

The Indianapolis Times

BOYD GURLEY, Editor.

ROY W. HOWARD, President.

WM. A. MAYBORN, Bus. Mgr.

Member of the Scripps-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 in 3500.

No law shall be passed restraining the free interchange of thought and opinion, or restricting the right to speak, write, or print freely, on any subject whatever.—Constitution of Indiana.

CONGRESS

A studied effort to belittle Congress seems about to begin.

The people of the country will do well to think before they lend themselves to it.

It is easy to ridicule Congress. There are lots of funny folks wearing the frock coat and black Stetson hat that go with the office. The chubby chin-whiskered farmer, drawn by the cartoonists to represent Congress, is a figure that amuses us all. And that is all right. If it helps to keep Congress in its place, it serves a good purpose.

But what is Congress' place?

There are three branches of the United States Government—the legislative, the executive and the judicial. And of these three, the framers of the United States Constitution had in mind that the legislative branch should be the most important.

It is the one branch that comes directly from the people, that is compelled to maintain direct contact with the people, that, in short, really represents the people. The makers of the Constitution provided that the executive branch should have certain powers and the judicial branch should have certain powers. All other powers they decreed, should rest with the people—through the legislative branch of Congress.

The more Congress loses its power, the farther the country departs from a democracy. Cripple Congress and the people lose, to that extent, their control of their own affairs—their right to say how much they shall be taxed; their right to say whether they shall or shall not be led into a war.

Keep this in mind the next few months.

The assault now being prepared against Congress has to do with the handling of foreign affairs. The Senate will be rebuked for "interference" in the matter of Mexico and Nicaragua, the House for "interfering" in the matter of China.

Why shouldn't Congress interfere? Congress must vote any declaration of war that may grow out of our foreign relations. Congress must vote to draft the millions of young men that are called to the colors. Congress must vote the taxation that is put upon all the people when war is declared. And Congress must face the people on these questions.

This being so—and having the authority, specific and implied, to do so—why shouldn't Congress interfere when it sees the country drifting toward war, through the inaptitude of executive officials (whose salaries Congress pays)? War with Germany, or Great Britain, or Mexico, wouldn't be war between Frank B. Kellogg and Germany or Great Britain or Mexico. It wouldn't even be war between Kellogg and the ruler at the moment in one of those countries. It would be war between all the people of our country and all the people of the other country.

That is the situation when war results, as it so frequently does, from bungling diplomacy.

But, say the critics of Congress, delicate diplomatic negotiations can not be carried out by a mass meeting like Congress.

Is that true? Is diplomacy such a furtive, hole-in-the-corner business that it can only be done in the dark? Well, we've had that kind of diplomacy in the past and the record made isn't one to inspire veneration.

Students of government generally admire the achievements of the British government during the past few generations. With an empire scattered all over the globe, with delicate relations to maintain with people of every color, language and religious creed, the bumbling, baw-hawing Britshers seem always to muddle through.

Right now they appear to be working themselves out of the most difficult situation imaginable in China, a situation infinitely more complicated and precarious than America's, a situation that has called for resourcefulness and ingenuity.

If they fail, it will be because of strong arm tactics, such as the dispatch of thousands of additional troops to China at this time.

If they succeed it will be because China was made to hear the voice of the people, expressed through Parliament, in criticism of these war-like gestures. For Parliament is ringing with criticisms and objections, earnest and angry, from the men who directly represent the people of Great Britain.

The man who happens to be in charge of British foreign relations can not hide in his Whitehall office in times of popular concern. He can not send notes to Parliament, withholding information desired by that body as "incompatible with the public interest." He must appear before Parliament and openly explain what he is doing and why.

That has been true in Great Britain now for many generations. Who shall say that it has not contributed to her success in foreign affairs?

It may be that the British system, despite the confusion it entails, results in a certain contact between the minds of the British people and the peoples of other countries. And the people are less inclined to go to war over private commercial interests than governments are. That may be the explanation. In any case, the system seems to work.

Congress, under our system, can not summon cabinet officials to defend or explain their policies in open session. It can interrogate them—to some extent—through various committees. It should never cease doing this—when occasion demands. And the occasion demands in the matter of Mexico.

The State Department never yet has made clear to Congress, and the people, what is behind its dangerous maneuvering. The State Department, to cite a familiar instance, never yet has explained its monstrous effort to unload an utterly baseless Bolshevik scare on the American people as part of its effort to justify a break with the Mexican government.

Members of Congress will do well to study the United States Constitution afresh to discover the powers that Congress has.

The American people will do well to hold Congress to account if Congress, through fear of inspired criticism, relinquishes any of the powers it possesses to protect and serve the people.

INVITE HIM OVER

While mass meetings seem to be the order of the day, why not invite Prosecutor Joe Davis of Muncie to come to Indianapolis and explain how he obtained warrants for protected lawbreakers after the grand jury had refused to indict?

