

The Indianapolis Times

ROY W. HOWARD, President
FELIX F. BRUNER, EditorWM. A. MAYBORN, Bus. Mgr.
Member of the Script-Howard Newspaper Alliance • • • Client
of the United Press and the NEA 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 3500.Our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son
Jesus Christ.—1 John 1:3.

There is a God within us.—Ovid.

THE CITY COURT PROBLEM

SOMETIMES the affairs of Indianapolis are sadly neglected in the Legislature. There frequently is a tendency on the part of out-State legislators to feel that the capital city is asking too much of them.

But there is at least one Indianapolis problem that the Legislature should solve before it adjourns in March. That is the city court problem.

Under the present system there is only one city judge to handle all police cases. In addition there is a crew of justices of the peace who handle petty civil and misdemeanor cases.

There are two arguments in favor of a revision of this system.

First: No human being can handle intelligently and justly the thousands of cases that pass through city court each year.

Second: There is no place for justices of the peace in a city like Indianapolis.

The proposed new court system would establish a municipal court of four judges. This court would handle the cases now handled by the police judge and would also handle small civil cases. Justices of the peace, who are constitutional officers and who can not be put out of business without amending the constitution—which is next to impossible—would be deprived of most of their powers and of most of their opportunities to prey on the community. There would, of course, be opportunity for appeal from the city tribunal.

One of the objections to the proposed measure is to the fact that the judges would be appointed by the Governor instead of elected. We are inclined to believe this is a wise provision. Political campaigns should have no place in the judiciary.

Indianapolis has had plenty of political judges. The present city judge, for instance, is conducting an active campaign for mayor. We have no objection to Judge Wilmette running for mayor, but he should not sit as judge and conduct a campaign for office at the same time. He should resign his judgeship or refrain from political activity.

MEN IN THE CHURCH

NOW we have another proof of the changing world and the changing status of women in modern life.

Dr. Lewis Brown, who is about to observe his twenty-fifth anniversary as pastor of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, declares that men are more responsive to religion today than are women.

Dr. Brown gives as the reason for women losing interest in the fact that many women are going into business and that they are neglecting church, using Sunday merely as a day of rest and recreation. Meanwhile, more men, he says, are going to church.

Does this mean that since women have gone into business men have more time for religious activity than they had previously? Or does it merely mean men are growing to see more plainly the need of spiritual well-being than they did in years gone by?

Probably the latter explanation is the correct one. Perhaps men are coming to see that the job of making money is not the only man-sized job in the world.

THE CHILD LABOR AMENDMENT

PONENTS of the Federal child labor amendment, which is shortly to come before the Indiana Legislature, continue to throw about it a smoke screen of misinformation.

On every hand we hear the statement that the amendment would "prevent anybody under 18 years of age from working."

Nothing could be farther from the truth. If the amendment carried this provision, it would be highly undesirable. As it is, it should be passed.

The amendment merely gives the United States Congress the power to enact labor legislation affecting persons under the age of 18 years.

The chances are that the boy or girl under the age of 18 who does not do some kind of useful work during at least part of the time when he or she is not in school will take a long time to learn to work afterward. It is much more desirable that boys and girls should occupy their time usefully than that they should loaf.

There is nothing in the amendment that would keep them from working at the proper kind of occupation. It is ridiculous to think that Congress would enact legislation to keep them from working.

But in some States—not to any great extent, including Indiana—children are forced to work in factories under deplorable conditions, and they are forced to work long hours.

This is the sort of thing at which the amendment hits.

How would you like to have your 12 or 14-year-old boy or girl working twelve hours a day in a cotton mill?

Of course the mill owners oppose any legislation to stop this practice. It is profitable for them.

This is the kind of thing the amendment is striking at—not at proper employment under proper conditions.

The Indiana Legislature should serve the youth of the country to the extent of ratifying this amendment.

FOURTH IN WHAT?

INDIANA ranks fourth in education among all States, according to statistics quoted by Donald DuShane, editor of the "Indiana Teacher," in the current issue.

The basis of comparison consists entirely of attendance records and the cost of educating the pupil.

NOT ONE WORD IS SAID ABOUT STANDARDS OF LEARNING; NOT A WORD ABOUT THE MENTAL EQUIPMENT OF THE TEACHERS OR HOW MUCH THE PUPILS LEARN UNDER THEM.

The term "educator," as applied to public school officials now means "accountant," "business manager," "financial expert," judging from the statistics mentioned.

It no longer means one who is mentally and intellectually gifted in the direction of inculcating knowledge and wisdom in the minds of our school children.

It is not an admirable thing that Indiana is fourth in "education" when the ranking has nothing to do with education.

SECRET OF OPPPOSITION TO GUN-ELEVATION REVEALED

Difficulty in Changing Own Equipment Cause of British Stand.

BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

WASHINGTON, Jan. 19.—The real, inside secret behind Great Britain's bulldog opposition to the elevation of big guns on American battleships is now known and is here given to the readers of this newspaper for the first time.

The reasons publicly advanced by London—namely, that the changes proposed would constitute a violation of the Washington naval treaty, and, secondly, that even were this not so to make them would tend to encourage naval competition—are only a diplomatic smoke-screen adroitly put up to conceal the really vital ones, which are these:

First, that while the United States can increase the range of the big guns of its fleet by making minor changes only—changes which in the opinion of all the powers, save Britain, would not infringe upon the terms of the treaty—Great Britain could not follow suit without alterations of a major sort considerably barred by the pact.

Would Be Outraged

Second, that even if none of the powers objected to the extensive alterations on British ships, and both Britain and America made the change, Britain would then find herself outranged from one to three miles by America.

Third, every one of Britain's twenty-two capital ships can already fire at an angle of 20 degrees or over, giving them a range of one and a half to three miles farther than thirteen of eighteen of ours whose angle of fire is only 15 degrees. She naturally wishes to retain this superiority.

Fourth, the cost of gun elevation on our ships would not amount to more than \$6,500,000 at the most, while similar changes on British ships would cost several times that, it is understood, around \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000.

This is due to differences in construction and the necessity of removing from the ships some of their side armor. It is here that the alterations would appear to run counter to the Washington treaty, which says: "No alteration in side armor, in caliber, number and general type of mounting of main armament shall be permitted."

The four reasons enumerated above the first two are the controlling factors. Britain has no intention of swapping places with America if she can avoid it.

Long Range

AYE SHANK, in a speech in Chicago recently, declared that more ability is demanded for the office of mayor in Chicago than for the presidency of the United States.

He wasn't throwing verbal volleys.

He was only emphasizing that the administration of municipal affairs in Chicago demands unusual executive talent.

That is undoubtedly true. The same requirement applies to every large city—even to Indianapolis.

Nevertheless, ability is the last consideration urged in determining the choice of mayors. The important qualifications are candidates' political, social and religious connections. Consequently municipal affairs are often efficiently mismanaged.

When a private corporation, with affectionate regard for dividends, seeks an executive to manage its affairs it hires the most capable man obtainable. Ability—not color of hair, social, political or religious leanings—is the necessary qualification. As a result private business is efficiently managed.

What has political oratory got to do with laying a pavement or digging a sewer?

All problems in municipal administration are essentially business problems. It's immaterial whether the city's chief executive is a Republican, a Democrat or a Seventh Day Adventist. The essential thing

RIGHT HERE
IN INDIANA

BY GAYLORD NELSON

Convention

A PAIR of Republican city conventions scuttled in the Courthouse Saturday afternoon. It was the culmination of days of civil war in which injunctions and counter injunctions exploded in hostile camps.

Fifty special deputy sheriffs and a brigade of policemen were present to prevent the figurative brawls from becoming a physical riot.

The double-barreled affair was a gorgeous exhibition of factionalism run amuck. The stake for which they battled was the city chairmanship of the Republican party.

It was the preliminary wight of the municipal campaign.

It is by such factional strife that we prepare to pick the officers of a \$626,000,000 civic corporation with 350,000 stockholders.

The efficient administration of the affairs of that corporation is of interest to every citizen. But efficient municipal administration is not the issue that has worried the factions and city politicians into a lather. They are concerned with control of the offices, not public welfare.

City government is only the football of factional strife and partisan politics.

Indianapolis needs fewer crowned political bosses and more nonpartisan executives. About the only part of the city government that is nonpartisan now is the city tax.

Executive

M AYOR SHANK, in a speech in Chicago recently, declared that more ability is demanded for the office of mayor in Chicago than for the presidency of the United States.

He wasn't throwing verbal volleys.

He was only emphasizing that the administration of municipal affairs in Chicago demands unusual executive talent.

That is undoubtedly true. The same requirement applies to every large city—even to Indianapolis.

Nevertheless, ability is the last consideration urged in determining the choice of mayors. The important qualifications are candidates' political, social and religious connections.

Consequently municipal affairs are often efficiently mismanaged.

When a private corporation, with affectionate regard for dividends, seeks an executive to manage its affairs it hires the most capable man obtainable. Ability—not color of hair, social, political or religious leanings—is the necessary qualification.

As a result private business is efficiently managed.

What has political oratory got to do with laying a pavement or digging a sewer?

All problems in municipal administration are essentially business problems. It's immaterial whether the city's chief executive is a Republican, a Democrat or a Seventh Day Adventist. The essential thing

is executive ability. How often do we get that under present conditions?

Drug Stores

R EPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM F. WERNER of Indianapolis will usher a bill into the Legislature to prohibit serving lunches or meals in rooms where other lines of business are conducted. It is aimed at the drug store lunch service.

