

## The Indianapolis Times

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



Give Light and the  
 People Will Find  
 Their Own Way

FRIDAY, DEC. 1, 1933.

## A LIQUOR TARIFF

SINCE the tariff conflict between nations has come down to a point of bargaining, it probably is fair enough to the administration to use a liquor tariff for trading purposes. That is the plan.

Many foreign nations have been counting upon a large export of liquor to the United States following repeal. Presumably they will be more willing to level down their general trade barriers against us, if that is the price necessary for them to share in the American liquor trade.

That the administration for the first time is beginning to understand the value of foreign trade to this country, and therefore is troubled by the international tariff war, is clear from recent statements by Agriculture Secretary Henry Wallace and Commerce Secretary Dan Roper. For several months the President and his aids seemed to be operating on the fallacy that this nation is entirely self-contained and independent of foreign trade. Today there is a new emphasis in Washington.

The goal should be reciprocal lowering of tariffs all around. As the United States, during the Republican administrations, was responsible largely for starting this costly war of trade barriers, doubtless the United States will have to be the prime mover in the opposite direction if anything is to be accomplished.

In any event in view of the damage already done to this country by the high protectionist policy, it would be grotesque to use the tariff to protect an infant liquor industry. Here is one line of foreign trade that might be developed with a minimum of consideration for domestic manufacture. We refer especially to hard liquor, rather than to light wines.

The liquor tariff should be temporary and for trading purposes only.

## A START, ANYWAY

EIGHT years ago, in 1925, the country was called prosperous. Five years ago, in 1928, the great "Republican boom" was at its height.

In 1925 and in 1928 farmers everywhere were in bad straits. They were given credit aplenty, public and private credit; but whatever the conditions in the cities, farm prosperity was but a goal yet unattained.

We know now how falsely prosperous those years were; how the bubbles of paper profits burst with a noise that still is rumbling around the land. Some city dwellers may have had warm silk shirts and had chickens in every pot, but the farm folk, relatively speaking, had neither a shirt nor a pot.

There followed the long and terrible depression. And then came the new deal. Under it, the effort to bring about recovery is based on making agriculture a paying business.

Already the results of this effort are being felt. County agents of the United States extension service, reporting to headquarters in Washington on what farmers are doing with the benefit payments made to them under the agricultural adjustment act, tell pleasant stories.

"Debits," says one report from Texas, "of five to eight years' standing are being paid, to the great amazement of bankers. Farmers have more cash in their hands than at any time for several years. County banks and small town merchants report that overdue notes and accounts are being paid and that trade in all lines shows a big improvement."

In 1925, in 1928, in 1929, no such picture as this was painted.

Apparently the new deal's farm experiment is beginning to produce recovery in some regions.

As farm purchasing power goes up, so will city purchasing power. In the increase in purchasing power is the essence of recovery.

## THEY COULD BE RIGHT

IN the news columns of today dry leaders express their attitude toward the slogan, "Make it smart to be legal." Needless to say, these views are not our views.

However, the statements of these drys should be of utmost interest to those who believe with us that respect for laws and national well-being can come only with repeal of summary legislation and establishment of new laws based on a sane foundation of public consent.

The drys believe that the American people will not buy liquor from legal dealers even when they have a chance; that repeal simply will mean greater expansion of bootlegging and its attendant evils. They count on this to bring about return to the prohibition era just ended.

Prohibition may return if they are right. The danger is real. It depends on our behavior in the near future whether the hard-won battle for repeal will stay won.

After repeal every purchase from a bootlegger will help prove the drys are right. Purchase from legal dealers, in obedience to whatever restrictions are laid down, will further the cause of American liberty.

## THE BEST SOLUTION

THE heated discussion that has arisen over the administration's gold policy is a most encouraging sign to all lovers of freedom of speech and of the press. Whatever one's opinions in the matter, it can be denied that the opposition is getting its full share of the debate.

But even more satisfying than this is the feeling that such open discussion of the country's most conflicting problem is certain

to bring about a saner and more effective solution than would consideration of the difficulty from one side alone.

Both the sound money advocates and the so-called inflationists have strong reasons to stand their ground. Each has rallied to its side the arguments of professors of economics and other experts to prove it is right.

And each has no ulterior motive back of its assertions other than the belief that its way out of the depression is the best.

Difference between the sound money men and the inflationists lies in the difference between a strict adherence to the economic phase of the gold problem and a consideration of its political significance as well.

For there is no doubt that politics, in the broader, humanitarian sense, has much to do with this matter.

While Wall Street looks upon the subject from a cold, matter-of-fact, dollars and cents viewpoint, President Roosevelt is forced to consider it not only in that light, but from the angle of the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker.

This is the politics of the whole matter. And this complicates the problem much more for the President than it does for the eastern financiers and economists.

Perhaps, if the sound money men had not risen up in their night and raised the howl they have, the administration might have overlooked the more conservative phase of this discussion.

