



## The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)  
Owned and published daily (except Sunday) by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co.  
214-220 West Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Ind. Price is Marion County, 2  
cents a copy; elsewhere, 3 cents; delivered by carrier, 12 cents a week.  
BOYD GURLEY ROY W. HOWARD, FRANC G. MORRISON.  
Editor President Business Manager  
PHONE-Hiley 5551 MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1931.  
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."

### After Prohibition, What?

Serious-minded citizens who want the fundamentals of this nation preserved must begin to plan on what is to happen after prohibition.

There can be no question as to the failure of the noble experiment. From every point of observation can be seen evidence of the evils that have come with the futile effort to suppress the use of alcohol by constitutional amendment.

At present, it plagues the solution of pressing industrial and economic problems. It diverts thought from questions that must be settled soon if this country is to remain true to its traditions of liberty and freedom and democratic government. It has made corruption common in government. It has not reduced crime, nor to any appreciable degree, the amount of drinking.

The fact that there will be a meeting at Tomlinson hall on Thursday night, sponsored by prominent citizens, to protest against prohibition is significant. Three years ago no business man would have dared face the fanaticism of professional dry leaders and the boycott that would have followed such participation.

That the meeting is to be held suggests how quickly sentiment is gathering against the failure of prohibition. Opposition to the evils of intemperance has not lessened. Common sense is suggesting that failure be recognized and plans be laid for something that will be more effective.

That is the big question. Prohibition is doomed by its own futility. It would, however, be tragic to merely blot out the present law if there is no well-formulated scheme to replace it.

Once again the suggestion is made that drinking be made unfashionable and the bootlegger impossible by government manufacture and distribution at exact cost. No one would then have any motive to corrupt government or to engage in making poisons.

Drinking would disappear from the homes of the classes that have furnished leadership before, and furnish it now by making law violation popular and fashionable.

Take out the profit from this business and there will be no liquor problem.

### Child Health Day

President Hoover has proclaimed May 1 as National Child Health Day.

We would like to visualize that day as one in which all the nation's 45,000,000 children would be dancing about maypoles, chanting happy verses about the virtues of spinach, carrots and certified milk, and other good things for children.

But we can't.

On the desks lies a dispatch that beet workers of Colorado, a large proportion of whom are children, just have had their wages cut 25 per cent and are desperate. Sugar is good for children, but not for beet workers' children, 28 per cent of whom are said to die before they are 18.

Another dispatch tells us that 70,000 more children worked in 1929 than in 1928, and that new census figures will reveal another increase in 1930. We learn that 1,060,858, according to last census, spend their time between 10 and 16 in gainful employment, that 40,000 of them are millhands, 11,000 are shop workers, 6,000 are miners!

President Hoover says that 6,000,000 American children are nourished improperly; 1,000,000 have damaged hearts; 382,000 are tubercular, 300,000 are crippled, 50,000 are partially blind, and 14,000 are in total darkness; 342,000 have impaired hearing, 1,000,000 have defective speech, 200,000 are delinquent, 450,000 are mentally retarded, 500,000 are dependent, 10,000,000 lack the things that go to make perfect childhood.

Do we need a child health day?

We need 365 of them every year.

**A Battle Against Barbarism Fails**

The Ohio criminal syndicalism law is a flagrant barrier to social criticism in the Buckeye State. It has been used in the coal fields to intimidate labor organizers by holding the shadow of the hoosegow over them. Several outrageous convictions have been secured under the law. They were overruled by the higher courts, fortunately.

Eminent Ohio liberals, among them distinguished attorneys, set out to have the law repealed, after it had been denounced by the high courts of the state. But the patriots got out in force, under leadership of the Daughters of American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution and the Franklin County Reserve Officers Association.

Though reported favorably to the house by the committee in charge, the repeal bill was defeated by a vote of 102-10.

By blocking criticism and peaceful agitation, Ohio thus invites the very action it aims to prevent, namely, forcible revolt.

### Another Democratic Platform

Senator Walsh of Massachusetts has outlined a better platform for the Democrats in the 1932 campaign than the one advanced by Chairman Raskob last week. As the principal speaker at the annual Jefferson day dinner of the National Democratic Club in New York City, Walsh stressed the economic issues which Raskob is inclined to steer away from.

In congratulating Raskob on his service in forcing general discussion of platform issues well in advance of the party convention, and including prohibition as a major election issue, he pointed out that the progressive wing of his party feared he was trying to make the Democratic party as safe for big business control as the Republican party.

Therefore, it is particularly fitting that the keynote of the Jefferson day dinner, coming so soon after the Raskob statement, should speak for the workers and farmers, who are the chief victims of this depression.

Walsh's indictment of the Republican administration was too sweeping and partisan. The administration is not responsible for the economic depression, produced by causes beyond its control. But its mis-

takes have intensified and prolonged the depression.

The administration, by its public statements and policies, encouraged the speculative orgy which ended in panic. It repeatedly underestimated the extent and seriousness of the depression, and consequently crippled private and public measures of relief and reconstruction.

It loaded the weakened country with a monstrous tariff burden, which curbed the consumers' market and killed much of the foreign trade upon which prosperity depends.