The people of Indianapolis ought to be interested.

Tracy

San Diego—Where Marines Gather for Possible Service in China.

By M. E. Tracy

SAN DIEGO, Feb. 1.—The sun sets in the ocean here. That is where it used to rise when I was a boy on the coast of Maine. The impressions of childhood are hard to overcome.

Navy Parking Place

At San Diego is one of the three great harbors where Uncle Sam parks his Navy on the Pacific Coast; perhaps, the most important.

Here is a marine base, a naval training station, flying field, and some other units of the national defense.

A dozen or more great ships are in port, with five times as many smaller ones and 1,200 marines came to town last week.

The talk is of an expedition to China.

Old Theory Wrong

The Point Loma, extending like a great lobster claw, protects San Diego harbor from the Pacific. At its tip, there is an old Spanish lighthouse standing more than 400 feet above sea level.

The ancient theory was that the higher a lighthouse stood the farther it could be seen. But like many other ancient theories, it has been exploded by modern science.

The most effective lighthouses are from 100 to 200 feet high. If higher than that, ships are likely to sail in under the rays, especially in foggy weather.

Tia Juana Near

Eighteen miles south of San Diego, and just across the Mexican border, is Tia Juana, which earned worldwide infamy some months ago, whether deservedly or not, through the quadruple Peete suicide.

The conditions in Muncie and in Indianapolis were similar to a degree, except that the results differed. In Muncie, it is said four jurors voted against indictments. Those four were not able to protect and give immunity. In this county, if rumors have any basis of truth, four men were convinced of the guilt of at least some of those investigated.

But where four men were convinced, the accused escape and are apparently safe. In Muncie, where two only were convinced, the suspected must go to trial.

There is a difference. Perhaps a large mass meeting and an address by the Muncie prosecutor as to how he gets results might be in order.

THE WRONG VICTIMS

The Legislature seems to have a wonderful genius for picking the wrong bills when it comes to the usual slaughter.

The money lenders who get 42 per cent a year on loans to those who are forced to borrow small sums under \$300, as interest will rejoice in the killing of the measure of Representative Burns which would have limited them to 2 per cent a month.

Usury is a long recognized abuse. It dates back into the centuries. Often it is legalized. It has never been humane—not respectable.

It might seem that there should be some protection for the unfortunate man or woman who has suffered a sort but is pressed by dire need to borrow.

It might seem that the discrepancy between those who can borrow a million at 5 per cent and those who must pay 42 per cent on \$300 or less is a trifle great.

As the law stands, those who most need money and can least afford to pay interest, pay the heavy tribute.

The killing of the measure which would have given a board of welfare for Marion County was understandable, even if ill advised.

That measure would have taken this distribution of charity out of the hands of the township trustees and placed it under the direction of a board composed of men and women who have a sympathy with needs and an understanding of something of the principles and policies that produce the best results.

It was not to be expected that such a measure would pass, meritorious as it was. The killing of the loan bill is not only unforgivable but inexcusable on any theory.

CHINESE ARE HUMAN

By N. D. Cochran

As we Christians believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we must believe that all human beings are brothers and that they all have souls.

That means, of course, that the Chinese have souls. They may be Chinese souls and they may be heathen souls, but they are souls just the same; and savable souls. For if heathen souls are not souls that can be saved we wouldn't send Christian missionaries to China to save them.

But it looks now as if something has gone wrong in China, for the Chinese are driving foreigners out of the country, or at least to the coast of the sea. And practically all of these foreigners are Christians, whether from America or Europe. For with the exception of the Japanese the foreigners are English, French, British, Italian and Russian, for the most part.

If they fail, it will be because of strong arm tactics, such as the dispatch of thousands of additional troops to China at this time.

If they succeed it will be because China was made to hear the voice of the people, expressed through Parliament, in criticism of these war-like gestures. For Parliament is ringing with criticisms and objections, earnest and angry, from the men who directly represent the people of Great Britain.

The man who happens to be in charge of British foreign relations can not hide in his Whitehall office in times of popular concern. He can not send notes to Parliament, withholding information desired by that body as "incompatible with the public interest."

He must appear before Parliament and openly explain what he is doing and why.

That has been true in Great Britain now for many generations. Who shall say that it has not contributed to her success in foreign affairs?

It may be that the British system, despite the confusion it entails, results in a certain contact between the minds of the British people and the peoples of other countries. And the people are less inclined to go to war over private commercial interests than governments are. That may be the explanation. In any case, the system seems to work.

Congress, under our system, can not summon cabinet officials to defend or explain their policies in open session. It can interrogate them—to some extent—through various committees. It should never cease doing this—when occasion demands. And the occasion demands in the matter of Mexico.

