3t

FOR SALE—Large flat top desk, gas range, ice box, each \$5. Call at 332 Mercer Ave. R. A. Tooke. 154-1t

FOR SALE—6 room house on West Monroe street, 1400 block. Semi-modern. Paved street, good sewage system and some fruit. Price \$1250. See Charles S. Steele at the Gillig and Steele Insurance Agency. (b) 154-3tx

FOR SALE—3 burner oil stove used only 2 weeks, good as new. A bargain. Lenhart Dairy Products, corner Third and Monroe, b154-3tx

FOR SALE—One red heifer calf, Oscar Werling, north of Magley. Rural route, Tocsin, Tocsin phone. (b) 153-2tx

FOR RENT

FOR RENT—3 nice rooms, wood-burner, coal bin and garage. Inquire 249 North 7th St. (b) 152-6t

FOR RENT—Completely modern house, 334 S. Winchester street. Eight rooms and bath; hardwood floors. Motor plumbing. Large yard. Inquire Dick Heller, Democrat office. (b) 153-3tx

FOR RENT—Five room modern house at 410 North 7th Street. Inquire of Pat Miller, 412 North 7th Street or write Mrs. Rose Moran, 4702 College Avenue, Indianapolis. (b) 153-3t

FOR RENT—A good 6-room house on 13th St. Modern furnished flat over Adams Theatre. Julius Haugk. Phone 666. (g) 153-3tx

LOST AND FOUND

LOST: Small black 2 compartment purse this morning between Kroger store, south Second street and 422 W. Adams. Contained about \$5. Finder please call 157. (b) 152-4t

LOST, STRAYED OR STOLEN—Large spotted dog disappeared from Curryville Monday evening. Reward offered. Anyone finding this dog return it to Curryville. Standish Stevens. (b) 153-3t

OUR PLANT will operate Tuesday and Thursday until July 15th. After this date will operate every day except Saturday afternoon. Canning price will be 6c per can. Colter Canning Co., Hoagland. 154V3tx

Police Method Cleared

London, June 29—(UP)—The suicide of Violet Sharpe, maid in the Morrow home at Englewood, was not caused by police violence in questioning her about the Lindbergh kidnapping, Capt. R. A. Eden, foreign under-secretary, told the house of commons today. Eden said the British consul-general in New York reported he was satisfied "no physical violence or so-called third degree methods" were used by the police.

BARGAINS—Bargains in Living Room, Dining Room Suite, Mattresses and Rugs. Stuckey and Co. Monroe, our Phone number is 44 ct.

YAGER BROTHERS Funeral Directors

Ambulance Service, day or night. Lady Attendant Phone 105-44. Funeral Home, 110 So. First St.

J. M. DOAN

FUNERAL DIRECTOR

Modern, Dependable. 24 hour service. MRS. DOAN, Lady Attendant. Ambulance Service anywhere. Phone 1941

S. E. BLACK Funeral Director

You will find our service as perfect as it is possible for us to achieve. AMBULANCE SERVICE

500--Phones--727

MRS. BLACK, Lady Attendant.



Common Horse Sense will tell you to stick always to Winner BRAND WORK CLOTHES!

**HOLTHOUSE
SCHULTE & CO.**

MARKET REPORTS

DAILY REPORT OF LOCAL AND FOREIGN MARKETS

BERNE MARKET

Corrected June 29
No commission and no yardage.

Hogs 100-150 pounds \$4.00
150-220 pounds \$4.70
220-250 pounds \$4.50
250-300 pounds \$4.30
Roughs \$3.00.
Stags \$1.75.
Stags \$1.60.
Vealers \$5.75.
Spring lambs \$5.00.

Fort Wayne Livestock Market
Hog market 15-20c higher; pigs \$4.50-4.75; light lights \$4.75-4.90; lights \$4.90-5; mediums \$4.75-4.90; heavies \$4.60-4.75; stags \$2.50; calves \$5.50-6; ewe and wether lambs \$5.50-5; bucks \$4.50.

East Buffalo Livestock Market

Hogs on sale, 500; active weight above 150 lbs. 25-35c higher, others about steady; good to choice 150-200 lb. \$5.50-5.60; plainer lots, \$5.25-5.40; pigs \$5.25; packing sows \$3.25-3.50.

Cattle receipts 350; steers steady; cows firm; medium to good dry fed steers \$6.25-6.75; cutter cows, \$1.50-2.50.

Calf receipts, 150; vealers unchanged \$7 down.

Sheep receipts, 600; better grade lambs 25c lower; medium to lower grades 50c lower and almost unsellable; good to choice natives, \$7.75; fat ewes and wethers \$7.25; fat bucks \$6.25; throwouts \$4.25-4.75; inferior kinds \$3 and under.

