



## The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)  
Owned and published daily (except Sunday) by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co.  
214-220 North Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Indiana. Price in Marion County, 2 cents a copy; elsewhere 5 cents; delivered by carrier, 15 cents a week. Mail subscription rates in Indiana, \$3 a year; outside of Indiana, 60 cents a month.

BOYD GURLEY,  
EditorROY W. HOWARD,  
PresidentEARL D. BAKER,  
Business Manager

PHONE-Riley 5551

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

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

### The Republican Plank

Again the Republicans have pussyfooted on prohibition. Their platform plank is a meaningless evasion.

It was dictated by Herbert Hoover. A majority of delegates, like a majority of the country, wanted a repeal plank. But Hoover refused. He was in Washington at telephone and made a majority of 1,154 delegates bury their convictions and the sincerity of their party.

They were reluctant. But the cabinet officers and Hoover secretaries, who ran relays at the Chicago end of the White House wire, applied the old loyalty pressure. "Stand by the President!" That did the trick.

There is only one major question at issue. That is retention or repeal of prohibition. The Hoover plank evades it. "We do not favor a submission limited to the issue of retention or repeal."

If the Republican party had courage, it would have defied Hoover and declared either for or against the eighteenth amendment. That is the purpose of a party platform—to take sides on issues which divide the voters. Party evasion of a national issue thwarts representative government.

The American voter respects convictions, even though they disagree with his own. A wet could respect Hoover and the Republican party for a sincere declaration in favor of the eighteenth amendment. But voters will not respect the sincerity of a party which tries to trick both drys and wets with a double-dealing declaration.

Hoover and his henchmen know the effect of their muddled modification ruse—if it carries. It means more years of delay. It prevents a clear-cut vote.

But it does much worse than that. It pitches the country into an endless dispute while awaiting a perfect substitute. If we wait to discover one, we never shall get rid of national prohibition.

We have tried prohibition long and fairly. It has failed. We must repeal it, and then slowly evolve some other plan.

All the modificationist talk about the necessity of protecting dry states is subterfuge. If prohibition is repealed the dry states will be protected without any additional prohibition amendment.

With repeal of prohibition, the federal government will continue under the Webb-Kenyon law to protect dry states from liquor from wet states, just as the federal government protected them before national prohibition.

No constitutional amendment is needed to give the federal government power "to protect those states where prohibition may exist"—as requested by the Republican platform. The Republican proposal is for an amendment which would allow the federal government to "safeguard our citizens everywhere from the return of the saloon and attendant abuses."

But under outright repeal, no state would legalize the saloon unless the people of that state voted it back—in which case they have a right to vote it back.

The Republican declaration for a modification amendment which would "retain in the federal government power to preserve the gains already made in dealing with evils inherent in the liquor traffic," is meaningless. The Wickersham commission discovered that drinking conditions and crime were worse rather than better.

National prohibition has not given us "gains in dealing with the liquor traffic." It has set us back. It has made us a lawless nation of hypocrites.

It has increased drunkenness and crime. It has polluted youth. It has corrupted politics. It has robbed us of revenue needed to relieve the taxpayer and to employ and feed the hungry.

The Republicans have cast their die. The way is open for the Democrats to meet the issue honestly—and win.

### A Public Shame

One of the excuses given by the highway commission for the retention of the gasoline tax and the building of highways at a time when the tax money is needed for much more emergent needs is that the program of public work provides employment.

If that is true, the least that can be done is the protection of the workers from a wage so low as to amount to virtual peonage.

But the commission, even though it promised protection, fails to give it.

Once a contract is let to its favorites, labor becomes a commodity to be bought on the open market where the desperate needs of men cause them to take any wage that will keep them off the lists of charity.

Reports that contractors are employing men at 15 cents an hour are numerous.

It is about the rate allowed by township trustees for "made work" and paid for groceries.

One of the tasks of the special session of the legislature will be to divert some of these funds from the highway commission to purposes that will relieve the farmer and the home owner from the heavy burden of taxation.

Any plan that the fund gives employment will lack force when the peonage wages are exposed.

A public works program for relief of the unemployed is good only when men are paid, not given mere sustenance.

The purchasing power of those who are building roads becomes so negligible under this system of slavery as not to be important.

Indiana should not permit its contractors to operate on so shocking a basis.

A wage limit should be written into every contract. If not, those who take advantage of the dire needs of workers should be banned from any further contracts.