The State Department never yet has made clear to Congress, and the people, what is behind its dangerous maneuvering. The State Department, to cite a familiar instance, never yet has explained its monstrous effort to unload an utterly baseless Bolshevik scare on the American people as part of its effort to justify a break with the Mexican government.

Members of Congress will do well to study the United States Constitution afresh to discover the powers that Congress has.

The American people will do well to hold Congress to account if Congress, through fear of inspired criticism, relinquishes any of the powers it possesses to protect and serve the people.

My Dear—You Don't Know the Half of It!



Work

Information to Partner
Offsets Disclosing to
Opponents.

By Milton C. Work.

The pointer for today is: The original two-bid may be made when the hand has greater strength than Ace-King-Queen-x-x, but not when it has less.

Continuing yesterday's discussion, it should be remembered that the original two-bid is a guarantee of Ace-King-Queen-x-x; it should not be made with a holding "nearly" or "practically" as good, such as Ace-King-Jack-Ten-x-x, or Ace-King-x-x-x-x. It may, however, be bid when the holding is better than the minimum; for example, seven cards instead of six headed by Ace-King-Queen, or Jack in addition to the Ace-King-Queen, or a little side strength.

The following hands were given yesterday to be thought over until today:

1. Sp.: Ace-King-Queen-x-x-x. Ht.: x-x. Dl.: x-x.

2. Sp.: x-x. Ht.: King-x. Dl.: Ace-King-Queen-Jack-x-x. Cl.: x-x.

3. Sp.: King-Jack-x. Ht.: Ace-King-Queen-x-x-x. Dl.: x-x. Cl.: x-x.

No. 1 contains the minimum requirement for an original no-bid; while No. 2 contains a Jack in the suit, and a side King, over the minimum. A two-bid would be correct with either No. 1 or No. 2, whether the strong suit were a Major or a Minor; possibly the bid is more valuable in Minor than in a Major.

Objection has been raised against this two-bid convention on the ground that the information conveyed by it is too definite and tells the opponents too much; but experience has shown that in all games of the Whist family the benefit obtained by informing the partner more than offsets the disadvantage which results from informing the adversaries.

With No. 3 a two-bid would inform the partner accurately concerning the Hearts; but it should not be made because it might deter him, with only two Hearts and with good Spades, from showing the Spades.

KEITHS—A clown. Al K. Hall, on the bill this week is a certain guarantee against any form of gloom which one may have.

PALACE—Our idea of a well appointed dance act is present here in the offering of La Berlin in the Premier Revue.

William Hodge puts his ladies of much dramatic laughter in the well or the ocean. Tell me that great dramatic writing strikes the dramatic keynote. All right. Then I will talk. Give me a lot of happiness in the theater even if it be applesauce. Let William Hodge be another "Able's Irish Rose." I don't care if he is an amateur bouquet. As a play from about every strict point that I know about criticism, "The Judge's Husband" is terrible. From about every reason that I know why people buy tickets with real money at the box office—"The Judge's Husband" is as good applesauce as "Able's Irish Rose." And you know I think that "Able's Irish Rose" has done as much as anything in the world to make the American theater a happy place to visit.

Just as I consider "Able's Irish Rose" good theater do I consider "The Judge's Husband" good theater. The civic center is too local and too complicated for discussion in a column of this character.

John Nolen, however, is one of the ablest and most experienced city planners in this country, and his advice should not be ignored without grave deliberation.

It might seem that the discrepancy between those who can borrow a million at 5 per cent and those who must pay 42 per cent on \$300 or less is a trifle great.

As the law stands, those who most need money and can least afford to pay interest, pay the heavy tribute.

That is the situation when war results, as it so frequently does, from bungling diplomacy.

But, say the critics of Congress, delicate diplomatic negotiations can not be carried out by a mass meeting like Congress.

Is that true? Is diplomacy such a furtive, hole-in-the-corner business that it can only be done in the dark? Well, we've had that kind of diplomacy in the matter of Mexico.

It may be that the British system, despite the confusion it entails, results in a certain contact between the minds of the British people and the peoples of other countries. And the people are less inclined to go to war over private commercial interests than governments are. That may be the explanation. In any case, the system seems to work.

It may be that the British system, despite the confusion it entails, results in a certain contact between the minds of the British people and the peoples of other countries. And the people are less inclined to go to war over private commercial interests than governments are. That may be the explanation. In any case, the system seems to work.

It may be that the British system, despite the confusion it entails, results in a certain contact between the minds of the British people and the peoples of other countries. And the people are less inclined to go to war over private commercial interests than governments are. That may be the explanation. In any case, the system seems to work.

It may be that the British system, despite the confusion it entails, results in a certain contact between the minds of the British people and the peoples of other countries. And the people are less inclined to go to war over private commercial interests than governments are. That may be the explanation. In any case, the system seems to work.