Walsh had no difficulty in proving the disastrous consequences of these administration policies.

But he was not so clear or effective in presenting an alternative constructive program.

Walsh and his progressive Democratic colleagues should be given credit for facing economic issues which the Raskobs of their own party and of the administration are evading.

But Democratic progressives will have to do more than find fault, if they are to get very far. They must be more definite as to what they propose to do about unemployment, farm relief, tariff, power, taxation.

On one of these—taxation—Walsh was fairly specific. He proposed a revision of federal taxes to shift the burden less upon wage earners and small business men and more upon the very wealthy. That seems to us fundamental.

In this connection, he repeated the astounding government figures showing that the annual net income of 504 multi-millionaires is \$1,165,135,000, which equals the value of the nation's total wheat and cotton crops.

Obviously, such extreme concentration of wealth restricts the purchasing power of the people, and destroys the mass market, without which mass production is a curse instead of a blessing.

By adding tax reform to prohibition repeal, Walsh has put his finger on two national issues which are as fundamental as they are popular.

But can he get the Raskob party managers to accept tax reform, and can he get the western Democratic progressives to accept prohibition repeal? Probably not.

### No Plot Needed

It makes headlines and very interesting reading when an Indiana congressman charges that the grain speculators and the Democratic national committee are in cahoots to besmirch the name and beittle the work of the federal farm board.

Ha! A plot! says the Republican national committee.

But it must be evident to all that no conspiracy is required to prove that the federal farm board's speculation has been bad, futile and very expensive business.

In its efforts to "stabilize" the grain trade, it bought millions of bushels of grain. This surplus is worth a good deal less now, and still depresses the market. The board realizes these purchases will be advised, for it has announced it no longer will buy wheat.

It also tried to "stabilize" the cotton market, and now, through its agencies, it holds more than 1,300,000 bales—bales of cotton worth a good deal less now than when acquired.

Protests against these and other operations of the board, from a Democrat and a grain trader, coincided in the newspapers, and the G. O. P. nose-sometimes very tender—scented a plot.

No plot is needed to prove what every one already knows.

### U. S. Artist Out in Cold

STILL, we are not without liberality in certain aspects of progress. Though insistent on protecting industry and labor at all costs, we prefer foreigners when it comes to art. Such infant enterprises as United States Steel, or the Aluminum Company of America can depend on a tariff to safeguard them from foreign competition.

We leave no stone unturned to insure them a good price for their products. When it comes to the American singer or musician, however, we leave just as few stones unturned to see that the foreigner gets three times as much.

While looking upon the Mexican labor or Russian pulpwood as a menace, we are perfectly content with a situation which virtually discourages our young men and young women from getting into art.

### Hard on Home Talent

IF congress really wants to do something worth while for development and improvement of American life, it might begin with a study of the artistic situation in this country, particularly as that situation is reflected in private galleries, public museums, grand opera and the concert stage.

It would surprise some people to learn where the "treasures" come from and who gets the money. It also would surprise them to learn what other countries are doing to protect their artists, especially in the field of music, against outside competition.

According to Dr. Hurd, the mucous membrane of the nose becomes deranged either by a bad diet which is deficient in vitamins, by sensitivity to various protein substances, or by some disorders of the glands of internal secretion.

The changes that take place in

## M. E. Tracy SAYS:

*In Spite of All The Fine Talk,  
There Is Still a Lot of  
Prejudice in This Country  
Against Foreigners.*

NEW YORK, April 13.—Thirty-five thousand Mexicans left California during the last three months and it is expected that as many more will have done so by midsummer.

Unemployment furnishes only part of the explanation. Several recent developments have tended to create a feeling among Mexicans that they are not wanted in this country.

First, immigration authorities have been staging a drive against aliens subject to deportation. Second, a bill now is before the California legislature which would create separate schools for Mexicans. Third, there has been more or less discrimination against Mexicans in providing work.

No doubt Mexicans have exaggerated or misunderstood the meaning of these activities, but their reaction is not without warrant. In spite of all the fine talk, there still is quite a lot of prejudice in this country against foreigners, especially against foreigners who lay track, dig ditches, hoe the garden and wear overalls.

When times are flush, we are glad to have them around, chiefly because we shrink at doing the dirty work ourselves. When times are hard and we need the work, even though it is a little dirty, we make no bones about intimating that their room is preferable to their company.

Foreigners would understand the situation better and take it more philosophically if there hadn't been so much fine talk.

### In Our True Colors

THE same rule goes for others besides the stranger without our gates. We have talked a great deal about what we have done for the Filipinos, but somehow, it hasn't convinced them that independence wouldn't be a happier lot.

So, too, we have talked a great deal about the benefice of our advent in Porto Rico, but the nationalistic party now is issuing bonds to be redeemed five years after the island has become a republic. And the Virgin Islanders, who shouted so gleefully when the Stars and Stripes was raised over their domain fourteen years ago, now threaten to migrate in large numbers.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which we have the habit of exuding when it costs nothing.

The Grundy bill looks like a more painful symbol of how we really feel toward the world in general than do some of those idealistic utterances which