Apparently those who pay the lowest wage get the most favors. There may be a reason.

### Then and Now

The Republican platform, on the issue of 1864:

"As slavery was the cause, and now constitutes the strength of this rebellion, and as it must be, always and everywhere, hostile to the principles of the republican government, justice and national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the republic."

The Republican platform on the issue of 1932:

"We do not favor a submission limited to the issue of retention or repeal."

### On Which Plank?

Senator James E. Watson, once again a candidate, gets a break.

He now has two prohibition planks with which to fool the voters, and can perform his usual stunt of being on both sides of every question.

To those who still believe in prohibition, he will

## M. E. Tracy Says:

The Administration's Prohibition Plank Is a Straddle, Concealed by Verbose Technicalities.

NEW YORK, June 16.—The Republican national convention is in the midst of its expected wrangles over prohibition as I write. The issue has been drawn clearly.

On one side there is the straightforward repeal plank presented by Senator Hiram Bingham of Connecticut; on the other is the rather complicated resubmission formula, which was forced through the resolutions committee in obedience to President Hoover's wishes.

Being simple and honest, the repeal plank requires no explanation. Being a straddle concealed by verbose technicalities, the administration plank requires too much. It obviously was manufactured to placate the drys. As Daniel A. Poling says, it leaves them less to worry about than the wets.

### Violates State's Rights

THE administration viewpoint is plausible, but specious. The basic fault of federal prohibition lies in its suppression of state rights and restraint of personal liberty through centralized control, which, more than anything else, this republic was designed to prevent.

The problems created by federal prohibition can not be solved by any scheme or compromise based on the theory that such centralized control is wise, just, or practical. Unless it is prepared to abandon the principles on which it was founded, the nation has no choice but to move for repeal.

We can make little headway in meeting the real issue until authority to deal with the liquor traffic has been returned to the states, and the federal government is restricted to its proper sphere of regulating interstate trade.

### A Political Dodge

FEDERAL prohibition is, and always has been, less significant as a moral experiment than as a political innovation. Its admitted failure to remedy the liquor evil may, or may not, have left us worse off than we were, but the damage it has done to our system of justice and system of government will require generations to repair.

It is ridiculous to talk about doing anything helpful, or effective as long as the federal government retains power to play the part of a "Peeping Tom," and breed the contempt which goes with such part.

The task we face is not only to stop the futile spying, snooping, and prosecuting, but to restore the dignity which formerly attached to federal activities.

The last twelve years have accomplished no purpose more distinctly than to put federal courts on a level with police tribunals, and to make average people think of them as clearing houses for petty crime.

### Someone Must Be Hurt

W<sup>H</sup>Y pussyfoot for the sake of party harmony under such circumstances? Why not come out like men, admit the blunder and do what we can to correct it? This is no time to straddle, or play safe, as politicians will find out before they get through.

The very storm that has arisen at Chicago, in spite of all the Hoover administration could do, should leave no doubt on that score. Of course, a repeal plan would offend the wets, but does anybody imagine that we are going to get out of this mess without offend some?

By and large, honest, straightforward offense represents less risk than universal disgust, which is the invariable consequence of side-stepping.

"What does a man get for all the money he wastes on tobacco?" a reformer asks. A good bawling out if he drops ashes on the rug.

Contract bridge is a game for morons, a learned doctor tells us. That's all wrong. He should ask some of the wives who play with their husbands.

Poetry, says a writer, is an overflow of powerful emotions. It's really a shame that more golfers don't try it.

A Texas boxer always listens to a saxophone record just before entering the ring. And then imagines that his opponent is the man who made it, we presume.

"What does a man get for all the money he wastes on tobacco?" a reformer asks. A good bawling out if he drops ashes on the rug.

In the book of pictures showing the horrors of war, the most grawsome one was left out. Meaning, of course, a shot of a plate of army beans.

An English judge says \$50 is a ridiculous price to pay for a woman's coat. Maybe that's why many women wouldn't think of paying less than \$75.

Now they're saying that Al Capone's famous scar will be gone when he leaves Atlanta. Which proves again that "time" is the great healer.

The telephone company warns that banging the receiver down may cause trouble. Especially when the man who does it is talking to his wife.

From all the trouble congress had with the economy, it would seem that Uncle Sam is having trouble with his waste-line.

