

THE WEATHER

Tonight and Sunday, partly cloudy;
warmer on Sunday.

VOL. XXXII.

Published at Indianapolis, Ind., Daily Except Sunday.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 25, 1914, at Postoffice, Indianapolis, Ind., under act March 3, 1879.

INDIANAPOLIS, SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1920.

Subscription Rates: By Carrier, Week, Indianapolis, 10c; Elsewhere, 12c. By Mail, 50c Per Month; \$5.00 Per Year.

NO. 306.

J. GUY HAUGH DISAPPEARS WITH 2 SONS

Takes Them From Orphans' Home for Ride and Doesn't Return.

ECHOES DIVORCE TRIAL

J. Guy Haugh, former local haberdasher and hotel owner, has disappeared with his two sons, Roland, 7, and Guy, Jr., 3.

Taking them from the Indianapolis Orphans' home, 4107 East Washington street, where they were placed by court order, for an automobile ride, he apparently was in flight or concealment with them today.

Mrs. Marguerite Haugh, his divorced wife, is frantically searching for the children.

She appealed to authorities to institute a nation-wide search, even to watching steamship lines, fearing that her former husband will seek to keep the children by taking them out of the country.

This climax of a long series of domestic difficulties between Haugh and his divorced wife, who is a native of France, occurred yesterday, when Haugh drove to the orphans' asylum to visit his children.

TOLD MATRON TO DRESS THEM WELL

Asking the matron to dress them in their best clothes, he sped away with them in his car.

He had not returned this afternoon. At the Haugh home, where he has been living, it was said that he was out of the city and that his whereabouts were unknown.

No word had been received from him, it was claimed at the asylum.

Mrs. Haugh, after vainly seeking aid from many sources in Indianapolis, went to Rushville to consult a lawyer.

Judge Will M. Sparks of Rushville, who granted Haugh a divorce from his wife, issued an order last week making the children wards of Marion county.

She will seek to have a warrant issued, charging her former husband with kidnapping, she said before she left.

MOTHER NOT ALLOWED TO SEE CHILDREN

Laura A. Beggs, superintendent of the Orphans' home, said Haugh left the home with the children yesterday.

"Many of the children here have one or both parents living," she said, "and the parents frequently come to see them."

"Mr. Haugh was allowed to take them for a ride, and has not returned," she said. "He was not allowed to see the children."

"I simply thought it best that she be not allowed to see them," said the superintendent.

POLICE TAKE NO ACTION IN CASE

After talking to Judge Sparks of Rushville on the long distance telephone, Mrs. Beggs said that the orphans' asylum would take no legal action to recover the children.

"They were simply placed in our care, and if any action is to be taken it must be taken by the court or the authorities," she said.

A dispatch from Rushville said Judge Sparks had left the matter entirely to the local authorities.

No indication had been taken by local authorities this afternoon to apprehend Haugh.

Mrs. Haugh, who went to New York a few weeks ago, after being taken to the criminal court, returned to Indianapolis to continue her fight for the children.

She has called at the orphans' home frequently, but has not seen the children any time, it is said.

When she called this morning she was told they had disappeared with Mr. Haugh.

HAUGH'S NET ON BOARD STEAMER

Mr. Haugh and his former wife first met on a steamship on their way to France about ten years ago.

Mrs. Haugh, who is said to come from a family of distinguished army officers and literary people in France, was then secretary to a literary man in New York.

Her romance with Haugh quickly blossomed, resulting in their marriage.

They returned to Indianapolis to live at Central avenue and Sixteenth street, in the Haugh home.

Their domestic difficulties culminated in the granting of the divorce by Judge Sparks of Rushville last year.

Mrs. Haugh's plea for her children was refused.

On May 10, last year, Mrs. Haugh was arrested on a charge of attempting to shoot her husband in the Horace Wood garage on North Meridian street.

CLUB WOMEN COME TO HER ASSISTANCE

She was arrested and, apparently being penniless, was released on bond furnished by Dr. Amelia Keller and Mrs. Ovid Butler, prominent club women of the city.

She was taken into Mrs. Jameson's home, but later to St. Vincent's hospital, where she underwent an operation.

