

THE BARRINGTON REVIEW

LESLIE W. MCCLURE, Editor and Publisher
WALTER R. WINTERINGHAM, Business Director and Foreman

NATIONAL
EDITORIAL
ASSOCIATION



ILLINOIS
PRESS
ASSOCIATION

All communications should be addressed to the BARRINGTON REVIEW, Barrington, Illinois. Cards of thanks, resolutions of condolence, poetry, memorials, and notices of entertainments or society and church sales and parties for pecuniary benefit will be charged for.

TELEPHONE, BARRINGTON NO. 1

SAFETY FOLLOWS "CLEAN-UP WEEK"

Spring clean-up week, which is an annual observance in Barrington will be May 1 to 7. The week was started primarily as a beautifying movement—old shacks were torn down, vacant lots cleaned of debris, homes painted, grass-grown fields cut and the harvest burned. It is amazing how little is needed in many cases to change a squalid street to one that is pleasant and charming to the eye.

Something other than a better looking town results from a clean-up week that is loyally and enthusiastically supported by all citizens. For a sound, thorough clean-up process is one of the best possible ways of getting rid of fire hazards. A town which rids itself of old, unused shacks, and which does away with litter and grass-ridden lots, becomes a safer place in which to live and work.

Clean-up week should not stop at exteriors. As the national board of fire underwriters points out, everyone should go through his home inside as well as out in search of fire dangers. A congested attic or basement, filled with ancient magazines and broken furniture and clothes that will never be used again, is the perfect starting place for a blaze. Frayed or amateurishly repaired light cords, improperly stored inflammable liquids, dirty or worn heating units—from such things as these come fires that destroy hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property and thousands of lives.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

To quote a leading business magazine, the threat of a world war "will affect almost everything that is done in Washington from now on: naval construction, merchant marine, army expansion, taxes, Secretary Hull's reciprocal trade program, perhaps even government reorganization." War—past, present and future—is an ominous and exceedingly active element in American affairs today.

Most obvious example of our preoccupation with the prospect of war is the naval building program, the largest in our peace-time history. Its proponents—and there are many—argue that our best guarantee of peace is a mailed fist second to none. On the other hand, there are men of distinction and authority who argue with force that this program is leading us straight into war. Reason: navy specifications today call for fighting ships of tremendous cruising ranges, and for supply vessels able to make runs of thousands of miles, provide the fleet with oil, food, munitions, and return to bases on the continental United States. How, say the opponents of the building program, can ships of this type be justified as essential tools of the national defense? Why do we not build, instead, small fast ships with a relatively short cruising range, sufficient in number and power to defend our coasts—but not to fight in foreign waters? Is it possible, they conclude, that the unspoken purpose behind the current program is the creation of a U. S. fleet primarily designed for and capable of fighting in the China seas or the Mediterranean?

Apparently the day is over when representatives of great governments could sit down, argue differences, arrive at agreements and go home, with all concerned knowing that the agreements would be kept, at least until some crisis arrived which made one of the participants feel that it was necessary to sacrifice principle to expediency. The U. S. state department at the present time doesn't say it in so many words—but it obviously feels that the words, treaties and promises of the belligerent powers—Germany, Japan and Italy—cannot be trusted. There are two concrete examples of this which are not widely known. A few months ago the Japanese government intimated that it was again ready to discuss a treaty for the limitation of capital fighting ships—and the U. S. government offered no encouragement. And for two years, Hitler has periodically proposed an agreement among the great powers to ameliorate some of the evils of war, such as the unrestricted use of submarines and the ruthless bombing of civilian centers—and again this government has turned a deaf ear to the suggestion.

It is, of course, almost unthinkable to blame the U. S. government for this attitude. The dictators who agreed to non-intervention in the Spanish revolution have all but made a Franco victory certain by sending him apparently unlimited quantities of men, planes, cannons, and other essentials of war—and Japan, which now, burdened under a staggering debt, might wish to slow down the world naval building race, was the first to violate the previous naval building treaty. The state department's attitude is simply an indication of the difficulties of carrying on diplomacy in a world where the old values have been so largely destroyed.

One by-product of this is Secretary Hull's policy of caution. Officially, we have not yet recognized Italy's conquest of Abyssinia, nor Germany's sudden seizure of Austria. We have made protests against these acts—but mostly in veiled and indirect terms. Our fear of foreign entanglements has made it impossible for us to take the lead or even a prominent part in seeking to curb the ravages and injustices of the dictators. Yet no one thinks that the feeling of this country is a neutral one—American sentiment against the dictators is almost 100 per cent strong. Judging by what evidence there is, the majority of Americans were disappointed at the failure of Eden and the adoption by England of the Chamberlain "peace at any price" foreign policy. It is not a remote possibility that this partisan sentiment will in the future be reflected in the government's attitude, and result in a more aggressive and pointed U. S. policy toward the totalitarian states.

