

# The Indianapolis Times

ROY W. HOWARD, President.  
FELIX F. BRUNER, Editor. WM. A. MAYBORN, Bus. Mgr.

Members of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance. Client of the Post Office, the New Service, and the Scripps-Paine Service. Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations.

Published daily except Sunday, by Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214-220 W. Maryland St., Indianapolis. Subscription Rates: Indianapolis—Ten Cents a Week. Elsewhere—Twelve Cents a Week. PHONE—MA in 3500.

But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.—1 John 1:7.

God's glory is His goodness.—Henry Ward Beecher.

## IF YOU WERE JUDGE

OUR MEN, all former letter carriers, stood before Judge Winslow in New York and confessed thefts from the sales of stamps from a postoffice aggregating \$100 each.

The normal thing for a judge to do, under the circumstances, would be to sentence the men to terms in penitentiaries.

This judge didn't.

He inquired and found that one of the men, receiving \$2,000 a year after twenty-four years in the postal service, was trying to support a wife and six children on that income.

Others, receiving but \$1,800 a year, were tackling similar financial problems.

"This is tragic," exclaimed Judge Winslow. "These men are obviously not of the criminal class and I am not going to add them to that class."

The judge asked where the men found employment after leaving the Government service and volunteered to see their employers and try to get better jobs for the postmen.

That was an unusual decision on the part of a merciful judge. Judge Winslow's action will serve a useful function in more ways than one. It put the situation of the underpaid postal employees in newspapers all over the land. It stirred up a feeling of shame on the part of the public that its own employees were so miserably paid.

His action may serve in a less useful way, if other postal employees, in a service where honesty is positively essential, are tempted to do what their fellows did for the sake of eking out livings for their families. Judge Winslow's leniency may serve the public badly in this respect.

But in this case, too, the responsibility comes back to the public and the Government. It is something worth thinking about.

What would you have done, if you had been on Judge Winslow's bench when those four former postmen confessed?

## UTILITIES AND COURTS

IT APPEARS that the public utility regulation question is rapidly approaching a showdown in Indiana. The bill introduced by Senator Barker designed to prevent utilities from appealing to Federal district courts for higher rates was a step in that direction.

The action of public service companies in taking their cases to the Federal Court when they are not satisfied with the ruling of the State commission has resulted in trimming the power of the latter down to the point where it is almost useless.

The situation resolves itself into this: The public service commission may give utilities what they want and get away with it. If it rules against the utilities the ruling means nothing.

State regulation is much to be desired. With the consolidation of public utilities and the erection of central power plants serving wide areas, this appears to be the only practical type of regulation. But the utilities have found a way to get around it through the Federal Courts.

Senator Barker's bill provides that appeal can be taken from a decision of the commission only to State courts and that the utilities after having gone through the State courts would then have the usual right to go to the United States Supreme Court.

There appears to be some doubt as to the constitutionality of such a bill, but certainly something in this direction is badly needed.

## What I Want of the Law

AN EDITORIAL

I DO not want the law to do things for me that I can and ought to do for myself.

I do not want the law to be my conscience, or my school teacher, or my religion.

But I want the law to protect me.

## Ask The Times

You can get an answer to any question of fact or information by writing to The Indianapolis Times, Washington Bureau, 1220 W. Maryland St., Washington, D. C., including 5 cents in postage. All questions and answers are confidential. All answers are given gratis. Unsigned requests cannot be answered. All letters are confidential.

There are some difficulties in the way of intense heat encountered in digging the Simpson Tunnel?

Yes, in places the tunnel passes 7,000 feet below the mass of the mountain, and both hot and cold springs were encountered; the internal heat was so great that at times the men could only work when sprayed with cold water.

How much land has the Government bought for Eastern and Southern national forests? 2,346,354 acres.

What kinds of chickens are known as ornamental breeds? The Polish, Exhibition Games, Sultans, Frizzies, and Bantams are representative ornamental breeds.

What are the meanings of the following names? Alice, a princess; Eleanor, light; Mabel, for love; Mildred, gently strict; Sophia, wise.

Is the French horn a difficult wind instrument to learn to play? Yes, it is one of the most difficult of the wind instruments.

What is the maximum amount of cotton one person can pick in a day? About 500 pounds.

What two States produce the most poultry? Iowa produces the most, though Illinois runs her a close second.

What woods are used for banjos? Maple is most used, with India redwood second best, and holly third.

What is the plural of "aide-de-camp"? The plural is "aides-de-camp," not "aide-de-camps."