Dr. Keller took one of the children into her home and Otto Keller, a brother, took the other.

Mrs. Haugh became estranged from Dr. Amelia Keller after she was released from the hospital, and went to New York to earn a living teaching French.

She returned to Indianapolis to face trial in criminal court.

During the trial the state failed to produce the revolver with which she is said to have tried to shoot her husband.

Haugh freely admitted that he took the revolver from Indianapolis to Chicago, where he left it.

The court, holding that the defendant had the right to be confronted with the alleged weapon, which her attorneys said was not loaded with bullets which would cause death, dismissed the case.

HAUGH APPEARED PLEADED AT OUTCOME

Haugh smiled, contentedly.

Mrs. Haugh, too, smiled and said: "Thank you, Guy."

Dr. Keller and Otto Keller asked to be relieved of the custody of the children.

Judge Sparks, refusing to definitely award custody of the children to either of the parents, made them wards of Marion county.

According to the order, Haugh was not required to pay anything for their support.

The order did not say whether either parent should be forbidden to see the children.

Mrs. Haugh, after learning of the disappearance, first called on juvenile court authorities to help her.

She then called the police and was told she was required to file an affidavit charging kidnapping before the police could seek out Haugh.

DECLARES SHE'LL NEVER END FIGHT

Mrs. Haugh has declared she never will end her fight for the custody of her children.

Some time ago she appealed to Haugh to allow her to take the children to France and rear them among her relatives.

"She wanted to go back to her own (Continued on Page Eight.)"

What's What In Indianapolis

"Know Your Own Home Town"

(By the Reference Department, Indianapolis Public Library, C. E. Rush, Librarian)

When and by whom was Indianapolis named?

At the meeting of the legislature in January, 1821, Judge Jeremiah Sullivan of Jefferson gave the capital, hitherto unnamed, the name of "Indianapolis." At first much fun was made of the suggestion, but finally it was adopted through the support of Samuel Merrill, a member of the legislature.

Are we a church-going city?

Indianapolis has 221 churches of all denominations, with a membership and affiliated attendance of 120,000 people.

How long did it take to erect the Soldiers' and Sailors' Monument, and how much did it cost?

It took fourteen years to erect the Monument, from 1887 to 1901, and it cost \$600,000.

(Series Number One.)

CARROLL QUILTS CHAIRMANSHIP RACE IN COUNTY

Move in Interest of Harmony Staged at Public Gathering of Democrats.

Thomas Carroll, who for several months has been engaged in forming an organization of several hundred democratic workers and followed addresses made by Henry N. Spain and Thomas Taggart.

The meeting was presided over by James E. Deery, former city judge, made a short speech.

James E. Berry, Mr. Carroll's opponent in the chairmanship fight, was not present at the meeting, contrary to expectations.

It is understood, however, that he will not actively contend for the chairmanship in the face of Carroll's withdrawal.

The withdrawal of Carroll was in the interest of harmony in Marion county, which Mr. Taggart said was worth thousands of votes in the rest of the state.

Before closing his address Mr. Taggart also indicated his desire for the nomination of a county ticket without slanders or combinations and he was heartily applauded.

After Mr. Carroll had withdrawn, Mr. Taggart congratulated him before the meeting and complimented him highly on his willingness to forego his own ambition in the interests of party harmony.

The public withdrawal of Mr. Carroll was the result of negotiations which have been under way since Mr. Taggart expressed a desire to have the democrats of Marion county united for one candidate for chairman.

Following the meeting supporters of Mr. Carroll expressed praise for Thomas E. Riley, member of the board of works, who, they said, was responsible for having brought Mr. Carroll to the point of being willing to give way for Mr. Sullivan.

'HE WANTS WHOLE STATE OR NOTHING

Holding that "the vote of the people is final," and that "the politicians ought to be permitted to juggle with or thwart that expressed will," Senator Hiram Johnson issued a statement today declaring that if he does not lead the Indiana republican primary next Tuesday he does "not ask any votes from Indiana."

Senator Johnson speaks at Tomlinson hall tomorrow.

