



The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)

Owned and published daily (except Sunday) by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214-220 W. Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Ind. Price in Marion County, 2 cents—10 cents a week; elsewhere, 3 cents—12 cents a week.

BOYD GURLEY,
Editor.

ROY W. HOWARD,
President.

FRANK G. MORRISON,
Business Manager.

PHONE—MAIN 3500.

SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1928.

Member of United Press, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Newspaper Enterprise Association, Newspaper Information Service and Audit Bureau of Circulations.

"Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way."—Dante.

Harry Sinclair Today

A theory about money exists among the cynical, expressed as follows: "It is not how you get it, but have you got it?"

That theory too often appears to express the truth.

"Men mumble," it is contended—"but money talks."

The all-expulsive character of money, however, fails sometimes. For example, the belief that money covers all sins and justifies all acts has been shattered in the case of Harry Sinclair.

At the outset of the oil scandal it was quite evident that Sinclair possessed firm faith in the "have you got it" theory.

His boldness and his arrogance, together with his money, carried him a long way.

As a business man, he was possessed of great ability. He could organize. He had vast energy. He instinctively knew the difference between efficient men and mediocre. He didn't fear to deal in large figures. To him millions were as dollars to men of lesser vision.

He saw the world-wide sweep of oil—its tremendous importance in the rapidly expanding industrial era, mass production and international trade. Harry Sinclair could "put things over" and make them stick.

Those very traits of boldness that made him effective in his start as an oil man carried him on beyond the zone of legitimate business practice. With great wealth came great contempt for those who didn't have it—and dreams of greater power. Harry Sinclair began to take short cuts and he got caught.

But he thought money would carry him through. For months after the initial revelations it commonly was predicted that he would "get by" unscathed.

At first, the enormous Sinclair fortune was a shield—an armor against his prosecutors. But the armor grew heavy as time went on. Finally it ceased to be a shield and turned into a great weight.

The very prominence of the man became a liability. One less prominent, one less large might have been lost in the shuffle of other and more exciting public events. But Sinclair stood out. He was too big.

Because of his size he held public attention. No Snyder-Gray case, no great disaster, no war or rumor of war, no happening whatsoever, was important enough or far-reaching enough to bury Sinclair.

And so it came to pass that even those cynical ones who thought money justifies everything now are saying that Sinclair is gone.

Hero of the racing world a few years ago, owner of a derby winner, leading player in the sport of kings, master of a stable that not even a king could afford, this "certain rich man" now has been barred as an undesirable associate by those who once fawned upon him.

It would be interesting to know the emotions of Harry Sinclair today. Such knowledge, of course, is the exclusive property of Sinclair himself.

It is probable that he would give all he owns to have the slate washed clean and be once again where he started, the young Kansas drug clerk; and that if he could thus turn backward time in its flight, he would not ever depart from the way that is straight into paths that are devious.

Wealth could have been his just the same. For his ability was such that riches were inevitable. And, besides, happiness could have been his, too, and the esteem of his neighbors, without which life, after all, with all the money in the world, is a mockery.

Rich though he is today, Harry Sinclair is the poorest of men.

Fall Talks About Talking

Albert B. Fall has offered to tell what he knows about the notorious oil leases.

He is willing, he wired Chairman Nye of the Senate investigating committee, to answer in "a deposition" any questions that might be asked. The deposition would be used in the coming trial of Harry F. Sinclair. Fall was to have been tried with Sinclair, but his illness, he says, prevents his going to Washington from his ranch at Three Rivers, N. M. He is unwilling to talk to the Senate committee—because of the pending litigation, he says.

For Fall even to talk about talking at this late date is surprising, to say the least, in view of his careful silence for more than four years. Evidence relating to the huge payments of Sinclair and Doheny to Fall was obtained by the Senate committee without any help from him, and only by the most painstaking digging.

Fall had an opportunity to tell what he knew in 1923, and cooked up the false story about having been given \$100,000 in cash by E. B. McLean. He had opportunity to talk in February, 1924, but he claimed immunity before the Senate committee on the ground that he might incriminate himself.

He had opportunity to reveal his story when the civil suits to recover the oil lands were tried. He could have talked when Doheny was tried in November, 1926, but he did not take the stand.

If Fall can demonstrate his innocence, why has he not done so? If he wants all the facts to be known, and has nothing to conceal, what is to keep him from talking now?

Emil Ludwig, the German author, visited Washington and says he found Charley Dawes a pure artistic temperament. He didn't even hear Dawes talk to the Senate, either.

THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

BRIDGE ME ANOTHER

(Copyright, 1928, by The Ready Reference Publishing Company)

BY W. W. WENTWORTH

(Abbreviations: A—ace; K—king; Q—queen; J—jack; X—any card lower than 10.)

- When you hold honors in sequence, which should you lead?
- When you hold two suits fairly guarded, in discarding should you discard from both?
- Partner having bid a suit, what do you lead against a suit bid, when you hold three or less of partner's suit?

The Answers

- Lead the highest.
- Never discard so that they both become worthless. Better to choose one suit and discard the other.
- Lead highest card except when holding K X X, lead lowest.

Times Readers Voice Views

The name and address of the author must accompany every contribution, but no names will be published. Letters not exceeding 200 words will receive preference.

Editor Times:

Dear Sir: Yours seems to be about the only paper brave enough to publish actual facts, regardless of who is hit, and I am wondering if you will make this letter public, so a few business concerns, if not all of them, may know just how a number of their employees obtain their positions.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?

Do they know that a clerk or, say a stenographer, making only \$25 a week, must pay something like \$54.17 (this fee depends upon the 50 per cent rate) to obtain the position? If the position only lasts a month, she or he simply is the loser by \$54.17.

The employment agencies will tell you that the fee is fifty per cent (or whatever is charged by some, thirty-three and one-third per cent, etc.) of this first month's salary.

If the stenographer or clerk is paid \$25 a week, the employment agency figures it on basis of a year and one-twelfth of that amount is the first month's salary.

In most cases one has to be very alert to cope with their high-handed methods.

Every scheme known to them, is resorted to, in order to place someone in a position where they may obtain a fee.

It does seem that with so many people out of work and willing to work for almost nothing, business firms would give a thought to their method of obtaining help and utilize the FREE employment agencies.

With so many places available for firms to obtain help, why do they patronize the employment agencies where an enormous fee is charged?