

# The Mount Joy Bulletin

Jno. E. Schroll, Editor and Publisher

ESTABLISHED JUNE, 1901

Published Every Thursday at No. 9-11 East Main St., Mount Joy, Pa.

Subscription, per year .. \$2.00  
Six Months ..... \$1.00  
Three Months ..... .50  
Single Copies ..... .05  
Sample Copies ..... FREE

Entered at the Postoffice at Mt. Joy, Pa., as second-class mail matter under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Member, Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association

Publication Day, Thursday  
Copy for a change of advertising should reach this office Tuesday. We will not guarantee insertion of any advertising unless copy reaches the office not later than 9 a. m. preceding day of publication.

Classified ads will be accepted to 9 a. m. publication day.

## EDITORIAL

Many folks take the road of honesty because there is so much competition these days in being crooked.

They say we have no idea of the many uses to which alcohol may be put, but we doubt if there is any person who can't name at least one.

### WHAT A DIFFERENCE

How many of you know that only about half the circulars distributed (not sale bills) are read. That is actually true.

But with a newspaper its different. Dad reads it, mother reads it, the children read it and then the neighbors read it.

Can you realize how much better it pays to advertise in newspapers? A trial will readily convince the most skeptical individual.

### IT SOUNDS GOOD

Once upon a time there was a farmer who raised two chickens. Took them to the city, sold them to a factory worker and with the proceeds bought two shirts. So the farmer had two shirts and the city man had two chickens. Observing the transaction, the planner told the farmer he could get more money for his chickens, by making them scarcer. If he did not raise so many he would get more income for those he did raise. The planner also told the workman in the city that he must work fewer hours and get more money for his labor. This would raise the prices on the articles he made so he would have more money with which to buy. So the farmer brought one chicken to the city market. He got as much money for it as he had previously gotten for two chickens. He felt fine. This was the life. But when he went to buy some shirts, he found that the shirts had also doubled in price. So...he he got one shirt. Now the farmer has one shirt and the city man has one chicken whereas if they had not listened to the silvery-tongued pseudo-economist, they could each have had twice as much. And this, children, is now called "the more abundant life."

### FREIGHT TRAIN ON THE HIGHWAYS

One of the most important questions affecting the taxpayers of the nation is this: Are the huge modern commercial trucks paying their way--or are the vast sums needed to build and maintain highways suitable for this kind of traffic being paid by the rest of us?

Various authorities have spoken on the subject. And here is what some of them say.

The Chief Engineer of Highways, State of California, said: "Big trucks in this state are responsible for 53 per cent of the total cost of new highway construction."

The Highway and Traffic Problems Commission of Illinois said: "Private automobiles in this state are paying three times more tax per ton mile than the largest type truck."

The U. S. Commissioner of Public Roads said: "The chief destructive factor of highways is overloading (of heavy trucks)."

The Cincinnati Post said: "What every state is up against is an effort to put freight trains on the highways, with the taxpayers providing the right of way not the railroads, as happens when freight cars are kept on rails."

The American Automobile Assoc. said: "Billions of dollars worth of the nation's finest highways are being pounded to pieces by overloaded commercial vehicles."

It's no wonder that more and more highway officials--to say nothing of the people who pay the bills--are looking anxiously for the

## School News From

(From Page 1)

Stephens, Wilbur Brubaker, Donald Mowrer, Ruth Miller, Clara Anna Weaver, Sara Brubaker, Martha Roland, Pauline Miller, Richard Martin, Richard Humbert, Joyce Prescott, Jane Waller, Marian Ney, Jeanne Miller, Ohmer Gingrich, and Shirley Warfel. Winners of the Senior High-Bee were: 1st - Richard Martin; 2nd - Pauline Miller and 3rd - Martha Roland. Medals were presented to all winners. Mrs. Vera Gingrich pronounced for the first class; Miss Jane Wilson was judge and Mr. Robert Slaugh was scorer. Mr. Robert Phillips taught the senior high classes; Mr. Stanley Dotterer was judge and Mr. John Hart was the scorer.

