

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)
ROY W. HOWARD President
TALCOTT POWELL Editor
EARL D. BAKER Business Manager
Phone—Riley 5531



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

Owned and published daily
(except Sunday) by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214-220 West Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Ind. Price in Marion county, 2 cents; elsewhere, 3 cents; postage—delivered by carrier, 12 cents a week. Mail subscription rates in Indiana, \$3 a year; outside of Indiana, \$5 cents a month.

MONDAY, SEPT. 18, 1933.

POSTAL SAVINGS

THEIR is much to be said for bankers' opposition to the provision in the new law guaranteeing deposits. It is true that such panaceas have not worked when attempted by the states. It is also true that this part of the new law was a hasty and rather ill-begotten compromise not particularly pleasing to anyone, least of all apparently to the administration.

Probably the next congress will improve the law before its permanent guarantee provisions become effective.

But the bankers in their opposition would be on firmer ground, and carry more conviction with the public victimized by bank failures, if they were not trying to destroy the postal savings system.

The postal savings system is the best form of government insurance we have. It should be extended. It would have been extended by the last congress—Senator Dill believed that he had administration support for his bill—but the private system is tried.

Meanwhile, no more disturbing statement has come out of official Washington than O'Connor's declaration that "Congress would be justified in repealing the postal savings act."

If this is the administration's policy, it is going backward, not forward. If it is not administration policy—and it probably is not—Controller O'Connor should not be allowed to deal in that propaganda.

The controller of the currency, of all persons at this time, is too busy, or should be too busy, with his legitimate duties to start wrecking government institutions.

They expect marriage to be one long idyll. It isn't; it never has been and it never will be; but when they find that out, they cry to heaven that they have been used shamefully, instead of gritting their teeth and pitching in to make a success of it anyway.

CRY OF THE SCHOOLS

STORIES told by some forty state school superintendents in Washington on Saturday leave no doubt as to the extent of the blight attacking free education in America.

Dr. Charles A. Lee of Missouri, new head of the National Council of State Superintendents and Commissioners of Education, says that the schools are opening with 80,000 fewer teachers at their desks; many of the million teachers who have jobs have taken cuts as high as 60 per cent; half of them receive less than \$400 a year; more than \$40,000,000 is owed them in salary warrants; some teachers in the south get \$35 a month, or less than the minimum set by NRA for day labor; whole southern counties plan to run their schools this winter three, four and five months; midwest towns charge tuition for high schools.

Last year 250,000 children attended school only part time. In February 1,800 schools closed their doors against 106,000 pupils. Kindergartens were eliminated or curtailed in 170 cities.

She is the biggest buyer; she knows when prices are rising. She will be advised by Consumers' Council of NRA and Triple A, when price increases are unreasonable.

Her complaints, if any, will get a hearing in Washington. Guarding herself, she helps guard her fellow consumers and the producers of the things she buys.

And in protecting her, the government is helping the farmers, the industrialists, and their workers, and fair competitors who are living up to the spirit of the blue eagle.

BLUE EAGLE PRICES

THE Agricultural Adjustment Administration is ready to go to "considerable lengths to prevent" price gouging. This declaration should hearten consumers, who are asked from all sides to "Buy Now" as part of the recovery campaign.

If consumers know that the federal government is ready to exercise its great powers to stop profiteering, they naturally will be more ready to spend their dollars.

Profiteering is a two-edged sword. Prices that are unreasonably high drive away purchasers; less buying means lower industrial and farm prices. Enlightened selfishness dictates that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, whose task is to raise farm prices, sees that consumption is not decreased by profiteering.

This price question is a controlling one in the present effort to raise mass purchasing power.

NRA officials have appealed to manufacturers to hold off price increases as long as possible. Triple A officials say they will countenance only fair increases. In this situation it is the housewife, naturally, who holds the big stick.

She is the biggest buyer; she knows when prices are rising. She will be advised by Consumers' Council of NRA and Triple A, when price increases are unreasonable.

Her complaints, if any, will get a hearing in Washington. Guarding herself, she helps guard her fellow consumers and the producers of the things she buys.

And in protecting her, the government is helping the farmers, the industrialists, and their workers, and fair competitors who are living up to the spirit of the blue eagle.

CHINESE PRE-EMINENCE

A LITTLE cable dispatch from China the other day emphasizes, as few news items ever do, the incredible age of the civilization of that mysterious land.

It recorded the fact that a lady in Peiping can trace her ancestry directly back to old Confucius himself—and that she is his seventy-seventh lineal descendant.

Since Confucius was born in 551 B. C., the family is now a little bit less than 2,500 years old. In the face of a record like that—it isn't altogether uncommon, either, in China—the most pretentious of western genealogies must look utterly insignificant.

To a person who can trace his family tree that far back, an American's pride in a Mayflower ancestor must look rather odd. And even the proudest members of European nobility, who claim direct descent from crusaders and what-not, must be, in the eyes of a cultured Chinese, mere upstarts.

It recorded the fact that a lady in Peiping is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that year 522,049 arrests for drunkenness. Now take the same cities in 1932, during prohibition rule. There were 577,162 arrests made for drunkenness; in other words, a gain of 55,113 arrests.