This WEEK in WASHINGTON

By
RALPH E. CHURCH
Representative, 10th Congressional District

The president's letter to an anonymous friend disclaiming any desire to be "dictator" in the United States is one of the most extraordinary pronouncements ever made by a president of the United States. There is hardly any doubt that it was a political maneuver calculated to assist the administration leaders in congress in driving the reorganization bill through to enactment. It is designed to answer the bitter opposition to this particular bill.

Let it be assumed that the president was absolutely sincere when he set forth his reasons for not having dictator aims. He gave three reasons: (1) "I have no inclination to be dictator." (2) "I have none of the qualifications which would make me a successful dictator." and (3) "I have too much historical background and too much knowledge of existing dictatorships."

But that is not the point! It is not a question of the inclinations and qualifications of the occupant of the White House. It is not a question as to whether or not we trust President Roosevelt. The point is that the reorganization bill destroys the nice balance of powers in the American system of government. It is a system of government and not the qualifications of those who operate it which is at issue. And, if this democracy is to survive, we must preserve the system from inroads upon it, however well meaning each step may be.

All are agreed that there is a great need for reorganization of the government. Bureaus and agencies have sprung up like mushrooms all over the United States. There is endless red-tape and much duplication of work. Our government should be reorganized.

All are agreed that the president should have a hand in the reorganization process. His knowledge of the workings of the machinery of government is essential in any decision as to what bureaus or agencies may be rearranged or disposed of. His recommendations would be invaluable.

But why—just why—can we not set ourselves to this task in accordance with the principles of this government? Why cannot we accomplish an efficient reorganization by close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches? Why cannot congress retain itself some of its constitutional power as a check on the executive?

Let us assume that the president will not exercise arbitrary power if it is delegated to him as provided for in the reorganization bill. Let us assume that we trust him and that he will exercise all the powers given him as wisely as any man could. Even so, is there any legitimate reason why congress should not at least have the power, which perhaps it may never need use, to check some arbitrary or unwise action by the president?

It is understandable why there should be thousands of American citizens who are inclined to wonder about the motives of the president when he does not wish congress to have any true check on his actions. It is difficult to understand why the president insists upon ignoring the democratic processes of government. The people are alarmed at his actions and those words of assurance embodied in a letter to an anonymous friend.

In his letter he endeavored to convey the thought that he would not veto any bill which congress may pass rejecting some executive order he may issue under the terms of the reorganization bill. The impression sought to be conveyed by the vague language is that he would heed the wishes of congress. If then the president believes that the wishes of congress should be followed, why should he so strenuously object to having a provision written into the bill to the effect that none of his executive orders become effective until congress approves them?

The battle which is being waged in congress over the reorganization bill is over a principle of government. If there are not those who will fight for the principles of this democracy, whatever the cost, then we are certain to follow the course which has meant the downfall of other democracies in the world.

Odd Provisions of Wills

Odd provisions of wills came to light in Belfast through the moving of a second reading of a private member's measure to compel testators to make proper provision for dependents when making their wills. The following odd examples were quoted: A wealthy testator, who did not get on well with his wife and children, left all he had "for the care of cats." Another testator left seven pence for a halter for his widow, in the hope that she would use it without delay. Another left his widow a farthing, and directed that the money be sent to her in an unstamped envelope. Another testator left his widow his trousers, saying that she had worn them during his life and might wear them after his death. Another testator imposed conditions in the event of the legatees entering parliament.

Fate of John Wilkes Booth

John Wilkes Booth after he shot Abraham Lincoln was shot and mortally wounded by Sergeant Boston Corbett, of the Sixteenth New York cavalry, at 3:15 a. m., Wednesday, April 26, 1865, when he tried to escape from a burning barn on a farm of a family named Garratt, near Bowling Green and Fort Royal, Va., where he had hidden after his escape from Ford's theater. Booth's body was secretly buried in a grave under the stone floor of a cell in the arsenal side of Washington penitentiary. After four years the body was disinterred and reburied in the Booth family plot in Greenmount cemetery, Baltimore.

Specimen Ballot

School District No. 4, Cook and Lake Counties, Illinois, Annual Election, Saturday, April 9, 1938.

Polling Place: Public School Gymnasium, Barrington, Illinois. Polls open 2 p. m. to 8 p. m.

R. E. Church

Secretary.

For President of the Board of Education to Serve for Three Years (Vote for One)

☐ ALFRED D. CHURCH

☐

For Members of the Board of Education to Serve for Three Years (Vote for Two)

☐ C. E. BILLINGS

☐ A. C. LINES

☐ WILSON T. HERREN

☐ J. W. LANGDALE

☐

☐

Are You Hiding Money In Your Basement



There is cash in your attic or basement. Look over the furniture, pictures, rugs, clothing and other articles you no longer use . . . someone else might buy.



Barrington Review

Want Ads Can Help You Find Ready Buyers