# WET AND DRY BATTLE TO RESULT FROM SCOTT CASE

## Prohibition Controversy

### Looms Following Drink- ing Revelations.

By CHARLES P. STEWART  
NEA Service Writer

WASHINGTON, Jan. 16.—One of the worst congressional fights in this country's history is impending. It probably will settle the prohibition question for good and all.

The Frank D. Scott divorce case brought the situation about.

Individuals mentioned in connection with this case may or may not be able to establish satisfactory personal alibis, but the Nation's lawmakers are very well convinced the country is going to accept as true the picture presented of official society life in the capital—a life not only extremely gay but unrestrainedly wet.

There are three kinds of Senators and Representatives:

1. The wets.

2. Those who vote dry but drink wet.

3. The honest-to-goodness drys.

The Scott case testimony pleases the wets. They consider it a black eye for prohibition.

**Vote Dry and Drink**

Those who vote dry but drink wet care nothing about prohibition in principle, of course.

They support dry measures and oppose wet ones only because they believe it is good for their political party.

Probably they would reverse themselves with as good or a better will if they thought a majority of their constituents would approve.

The Scott case testimony does not pain them on account of its disclosure of the fact that the very men who make the country's laws numerously violate the prohibition law. They know that already. They are merely scared lest they be found out.

The honest-to-goodness drys are thoroughly enraged. They realize that drinking Congressmen and other Government officials make prohibition ridiculous.

Their resentment against bibulousness in official circles has been increasing for a long time as they came more and more fully to find out how general it was. The Scott case has brought this anger to a head.

**Impeachment Proposed**

One plan has taken pretty definite shape.

This is the impeachment and expulsion of any Senator or Representative who can be proved to be a consumer of anything with an alcoholic content in excess of  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 per cent.

In dozens of cases such proof will be easy enough to get.

But the question is:

Proof having been furnished, will it be possible to get the necessary votes to throw the offenders out?

At first thought it may seem as if the answer should be—yes. The dry majority in both houses is a liberal one.

The trouble is, those who vote dry but drink wet probably will not be counted out. They're dry on any question of wet-and-dry lawmaking but they hardly can be expected to vote to expel themselves from Congress.

The honest-to-goodness drys and the wet drys, taken together, are in a majority, but how about the honest-to-goodness drys counted alone? It's more than doubtful if there's a majority of them.

Nevertheless, it's practically certain they will make the attempt. The leaders are counting heads now. They're doing their best to get pledges from doubtful ones.

Some are promising. Many are sidestepping. It's too soon yet to tell how the opposing forces will line up.

**Big Fight Ahead**

When the dry leaders are convinced their group has reached its maximum of obtainable strength they will launch their attack.

There will be a terrific fight goes without saying. Even an attempt at the expulsion of drys and scores of members of both the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States will be a sensation or proportions to compare with the outbreak of a war. An attempt to expel nobody but the avowedly wet weds to be that.

If the honest-to-goodness drys succeed they'll have scored a victory for prohibition that will count. If they fail—if Congress virtually admits that it's dry for the country but intends to stay wet so far as itself is concerned—it will be about the finish of so much as a semblance of prohibition enforcement, when the law stays in the code book or not.

**Across the Sea by Air**

Trans-Atlantic air-mail service is undoubtedly coming. American business men already have taken the necessary preliminary steps to inaugurate its actual operation. They are deferred only by immediate inability to buy their prospective fleet at reasonable prices.—Senator Copeland (Democrat) New York.

**More Advice for Farmers**

What the farmer needs to do is to organize his cooperative business on a better basis, to exercise a higher measure of good judgment, to display a greater amount of painstaking and skillful management, to be more punctual and prompt; in other words, to prove himself a better business man in every respect.—Senator Bruce (Democrat) Maryland.

**Interest**

**SIX** persons attended the open forum at the Chamber of Commerce the other night to discuss proposals regarding the State primary law. The attendance figure includes those there in officially.

It should be remembered that a husband and wife living together need make no return unless their aggregate net income for 1924 was \$2,500 or more or the aggregate gross income was \$5,000 or more.

Husband and wife living together may include the income of each in a single joint return, or each may file separate returns showing the income of each. Where a point return is filed, the tax is computed on the aggregate income and all deductions and credits to which either is entitled is taken from such aggregate income.

If a wife does not file a separate return or join with her husband in a return, the husband is required to include in his return all income received by the wife in payment of wages, salary, or from the sale of products of her labor. In the returns of married persons must be included also the income of dependent minor children.