Perhaps, if Al Smith and Bernard Baruch and other sincere antagonists of the President's policy had approved blindly of his every move, we might have found ourselves sailing fast toward actual inflation and its accompanying dangers.

So it is much better, then, that a voice has been raised against the government's gold policy, if only to keep those in control from running amuck.

## ANOTHER LOW GRAFT

NO matter how worthy the cause, or how high its aims, always there is some one who would turn it to his benefit for ill-gotten gains.

The public works administration is dispensing millions of dollars to finance projects in all parts of the nation, giving employment to thousands. One naturally would think that all classes of citizens would unite back of such endeavor, unselfishly and wholeheartedly.

But no! Back of the scenes, even here, the slimy head of the racketeer is upraised. "The easiest money in Washington is being collected today by lawyers, agents, lobbyists and politicians, supposed to have influence with the public works administration," says Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes, who administers this fund. "They collect large sums as retainers and fees, on the claim that they can get favorable consideration for municipal and state projects."

"Such influence does not exist. Gullible applicants merely are swindled out of their money." And, Mr. Ickes adds, persons employing such "fixers" are likely to cast suspicion on their projects, which otherwise might win favorable consideration.

## THE BOYS FIRST

AN intense local rivalry exists between the football partisans of the University of Michigan and Ohio State. And even though Ohio State went through its 1933 schedule with only one defeat, certain factions among the alumni deem the year a failure because that defeat was administered by Michigan.

A storm of criticism roared about the ears of Coach Sam Willaman of Ohio State. It was shouted that his coaching methods had been inefficient.

Coach Willaman replied: "They boy comes first, the school second, the public third. When I took the coaching job, I promised only that my methods would be beyond reproach, that I would throw my whole heart and soul into it, because my efforts would be for my own university, and that the team would win its share of games."

Willaman's record at Ohio State is splendid. In the last two years his teams have lost only two games. But it is just too bad that both of those games were won by Michigan.

## "UNEMPLOYED DEMOCRATS"

RECENTLY there was brought to the attention of the federal civil works administration the charge that a Youngstown politician had attempted to use civil works jobs to help out "unemployed Democrats." He was quoted as having instructed such jobless Democrats to register first with the city employment bureau and then take cards to the clerk of the board of elections. The politician further was charged with saying he spoke to the mayor and "he promised me he will put as many men to work as possible."

The speed with which Federal Relief Administrator Hopkins met this situation was none too fast. He notified the Ohio state CWA chief that if such conditions held Youngstown would be denied all CWA funds. "The civil works administration will not tolerate political interference," Mr. Hopkins wired.

Cities, counties and states elsewhere should take warning. Some waste, doubtless, is inevitable when the government starts pouring \$400,000,000 into localities, many of which are unprepared to use it efficiently. But politics, favoritism or graft is unthinkable. The money, every cent of it, belongs to the needy without regard to their politics, color or other status.

Any office holder who tries to favor one group of unemployed as against another should be made forthwith to join the ranks of the jobless himself.

German scientist found a live flea 5,000,000 years old—making it eligible to feed on pure Aryan stock.

Latest Paris edict is to "wear something in the hair." That must be the evening dress made for nudists.

Remains of an animal of the plaiasiadapi-dae family were discovered in the South Dakota badlands. Must have choked to death when it tried to give its name to the police.

"There is always the feeling that something good is around the corner," says Mrs. Roosevelt. Prosperity has been so overworked.

Al Smith calls it the "baloney dollar," and he's opposed to slicing it any further.

## A HORROR PASSES

THE world moves!

Only yesterday the word "bolshhevik" was a scare word to frighten babes and bankers. And on Friday night at the Waldorf-Astoria, in the grand ballroom of one of the swankiest hotels of this nation, the babes were not present, but the bankers were, and their kith and kin of American business, not terrified at all, but happy. A great concourse of them.

And whom did these toast? A bolshhevik, a mighty one, present in the flesh, the honor guest. Beside the Stars and Stripes, an expanse of crimson banner stretched, and on that banner was a hammer and sickle, symbol of that once most fearful economic religion—Communism—the faith of a nation covering, as Colonel Hugh L. Cooper declared, a sixth of the land surface of the earth.

And that martial air the orchestra played, the Internationale, the Internationale of the paraders and shouters and sometimes rioters of Union Square. The powerful of American capitalism rose and, paid respectful thought to the trade, not to speak of the increase in international stability and friendship likely to flow to them through this diplomatic union of the two banners hanging above the dais where Litvinoff, commissar of foreign affairs for all the Russias, genially sat.

A strange and confounding and altogether encouraging scene was this. The "red" nation, a horror when it was weak, had ceased to be fearful in its success and power.