CHICAGO GRAIN CLOSE

	July	Sept.	Dec.
Wheat, old 48	50 1/2	50 1/2	53 1/2
Wheat, new 48	50 1/2	50 1/2	53 1/2
Corn	28 3/4	31 1/4	32
Oats	19 1/4	19 3/4	21 1/4

LOCAL GRAIN MARKET

Corrected June 29
No. 2 New Wheat 36c
30 lbs. White Oats 15c
28 lbs. White Oats 15c
Soy Beans 30c
New No. 3, White Corn 29c
New No. 3, Yellow Corn 34c
LOCAL GROCERS EGG MARKET
Eggs, dozen 10c

NOTICE TO BRIDGE CONTRACTORS

Notice is hereby given that the Board of County Commissioners of Adams County, Indiana, at their regular meeting held at their rooms in the Court House at Decatur, Indiana, will receive sealed bids for the construction of the following bridges in said county on July 18th 1932 at 9 a. m.

1. Bridge over Little River, Root township, 200.00
2. Bridge over Little River, Root township, 1,000.00
3. Bridge over Little River, Root township, 550.00
4. Bridge over Little River, Root township, 200.00
Bids will be for the completion of said improvements in accordance with the plans and profiles and specifications now on file in the office of the Auditor of said county and shall include all labor and material for said work.

Each bid shall be accompanied by a personal or surety bond in the sum equal to twice the amount of the bid filed; said bond to be conditioned in the manner required by law. Each bid must be accompanied with the affidavits required by law. The time for the completion of the work will be fixed at the time of awarding contract.

The Board will reserve the right to reject any or all bids.
F. J. MARTIN
ALBERT REPPERT
DENNIS STUBBER
Board of Commissioners
Attest: Albert Harlow, Auditor. June 29-36

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF COUNTY COUNCIL
Notice of special meeting of County Council of Adams County, Indiana will be held at the Auditor's office in the Court House at Decatur, Indiana at 9 A. M. on July 18th 1932 for the purpose of making the following special appropriations for the several county offices to-wit:

Insanity & Epidemic	200.00
Transfer Prox. fund 210D to	
211A	10.00
Co. Prox. 201C and 211A	90.00
School Fund Property Ins.	14.00
Plim. Road expense	200.00
Deputy Assessors of Washington township	105.00
Co. Attorney Fund 104	250.00
Co. Assessor expense	175.00
Special Judge appointed by Circuit court	200.00
Special Judge appointed for "Wabash Brain"	1,000.00

Taxpayers appearing shall have the right to be heard thereon. After such appropriations have been determined and made, ten or more taxpayers feeling themselves aggrieved by such appropriations may appeal to the State Board of Tax Commissioners for further and final action thereon, by filing their petition, together with the county auditor and the State Board will fix a date for hearing in this county.

Dated June 27, 1932.
Albert Harlow, Auditor
Adams County.
June 29 July 6

**N. A. BIXLER
OPTOMETRIST**
Eyes Examined, Glasses Fitted
HOURS:
8:30 to 11:30—12:30 to 5:00
Saturdays, 8:00 p. m.
Telephone 135

THIMBLE THEATER



Test Your Knowledge

Can you answer seven of these test questions? Turn to Page Four for the answers.

1. Is Sing Sing a state or city prison?
2. What three governors of New York have been Presidents of the United States?
3. Who was Hetty Green?
4. What well known book did Lew Wallace write?
5. Who led an Army of unemployed to Washington in 1894?
6. Who was vice-president under Woodrow Wilson?
7. From what state does Senator Simeon D. Fess come?
8. What is a Zombi?
9. Where is Dartmouth College?
10. Who is Walter Johnson?

REPEALISTS NEAR MAJORITY

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE
Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Alaska, Hawaii, Philippines.

These delegations would put the repealists within a dozen votes of a majority and they are counting on defections in other states to carry them over the deciding line.

The plank offered by the outright wets would pledge the party to repeal and modification of the Volstead act. Dry states would be promised federal assistance in preventing shipments of intoxicants from wet areas. But the problem of the liquor traffic within the borders of any state would be wholly under control of state authorities.

Wets are divided as to the advisability of including in their program the Volstead modification advocated by former Governor Alfred E. Smith. The tentatively agreed upon plank states:

"Pending repeal, we favor immediate modification of the Volstead act to legalize the manufacture and sale of beer and other beverages of such alcoholic content as is permissible under the constitution and to provide therefrom a proper and needed revenue."

The revenue phase of the modification plank arouses considerable enthusiasm but opposed to it

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

The nine-man sub-committee has the 1,300 word platform almost in its final draft. The prohibition plank caused some misgivings and committeemen decided last night to sleep on it before finally approving the final text.

Farm leaders appeared before the full committee last night in executive session and presented the claims of agriculture, for a living wage. The farm leaders expressed it as "production costs." The farm plank does not specify the procedure, but promises to cope with the problem of crop surpluses. It pledges the party to improved rural credits and aid in re-financing farm debts.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

NOW SHOWING—"THE LOSING WINNER"



are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.



are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.



are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow disputes over questions which might have to be carried to the supreme court before they could be decided.

are those who contend that the prohibition problem should be attacked in the constitution without raising sidishow