A school savings program was reorganized in the East Donegal Junior High as a math project. Advisors are Mr. Alva Bender and Mr. Stanley Dotterer. Students use a part of a math period each week for depositing money, using regular banking forms. Each student keeps a duplicate of his own account.

Glenn Forney and Jeanne Miller attended the Open Forum of the Women's Republican Club Thursday afternoon, February 16th.

ways to solve the critical highway destruction problem.

### CROSSING THE BRIDGE

Moving this country's meat from the farms and ranches where it is raised to the centers where it is consumed is a man-sized job.

First of all, it requires a big and alert industry. There are something like 4,000 meat packers in the United States and 14,000 other commercial slaughterers of livestock. They are constantly competing among themselves for the available supply of meat animals, and they offer the producer a year-round cash market.

Second, there is a long bridge between the producer and the consumer. Most of the meat is now raised west of the Mississippi, while most of it is eaten in the east. The main task of the packers is to cross that bridge and to see that the meat is ready and waiting for the consumer when he goes to market.

Third, the demand cannot be properly met by just bringing certain quantities of meat to the markets. In some parts of the country, the heavy cuts of beef are in great demand. In other sections consumer preference runs, for example, to light lean cuts of pork. So it goes. In other words, the particular kind of meat which the consumer wants must be made available.

### YOU CAN'T EAT GRASS

You, a human being, cannot eat grass. But a cow or a sheep can, and they'll turn the grass into many things you can eat and wear. There you have the fundamental reason why the country should go on maintaining its herds of livestock at the highest possible level.

A very large part of our livestock population is raised on the grasses and grains which are fit only for consumption by these animals. If it weren't for the livestock industry, they would be entirely wasted. The meat animals wax fat and healthy on them--and thus the nation gets its beef and lamb, along with hundreds of other commodities, ranging a wide scale from fertilizer to such vital drugs as insulin, which are by products of the packing industry. These by products incidentally, actually help materially in holding down the price of meat to the consumer and increasing the value of the producer's livestock. Nothing is wasted--everything plays a part in meeting the cost of carrying on the business. And, the packers earn a profit of but a fraction of a cent per pound.

It is forecast that as our population grows the demand for meat will continue to increase and that the meat supply will increase with it. From the point of view of the farmer, meat animals constitute one of the very best crops. A year-round cash market is always open to him. The price naturally varies, but it is an honest reflection of the supply demand situation at the time he sells. Meat is, moreover, agriculture's principal source of cash income. Livestock can be raised and marketed on a small scale or a large. And meat in some form finally, is found in the daily diet of practically everyone.

Subscribe for the Bulletin.

# The Time The Anti-Trust Lawyers Killed Their Own Case!

For ten years the anti-trust lawyers have been attacking the business methods that make it possible to give the public the best quality food at the lowest prices.

In our last ad we told you how Federal Judge W. H. Atwell, at Dallas, threw the anti-trust lawyers and all their inflammatory charges against A&P right out of his court.

But the anti-trust lawyers were not satisfied with decisions against them by three federal judges.

They still wanted to destroy A&P.

## They Appealed to New Orleans

So they appealed Judge Atwell's decision to the three-judge Circuit Court at New Orleans.

One of the three, Judge Curtis L. Waller, agreed with Judge Atwell that the case should be dismissed.

The other two members of the Circuit Court, Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr., and Judge Allen Cox, although saying the case should be tried, agreed that the indictment was vague and contained many allegations which were inflammatory.

They decided that Judge Atwell at Dallas should protect A&P from these inflammatory allegations and could order the anti-trust lawyers to supply the defendants with a bill of particulars.

So the case was back in Dallas again.

Judge Atwell, carrying out the decision of the Circuit Court, struck out the inflammatory matter.

He said that without this inflammatory and prejudicial matter the Grand Jury might never have returned the indictment.

Judge Atwell said to the anti-trust lawyers:

*"There are many statements in the indictment which are not at all in violation, and are highly prejudicial and inflammatory."*

The anti-trust lawyers objected. They advanced an amazing argument. They said that the removal of their inflammatory allegations (which all four judges had agreed did not belong in the indictment), destroyed their case.

Judge Atwell instructed the anti-trust lawyers to furnish the court with a bill of particulars. In short, he wanted specific charges instead of vague generalities. He set the deadline for furnishing this material at January 15th, 1944.

