

# L. S. Ayres & Co.

*You'll Have a Head Start on Spring!*

Gay little felts to bring you spring ahead of time . . . in candy-sweet pastels as well as basic dark colors . . . the side swept pillbox, 2.95, the veiled bumper, 3.95

Hat Box, Street Floor



## Briefs and Bra by Extacee . . .

Lingerie for the Youthful Silhouette

You'll love these dainty underthings, designed especially for the junior figure! They're so carefully made they'll wash and wear wonderfully! Gardenia white, sizes 9 to 15.

Briefs of tricot knit rayon, 1.25

Knit nylon bra, 2.00

Tip Toe Lingerie, Second Floor

REMEMBER

**CLOSED MONDAYS**  
SHOP TUESDAY THRU SATURDAY  
9.00 to 5.25



How Flattering They Are!

## Our Barbara Lee No Seams

1.25

Smooth, sheer nylons without a hint of a seam to mar their flawless beauty! 20 denier, 400 needle fine nylon in the season's favorite shade—Taupe.

Sizes 8 1/2-10 1/2

Hosiery, Street Floor



There's a Light Look of Spring

## In our New Pastel Gabardines

14.95

Soft, rayon gabardine in Spring's most exciting colors . . . designed by two of your favorites—McKethrick and Winfield. Sketched are two from a selection in one and two-piece styles. Pink, aqua, ocean sand, grey and white included. Sizes 10 to 18.

Budget Shop, Third Floor



## Feeney Pushes Fight to Ban Rent Increase

### Will Make App National Office

Mayor Al Feeney announced today he will carry his fight against the 25 per cent increase recommended by the Indianapolis Rent Advisory Board to the national level.

The Mayor is preparing a letter which he will send to the Housing Expeditor asking for full consideration to the city's side in the Indianapolis controversy.

After attending the meeting of the rent board yesterday, the chairman, Mayor Feeney said, "The board was unable to give any evidence which would justify a 25 per cent increase in the city."

Despite his intervention, the board was prepared to recommend its recommendation of the 25 per cent "board" increase over the rate of June 30, 1947.

The recommendation that rent control be extended to Dec. 31, 1948, because "the rental housing will not be able to meet reasonable needs" in this rental controls expire Feb. 29.

A second vote on the recommendation was taken by the board yesterday afternoon after Feeney left the meeting. The vote was announced as 5 to 2 in favor of the recommendation.

One of the nine members of the board who were absent and one who was present but did not vote, James Robb, said, "I cannot in any way justify the majority's recommendation."

He contended that "it should be noted that four of the five majority vote are either indirectly representing large real estate interests in the city."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

Mr. Robb also charged that the income tax return which would show a ten per cent increase.

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."

He contended that "it was submitted in support of the increase that is not groundless for an increase in the area."