He is in Terre Haute this morning. Senator Johnson's statement declared that "whatever may be the technical provisions of the law of this state, good faith and fair dealing demand that the candidate with the highest number of votes to the primary receive the votes of the delegates to the national convention, and he can not conceive of any man placing his candidacy before the people and asking their support with the mental reservation that he will by some cunning, if the people reject him, obtain the delegates to the national convention."

"Any politician who does attempt to juggle with the will of the people, who as a delegate supports a candidate defeated by the people and rejected by them will be held accountable to the face of the state," Senator Johnson said.

"So far as I am concerned the will of the people is final."

"My opponents have all boasted that they will carry the primary."

"I do not lead in it. I do not ask any votes from Indiana."

"My opponents, with the certainty of knowledge which they say they possess, of their success, must of necessity take the same position."

"The people of Indiana are the ones who determine the presidential choice of the state, not a few politicians."

When the primary comes, he said, his choice by a plurality vote or otherwise the politician ought not be permitted to juggle with or thwart that expressed will.

All candidates ought at once indicate to the electorate that they will abide by the decision that the republicans shall render in Tuesday's primary."

ELEVEN CHANGES IN VOTING PRECINCTS

Eleven changes were announced today in the voting precincts for the Tuesday primary, according to Leo K. Fesler, county auditor.

The following voting places have been substituted for those announced last Saturday.

First ward, Precinct one, 2534 Sherman drive; Fourth ward, Twelfth precinct, 1115 West Twenty-seventh street; Sixth ward, Sixth precinct, Capitol avenue and Ohio street, Roosevelt hotel; Eighth ward, Sixth precinct, 1108 College avenue; (Continued on Page Ten.)

12-POUND GOLD NUGGET FOUND

BRUSSELS, May 1.—The largest nugget of pure gold in the world, weighing just over twelve pounds, has been found at the Kilo state mines and deposited in the Belgian Congo bank in London.

Writes Death Note With Her Lip Stick

CHICAGO, May 1.—A red lipstick that helped hide a girl's secret was used by Marie Williams to write her death message.

She was tired of singing and dancing for a living; tired of rouge and the lipstick.

She left a garden in the middle of a party and went home and opened a gas jet.

The landlady found her body on the floor, and a message written with a lipstick on a mirror.

"Have no pencil. Tell mother I am at ease."

Her mother, Mrs. S. Williams, Wilmington, Del., was notified of the death today.

FIND DEAD BABY AT STATEHOUSE

Body of Infant Girl Under Governor's Window.

The body of a fully developed girl baby was found about 9 o'clock this morning on the ledge of a window directly under the governor's office in the statehouse by Doss Shaffer, statehouse policeman.

The infant was wrapped in a white cloth and a newspaper.

It was evident, according to police officers who investigated, that medical attention had not been given the baby and that it had lived since death.

The baby was alive when placed on the window ledge, they said.

Calvin Petty, passing by the window, noticed the baby and called Shaffer.

Unable to get Coroner Paul Robinson, Shaffer notified the police.

An immediate investigation was ordered.

The baby, it is believed, was born last night, and weighed about eight pounds. There was nothing to indicate its parentage.

A police investigation is under way.

Budget Bill Passes Without Roll Call

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The senate this afternoon passed the McCormick budget bill without a roll call.

Plymouth, Ind., Now Has 4,338 Residents

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The census bureau announced today that the population of Plymouth, Ind., is 4,338, a gain of 500, or 13 per cent.

Burglar Takes \$40 in Visit to Store

A burglar entered the store of Lewis Abraham, 910 South Meridian street, some time during the night and stole \$40 from the cash drawer, Abraham reported to the police.

Mrs. Robert Watson, 510 North Meridian street, reported that her home was entered and ransacked by a burglar while she was away.

Nothing was taken.

Pan-American Ship on California Rocks

SAN FRANCISCO, May 1.—The steamer San Mateo, Pan-American liner of San Francisco, is ashore on the breakwater at Salina Cruz and is in a serious position.

The ship is standing by and hope to have the steamer, which carries a few passengers, off at high water.

The San Mateo left San Jose, Guatemala, April 29, for San Francisco.