And if the appeal of trade was the circumstance which dispelled fear in revealing certain better aspects of a traditionally communal nation waging mighty warfare against nature, certainly few present at the seemingly fantastic event were unimpressed by that passage in Commissar Litvinoff's address in which he said, in effect:

The population of Russia has grown 35,000,000 in ten years due to cultural growth and a health program which have cut the child mortality of 270 a thousand in half and increased literacy from 30 per cent before the revolution to 90 per cent now, more than trebling the number of children in school meanwhile.

Clearly it is no man's business what faith, religious, economic or political, his neighbor holds, so long as he does not seek to force it upon others and tends to his business and pays his debts.

The great banquet of 1,700 in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria hotel on Friday night was testimony to a new stabilization, a new security, a new influence toward peace.

A new Jewish state has been started in Siberia. It's called Bureya—which warns you in advance of the weather you can expect there.

A convict in Folsom prison, California, has developed a new hydrogen process, one-forty-fifth as costly as our present process. He will remain in jail.

Minnesota schools will have courses on temperance. Thus teaching the children to drink before they know what it's all about.

German professor says there are six distinct races in Europe, and not one of them is pure. He's in America, of course.

Why the "knees" on automobiles? Haven't they been crawling downtown long enough? What the autos do need is a pair of shoulders, to shove their way through jams.

Chicago university is going to conduct a research on sex. But whatever the proff discover, the girls will continue fooling the boys just the same.

## M.E. Tracy Says:

POOR old Rugged Individualism, what a razzing it has received! We want no more of it, they say, with its waste of competition, its futile clash of ideas and its ruthless winnowing of the unfit. What we want is a good man at the helm and another good man in the galley to dish out a balanced diet, conserving our initiative and imagination for the sportful, happy hours when we are off duty. We want to co-operate under skillful planning which will not only show us what to do, but how much.

Well, maybe they're right, but I'm a skeptic. I don't believe that we have suffered from an overdose of rugged individualism or that this howl for supervised industry and supervised play originates in the fact that average people have become too smart, independent and ambitious for their own good.

A few dominating personalities have lorded it at the top, to be sure, but what about the pliability and indifference at the bottom?

We Americans are not half so individualistic as one would guess from all the chatter, and have not been for fifty years. We have been joining companies, clubs, associations and movements of every description, submerging ourselves in order to strengthen the gang. We had gone haywire over collectivism long before NRA was ever heard of, had invoked all kinds of organization to get rich quick, boost prices and ballyhoo an artificial culture.

WALTER B. PITKIN says that about half our people have learned through depression how many things they can do without; that they have lost their ambition and their nerve. The physical side of this phenomenon may have been brought out when the boom collapsed, but its moral side began to appear long before.

Two generations ago, we began to teach children to believe in the herd idea, not only by precept, but by example. First, we taught them to think of the big school as the best school or the big church as the best church; of the big business as the best business and of the big city as the best city.

We carefully and assiduously have developed a quantitative viewpoint, have worshipped the tallest building, the largest concern and highest profit; have counted noses to prove the nation's growth, and the number of shares sold on Wall Street to prove its progress.

WE have taught our children to look for jobs with some gigantic enterprise — to fit themselves for cogs in the mechanism rather than self-reliant citizens. We have told them not to think of starting in business because the day when that could be done successfully had passed.

Realizing that buying power forms the basis of prosperity, we have preached down the doctrine of creative power. Little people must stand at the counter and do their shopping alone, we have said, but when it comes to contributing ideas they don't count.

I am heretic enough to believe that mass thinking, which means individual thinking all down the line, bears the same relation to social progress that mass buying bears to economic progress, and that mental consumption is just as important as physical consumption.

Also, I believe that the only way to get an overdose of rugged individualism at the top is through lack of it at the bottom.

## Not Exactly Bright!



## : : The Message Center : :

I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it.—Voltaire

## Well, Hoosiers?

(Times readers are invited to express their views in these columns. Make your letters short, so all can have a chance. Limit them to 250 words or less.)

By Independent Grocer.

This is in reply to the letter of "Taxpayer and Welfare Worker" which appeared Nov. 22. Mr. Taxpayer, if you'd stop long enough you'd have realized that the different items on the so-called "list" consists mostly of staple foods, that the list was made purposely for the people who can not select reasonably. There are hundreds who do not, if they did not that still doesn't help their stomachs or those of their children who are perfectly innocent of their parents' buying. Accents. Did you overlook the three or four cents difference, would I have to script and they could go anywhere and choose. Wouldn't it be just lovely for the majority of them to go to chain stores, one chain store particularly where they send their money across the water?

Haven't you seen enough to see that's partly what's wrong with our country today? As for farina being a "fixed" cereal, what's wrong with dried peaches, prunes, oats and pancake flour for breakfast? If a department store had a silk dress, a wool or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw fit to advertise the wool and cotton? You said Mr. Book had soap on the "list" for 5 cents a bar, that you noticed one store had three for 10 cents or cotton for \$1.99 or a few cents difference, would I have to wool or cotton one if I preferred the silk just because they saw