It should be remembered that a husband and wife living together need make no return unless their aggregate net income for 1924 was \$2,500 or more or the aggregate gross income was \$5,000 or more. Last year returns were required of such married persons whose aggregate net income was \$2,000 or more.

**Interest**

In view of this practically unanimous lack of interest one might conclude that the flame of community spirit burns low in Indianapolis.

Legitimate causes might have been responsible for the painfully slender turnout at this particular assembly. But other public forums at the Chamber of Commerce in recent months drew equally crushing emptiness.

The fact that there is no public interest here in such meetings is incapable.

Fifty years ago open discussion of any subject from the Nebular Hypothesis to the weather would have drawn a capacity crowd in this city. Today no serious debate draws a handful. Yet Union Station would be jammed to greet Jackie Coogan.

Are we too absorbed in private affairs to take interest in public matters? Is it lack of civic spirit or just a bad attack of inertia?

## RIGHT HERE IN INDIANA

By GAYLORD NELSON

### Instruction

**S**TATE SENATOR FRED M. DICKERMAN introduced a bill Wednesday providing that pupils—at the option of parents—may be released from public schools two hours a week to receive religious instruction, for which school credit will be given.

Unquestionably there is need for ethical instruction to young people. The lack of such training is evident in every court in the country.

About as far as many parents go in inculcating morals is to utter a few peevish don'ts. Those are insufficient to form the background to lives of moral grandeur when the children grow up.

Consequently optional religious instruction in connection with the schools has been adopted in many places—and has many enthusiastic advocates. It solves a difficult problem for many parents.

More and more difficult and unpleasant problems in child training are being turned over to the public schools for solution. "Teach it in the schools" is the invariable suggestion, whether the problem is fire

prevention, safety, or patriotism. This is a flattering testimonial to the schools.

However, raising children is primarily an individual not a collective social responsibility. The schools cannot carry the whole burden. The job also requires faithful, willing parents.

**Lobbyists**

**L**IETENANT GOVERNOR VAN ORMAN has announced that lobbyists will not be allowed on the floor of the Senate during sessions. Speaker Leslie will similarly curb them in the House.

The lot of the poor lobbyist in these degenerate days should wring a tear from a kiln-dried brick.

Formerly he was an imperious master. He strode into the Legislative arena, cracked his whip and billeaved through hoops or slunk back to their cages.

That Golden Age is past. Now the lobbyist must procure a license—at a cost of \$2—before he can ply his trade. What an indignity to inflict on the sensitive nature of a professional fixer!

The rule just promulgated is a more serious blow to his dignity. No longer can he appear on the floor and slay a legislator with a meaning look. He must slip the disobedient solon knock-out drops.

Still' restrictions have not eliminated lobbying. Nor will they. Special interests and organizations sponsoring hobbies will always have agents present to influence legislative action.

The Legislature itself must always do the lobbying for the interests of all the people. Only to the extent that it does will it earn its pay.

### Income Tax

Reduction of the income tax was effected by the revenue act of 1924. A rate reduction, however, was not the only benefit afforded by this legislation. Increases in the exemption for married persons and heads of families, a 25 per cent reduction on "earned income" and other changes are of immediate interest to every taxpayer. As an aid, therefore, in the preparation of income tax returns for the year 1924, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has prepared a series of articles on the new act and the regulations governing its administration, of which this is the first. The salaried man, wage earner, professional and business man—in fact every class of taxpayer—will be fully informed of their requirements and privileges. Taxpayers are advised to preserve these articles as a guide in the making of their returns.

Returns are required of every single person whose net income for 1924 was \$1,000 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more and of every married person living with husband or wife whose net income was \$2,500 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more.

Returns are required of every single person whose net income for 1924 was \$1,000 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more and of every married person living with husband or wife whose net income was \$2,500 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more.

Returns are required of every single person whose net income for 1924 was \$1,000 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more and of every married person living with husband or wife whose net income was \$2,500 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more.

Returns are required of every single person whose net income for 1924 was \$1,000 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more and of every married person living with husband or wife whose net income was \$2,500 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more.

Returns are required of every single person whose net income for 1924 was \$1,000 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more and of every married person living with husband or wife whose net income was \$2,500 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more.

Returns are required of every single person whose net income for 1924 was \$1,000 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more and of every married person living with husband or wife whose net income was \$2,500 or more or whose gross income was \$5,000 or more.