Strikers in Session Behind Closed Doors

Members of the Indianapolis Yardmen's association held closed meetings today for the first time since the strike began, more than three weeks ago.

Officers of the newly organized union denied that any compromise considerations were in progress, but said the men were receiving confidential reports from other centers.

Railroads reported the yard situation as unchanged, with all freight received here being handled without difficulty.

One Dead, 1 Missing in State Mine Blast

SPECIAL TO THE TIMES. TERRE HAUTE, Ind., May 1.—One man was killed and another is missing as the result of an explosion at the Submarine mine, northwest of this city, today.

Five men were injured.

Andrew Wilson, mine boss, is the dead man, while John Howe, track layer, is believed buried in the debris.

ST. LOUIS, May 1.—An earthquake shock was felt in St. Louis this morning. Experts at Washington university stated the seismograph there recorded the shock as 200 miles from St. Louis.

MT. VERNON, Ill., May 1.—Mt. Vernon and the surrounding country was rocked twice this morning by an earthquake or explosion.

CENTRALIA, Ill., May 1.—Two distinct earth shocks were felt here this morning.

CONTEMPT CASE 'BOOZE' GANG DELAYED AGAIN BY PROSECUTOR

Adams Insists on Fixing Responsibility to Suit His Own Family.

TIMES MOTION DENIED

Judge James A. Collins again continued proceedings in the contempt action started by Charles Adams, prosecutor, against James L. Kilgallen, as managing editor of The Times, today.

The court received memoranda from Mr. Adams on motion of the defendant to be discharged, thus making it necessary to delay proceedings further.

In this memorandum Mr. Adams took occasion to deny that Robert A. Butler was responsible for the publication of the article in question, regardless of the fact that it was shown in the memoranda accompanying the motion that the preparation and publication of the article was under the sole authority of Mr. Butler.

Judge Collins overruled the motion to discharge and after the answer was filed continued the case until next Wednesday at 10 o'clock, regardless of the statements of the attorneys for the defense that they were ready to stand on the answer as submitted.

In his memorandum Mr. Adams sets out some testimony in connection with an attempted investigation of an article that was published in The Times on March 12, 1919, for which Mr. Kilgallen assumed responsibility and attempted to fix on the premises that, having admitted having full authority over the publication of articles more than a year ago, Mr. Kilgallen can now be held responsible for all publications.

Walter Myers of counsel for the defense called the attention of the court to supreme court decisions showing that the answer of the defendant under oath was conclusive and the facts therein binding on the court. Mr. Kilgallen was again represented in court by Henry N. Spain, Samuel Dowden of Whitcomb & Dowden and J. L. Ert Slack, special assistant United States attorney.

EVERY ALLEGATION DENIED BY KILGALLEN.

The answer of Mr. Kilgallen to the citation growing out of the article concerning the statement of Charles A. Robinson that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room in defense of his clients, is in three paragraphs.

The first paragraph is a denial of each and every allegation of the information, citation and rule to show cause.

The second paragraph denied that the defendant either prepared or helped prepare or caused to be prepared or published or caused to be published the alleged contemptuous article.

This paragraph sets up that the alleged contemptuous article was prepared, written and published under the sole direction, control and authority of Robert A. Butler in the ordinary course of the duties of said Robert A. Butler, as editor and publisher of said Times.

Said newspaper, that defendant is informed and believes and therefore alleges to be a fact that Charles Adams, managing editor of said Times, had information filed herein for the purpose of securing said rule to show cause, is now and was at all times mentioned in said affidavit, informed of the fact that the duties and authority of said Robert A. Butler as an employee of said Indiana Daily Times included the duties and authority of preparing, handling and causing to be published articles of the nature to said article, and that therefore the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

DEFENDANT WITHOUT CONTROL IN TIMES.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.

Paragraph three of the answer sets up the fact that The Times is published by a corporation of which the defendant has no control and also sets out the alleged contemptuous article.

It declares that it is true that Robinson said in the article that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room and that he had examined witnesses in the grand jury room, but that the defendant is not responsible and can not be held responsible for publication of such articles.