Hoover denounced the Garner relief program as a "pork" measure. But pork would taste mighty good to a lot of people now.

## Just Every Day Sense

BY MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

SINCE the recent conference, a Methodist clergyman may solemnize the marriage of the innocent person in a divorce action.

This brings up the question: How is the innocence or the guilt of such person to be determined? According to church codes, the only cause for divorce is adultery, or, to use the legal phraseology, which, as usual, may mean any or everything, "other vicious conditions which, through mental or physical cruelty or physical peril, may invalidate the marriage."

Now, if the good men are going to depend for their facts on divorce records, no gentleman can get married under a Methodist roof and most ladies can. For it generally is understood that chivalry has risen to such heights in the land, and common honesty fallen to such low ebb that when love flees the home the man always is expected to furnish the cause for divorce action. Thus few women ever are anything but innocent.

WE never have faced the divorce question honestly. It seems to me that the Protestant churches, sooner or later, must decide upon one of two direct courses: They must marry no divorced person or all divorced persons. To temporize longer is to contribute to the general disgrace.

There is no sensible reason why any two people who wish to live apart should be expected to hatch up some false evidence that will humiliate either of them. That any man or woman should be compelled to have a reputation dragged through the newspapers or before the courts to escape an unhappy marriage is a hideous farce. Sentimentality no longer can hide the ugly facts.

We all know that any couple that wants a divorce can get it, either by lying about themselves or each other, or stooping to other tricks advocated by the bar, all of which are beneath the dignity of decent men and women.

Since this is so, and since we all know it is, why continue the great burlesque?

The Indianapolis Times, on the issue of 1864:

"As slavery was the cause, and now constitutes the strength of this rebellion, and as it must be, always and everywhere, hostile to the principles of the republican government, justice and national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the republic."

The Indianapolis Times, on the issue of 1932:

"We do not favor a submission limited to the issue of retention or repeal."

The Indianapolis Times, on the issue of 1932:

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

## The Windy City



DAILY HEALTH SERVICE

## Protect Sight of Your Children

BY DR. MORRIS FISHBEIN  
Editor, Journal of the American Medical Association

Chicago, Illinois

July 4, 1932

Protect Sight of Your Children

rows and stones are responsible for almost one-third of all these cases of blindness in children.

Firecrackers, torpedoes, bombs, and various types of fireworks are responsible for almost one-fourth of the cases, and other explosives for about one-fourth.

Then knives and scissors, sticks and nails account for another 10 per cent, as do chips of steel, wood, glass, dust and sand.

Only 5 per cent of all the cases are due to accidents occurring in sports, and only 3 per cent to automobile accidents or falls.

Assuming a certain number of accidents necessary under modern conditions of life, for example automobile accidents and falls, and those due to games in sports, it should be realized that the vast majority of the accidents to the eye are preventable, because they concern types of play not necessary for children, and because they concern

rows and stones are responsible for almost one-third of all these cases of blindness in children.

The boys and girls of this country are exposed to more hazards to their eyes in the week around July 4 than they are during three months at any other time of the year.

Many municipalities have endeavored to control fireworks by local legislation.

At one time it seemed likely that danger from Fourth of July accidents would be brought fully under control, but of late there has been an increase in this type of accident.

It is likely that there will be some national legislation to regulate this hazard.

Parents, teachers and every one interested in the welfare of the child should become active in this matter, not only for the prevention of these serious cases of blindness but also for the prevention of many other types of injury, including burns and lockjaw, that develop from such accidents.

Exposure of children to avoidable dangers.

The boys and girls of this country are exposed to more hazards to their eyes in the week around July 4 than they are during three months at any other time of the year.

Many municipalities have endeavored to control fireworks by local legislation.

At one time it seemed likely that danger from Fourth of July accidents would be brought fully under control, but of late there has been an increase in this type of accident.

It is likely that there will be some national legislation to regulate this hazard.

Parents, teachers and every one interested in the welfare of the child should become active in this matter, not only for the prevention of these serious cases of blindness but also for the prevention of many other types of injury, including burns and lockjaw, that develop from such accidents.

Exposure of children to avoidable dangers.

The boys and girls of this country are exposed to more hazards to their eyes in the week around July 4 than they are during three months at any other time of the year.

Many municipalities have endeavored to control fireworks by local legislation.

At one time it seemed likely that danger from Fourth of July accidents would be brought fully under control, but of late there has been an increase in this type of accident.