If the bill passes, some one must determine what constitutes a lunch. To some people a hearty repast is a glass of carbonated water, a dyspeptic tablet, three pounds of bonbons, or a large chew of tobacco. All of which every drug store handles.

That suggests the question: What is a drug store?

Its ancestor was the old apothecary shop, in whose musty interior prowled a bewhiskered pharmacist with a light sprinkling of calomel behind his ears.

The place was a laboratory where were compounded nauseous medicinal concoctions. It did not sell its hands with merchandise.

Now, however, the mortar, pestle and prescription case have practically vanished. Soda fountain, cigars, kodaks, candies and magazines are featured. Drugs are an obscure sideline.

The drug store's present character has evolved from its fight for existence. If the pharmacist can profit more by rolling his hair and dispensing sodas and sandwiches than by rolling pills, he will do so. It will be difficult for a statute to buck the law of economics.

Licenses

T HE Indiana Music Teachers' Association advocated a State board of examiners and a requirement that all music teachers in the States be licensed. The proposal will be pressed for legislative action.

State boards of examiners and licenses are now required in pharmacy, medicine, nursing, optometry, embalming, dentistry and engineering. Proposals for them are pending for naprapaths, chiropractors, podiatrists, beauticians and specialists and barbers.

Why not for music teachers?

Music teaching is undoubtedly dangerous to public peace, dignity, health and welfare. Perhaps the police and sanitary powers of the State should be invoked to protect against unscrupulous quacks in the vocation.

Unquestionably the State should regulate professions in which human lives are directly at stake.

However, there is no sound reason for wrapping the cloak of official authority and sponsorship around every struggling vocation.

A State license wouldn't make the sour note of a music teacher less acidulous—nor is it more efficacious in many other licensed professions.

State boards of examiners and licensing are usually demanded not by the public but by associations for their private ends. They are designed principally to club individual craftsmen into line—and they uselessly cumber the machinery of government, already sufficiently complicated.

What Determines Value?

AN EDITORIAL

W HO does not indorse the doctrine that a man is entitled to the social value of what he produces?

But what determines that social value?

What do Babe Ruth, or Charlie Chaplin, or Mr. Dempsey produce to warrant their incomes?

Yet, who kicks when such high lights pass the President of the United States, so far as salary is concerned?

There is evidently a factor in the social value of things besides necessity.

Appetite, inventiveness, desire, fashion and caprice seem to have a part in determining it.

A savage prince might pawn his birthright for a glass bead, but not the modern American business man. He demands a diamond, or a place in society, or a flapper's smile.

With the exception of a few essentials, values constantly change. What was comparatively priceless yesterday becomes fairly worthless tomorrow, and vice versa.

A Roman matron became rich by raising brown thrushes for Caesar's table.

O NE hundred years ago, men were making fortunes in the production of tinder boxes. Along came the phosphorus match and put them and their industry out of commission.

Mr. Ford has won wealth by manufacturing a small horseless carriage and Mr. Rockefeller through oil. Neither one nor the other was known to our great-grandfathers.

Today the hairdressers are getting a meal ticket by bobbing it. Tomorrow they may be getting a better meal ticket by getting it back in wigs and transformations.

Fifty years back, stone cutting was one of the aristocratic crafts, but the advent of steel and concrete has well nigh destroyed that.

The social value of what a man produces is dependent on the age in which he is born. It is also dependent on whether some shrewd inventor, or promoter, doesn't come along and change the fashion.

Two generations ago, they say, a man wouldn't eat tomatoes, and the farmer could hardly give them away.

In Revolutionary times, the New Englanders wouldn't eat ham, but no whey consider it as good as cod, and try to make toher people think it is the same thing.

If the cotton growers could get women to sing their skirts six inches they would be a market for many thousand more bales.

The period for filing returns of income on a calendar year basis is from Jan. 1 to March 15, 1925. Copies of the forms have been mailed to persons who filed individual returns for the year 1924. Failure to receive the form, however, does not relieve the taxpayer of his obligation to file his return and pay his tax on time. The forms are now available at offices of collectors of internal revenue and branch offices.

Persons whose net income was derived chiefly from salaries or wages and was not in excess of \$5,000 should use Form 140A. The form consists of a single sheet in which space is provided for answers to only four questions: salaries, wages, commissions, etc.; interest on bank deposits, notes, mortgages, and corporation bonds; dividends on stocks of domestic corporations, and other income, including from partnerships and fiduciaries. On the reverse side are instructions, which if studied will be of material aid to the taxpayer in the filing of a correct return.

Persons, any part of whose net income was derived from business or profession, including farming, or from the sale of property or rent, though the amount was less than \$5,000, should use the larger form, 1040. The use of the larger form is required also in cases where the net income was in excess of \$5,000, regardless of whether from salary, business, profession or other taxable sources.