When the anti-trust lawyers twice asked for more time, pleading sickness among their staff, Judge Atwell extended the time to February 25th because he believed that they were honestly trying, in good faith, to prepare the material he had requested.

Actually, it developed, they were using the time to get ready to drop the case in Dallas and start it in another court.

## They Quit in Dallas

On February 26th, while the judge was still waiting for his answer, and without any previous notice to him, the anti-trust lawyers gave a story to the newspapers in Washington, announcing that they were dropping the case in Dallas.

They said that it was their intention "to file a substantially similar suit in an appropriate jurisdiction at an early date."

The "early date" turned out to be the same day.

As soon as one anti-trust lawyer killed the case in Dallas, another anti-trust lawyer filed a new case in Danville, Illinois. This new case made most of the same allegations that had been made and dropped in Dallas; and that are being made against us today.

So now, according to the anti-trust lawyers, all four judges who had ruled on the Dallas case were wrong.

Despite defeats in three federal courts in widely separated parts of the country, they continued their campaign to destroy A&P.

When Judge Atwell heard of their action he ordered the anti-trust lawyers to prepare an order for his signature dismissing the Dallas case.

In signing this order he said to the anti-trust lawyers:

*"This nolle prosequi does not have the sanction or approval of this court. That is not necessary, nor that the government ask for the court's approval."*

*"It is, however, a matter that may be presented to the other court and may be of interest to the people at large."*

So after their efforts to destroy A&P had failed in Washington, D. C., Wilson, North Carolina, and Dallas, Texas, the anti-trust lawyers moved on to Danville, Illinois.

They were still determined to destroy this company which had brought more and better food at lower cost to millions of American families.

## They Were Wrong Three Times Before!

Three times the anti-trust lawyers went into federal courts and made serious and damaging charges against A&P.

Three times federal judges said the anti-trust lawyers were wrong and rendered decisions against them.

In previous ads in this series we told you about these other anti-trust "cases" involving us, which the judges said were not cases at all.

We think you should know about these previous cases, because once again the anti-trust lawyers are making damaging "allegations" that could seriously affect our business if they were believed by the public.

There was the time in Washington, D. C., when they said we and other good American citizens conspired to fix the price of bread in that city.

This was the time Federal Judge T. Alan Goldsborough ruled that A&P and the other defendants did not even need to put in a defense. He instructed the jury to bring in a verdict of "not guilty".

It was the time Judge Goldsborough said to the anti-trust lawyers:

*"If you were to show this record to any experienced trial lawyer in the world, he would tell you that there was not any evidence at all."*

*"Honestly, I have never in my over forty years' experience seen tried a case that was as absolutely devoid of evidence as this. That is the honest truth. I have never seen one like it."*

There was the time in Wilson, North Carolina, they said we and other good American citizens conspired to fix prices paid farmers for their potatoes.

This was the time Federal Judge C. C. Wyche directed the jury to bring in a verdict of "not guilty".

It was the time Judge Wyche said to the anti-trust lawyers:

*"In my opinion there is no testimony produced from which it can reasonably be inferred that the defendants entered into a combination to depress or lower the price of potatoes."*

*"I might say that I never tried a case in my life where a greater effort, more work, more investigation had been done, combing almost with a fine-tooth comb to gather evidence."*

*"But, as was said a long time ago, you can't make brick without straw, and you can't make a case without facts."*

There was the time in Dallas, Texas, when they made practically the same "allegations" they are making today.

This was the time Federal Judge W. H. Atwell ruled that the case should not even be tried. He said that the indictment contained inflammatory statements that he would not permit to be presented to a jury.

It was the time Judge Atwell said to the anti-trust lawyers:

*"I know of no American rule, and I wish I had the power to underscore the word 'American,' which permits us to try a man because of his size."*

*"If I thought I was presiding over a court and that I might have to sentence some person because he was a great big fellow, or because he was a Lilliputian, I would feel like resigning. God knows we don't want it ever to occur in America that the size is going to determine whether a man is guilty or innocent."*

THE GREAT ATLANTIC &



PACIFIC TEA COMPANY