I think we should consider the fact that approximately eight million, or two-thirds of our population, favor repeat, leaving one-third to be divided among prohibitionists and gangsters, those who never vote, those who would vote but have some logical reason for not doing so, and those who are not entitled to vote. Now divide this into the other forty million on an equal basis, and you have about ten million unpatriotic cranks and grafters trying to rule the other 110,000,000 people.

Let's hear from you.

By H. T. Van Ness.

It seems as though The Times is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that year 522,049 arrests for drunkenness. Now take the same cities in 1932, during prohibition rule. There were 577,162 arrests made for drunkenness; in other words, a gain of 55,113 arrests.

I think we should consider the fact that approximately eight million, or two-thirds of our population, favor repeat, leaving one-third to be divided among prohibitionists and gangsters, those who never vote, those who would vote but have some logical reason for not doing so, and those who are not entitled to vote. Now divide this into the other forty million on an equal basis, and you have about ten million unpatriotic cranks and grafters trying to rule the other 110,000,000 people.

Let's hear from you.

By H. T. Van Ness.

It seems as though The Times is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that year 522,049 arrests for drunkenness. Now take the same cities in 1932, during prohibition rule. There were 577,162 arrests made for drunkenness; in other words, a gain of 55,113 arrests.

I think we should consider the fact that approximately eight million, or two-thirds of our population, favor repeat, leaving one-third to be divided among prohibitionists and gangsters, those who never vote, those who would vote but have some logical reason for not doing so, and those who are not entitled to vote. Now divide this into the other forty million on an equal basis, and you have about ten million unpatriotic cranks and grafters trying to rule the other 110,000,000 people.

Let's hear from you.

By H. T. Van Ness.

It seems as though The Times is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that year 522,049 arrests for drunkenness. Now take the same cities in 1932, during prohibition rule. There were 577,162 arrests made for drunkenness; in other words, a gain of 55,113 arrests.

I think we should consider the fact that approximately eight million, or two-thirds of our population, favor repeat, leaving one-third to be divided among prohibitionists and gangsters, those who never vote, those who would vote but have some logical reason for not doing so, and those who are not entitled to vote. Now divide this into the other forty million on an equal basis, and you have about ten million unpatriotic cranks and grafters trying to rule the other 110,000,000 people.

Let's hear from you.

By H. T. Van Ness.

It seems as though The Times is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that year 522,049 arrests for drunkenness. Now take the same cities in 1932, during prohibition rule. There were 577,162 arrests made for drunkenness; in other words, a gain of 55,113 arrests.

I think we should consider the fact that approximately eight million, or two-thirds of our population, favor repeat, leaving one-third to be divided among prohibitionists and gangsters, those who never vote, those who would vote but have some logical reason for not doing so, and those who are not entitled to vote. Now divide this into the other forty million on an equal basis, and you have about ten million unpatriotic cranks and grafters trying to rule the other 110,000,000 people.

Let's hear from you.

By H. T. Van Ness.

It seems as though The Times is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that year 522,049 arrests for drunkenness. Now take the same cities in 1932, during prohibition rule. There were 577,162 arrests made for drunkenness; in other words, a gain of 55,113 arrests.

I think we should consider the fact that approximately eight million, or two-thirds of our population, favor repeat, leaving one-third to be divided among prohibitionists and gangsters, those who never vote, those who would vote but have some logical reason for not doing so, and those who are not entitled to vote. Now divide this into the other forty million on an equal basis, and you have about ten million unpatriotic cranks and grafters trying to rule the other 110,000,000 people.

Let's hear from you.

By H. T. Van Ness.

It seems as though The Times is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that year 522,049 arrests for drunkenness. Now take the same cities in 1932, during prohibition rule. There were 577,162 arrests made for drunkenness; in other words, a gain of 55,113 arrests.

I think we should consider the fact that approximately eight million, or two-thirds of our population, favor repeat, leaving one-third to be divided among prohibitionists and gangsters, those who never vote, those who would vote but have some logical reason for not doing so, and those who are not entitled to vote. Now divide this into the other forty million on an equal basis, and you have about ten million unpatriotic cranks and grafters trying to rule the other 110,000,000 people.

Let's hear from you.

By H. T. Van Ness.

It seems as though The Times is somewhat afraid to publish the general ideas and thoughts of the public, as I have not had any response to my letter of Aug. 28, sending you for publication a reply to the tirade of E. L. York against the beer industry.

I note in your issue of Sept. 13 that York now is trying to hide the Prohibition party behind a screen, because the repeal score today is 29 to 0. It could not be otherwise, because the people of the United States never before have had a chance to vote on the issue. It has been railroaded through by a minority group of selfish, single-track-minded political grafters.

He charges that drunkenness has increased. Can he prove it? He can not, but it can be proved that it has decreased since the advent of 3.2 beer. Take as an example at our recent state fair, where beer was sold for the first time in sixteen years. There were only two arrests made for drunkenness, while the past sixteen years, while no beer was sold, averaged ten a day.

Take also the old records like the check-up made in 1914, when the country was wet under a legal arrangement. In a list of 320 towns in the United States there were made in that