

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

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 1-5200

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 who 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-winked 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 than 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, haw-hawing Britishers 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 warlike 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 people 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 Congressmen 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.

especially if they have read and thought about the verdict of the last grand jury and its plain accusation that there were unusual conditions within its own body.

The Muncie prosecutor, on an affidavit of one of the jurors who had listened to testimony and believed that there was evidence to convict, issued a warrant. The man accused found that any friendship with the Muncie political machine did not protect.

In Indianapolis, it may be remembered, common rumor had it that four members of the grand jury voted for indictments. That may or may not have been true. The proceedings are secret. The evidence was promptly impounded.

In public statements the prosecutor of this county, William Remy, and the two special assistants who were paid by funds from the Governor's contingent fund, declared that there had been sufficient evidence in their judgment to indict.

The Indianapolis grand jury had investigated charges of corruption and fraud not only local but concerning the State government, especially during the reign of D. C. Stephenson, whose documents never materialized.

The local grand jury saw witnesses flee rather than appear. They should have known, and probably do know, the reasons why some of these witnesses were reluctant.

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—nor respectable.

It might seem that there should be some protection for the unfortunate man or woman who has security of 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 can and 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 killable 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.

The cable news doesn't indicate that it was anything the missionaries did in their soul-saving zeal that stirred the Chinese to hatred of the "foreign devils." So it must have been something the business men did that made the trouble. But the business men are Christians, too. And they didn't go to China to save souls; they went there to sell goods or buy raw material. In short, they went there to make money.

But even the foreign business men carried light into China. The Standard Oil Company is the biggest big business institution there. The first year it started in to do business it gave away a million lamps and since then has been selling hundreds of thousands annually to get the Chinese to burn oil. It has an enormous candle factory in China and sells millions of candles.

Most big business concerns got along pretty well doing business with the heathen Chinese. My impression on a visit to China not long ago, whether in Hong Kong, Shanghai, Tien Tsin or smaller cities, or even riding in the country, was that the Chinese were friendly. Everybody seemed to have a smile for us. Whether the soul back of those inscrutable faces was a Christian or a heathen soul, it appeared to be a brotherly and a friendly soul.

Another impression was that the husky Sikh policemen at the British consessions at Shanghai and Hong Kong were unnecessarily rough with the poor devils of ricksha men. Possibly they associated the foreigner with the big policeman's club and force. In their heathen minds they may have come to associate force and policemen's clubs with Christians.

Anyhow, without knowing a whole lot about it I can't help thinking that it wouldn't be difficult to build up trade and friendly relations with the Chinese if we went about it in a friendly Christian way.

It may be that even if the Chinese are heathen they are human enough to want to run their own country without the help of foreign policemen, just as our Christian brethren in Central and South America would like to run theirs.

But then they say the Chinese are peculiar. Perhaps if they were not peculiar they would thank us for saving their souls and beating their bodies.

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

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 Petet suicide.

Tia Juana is not what you would describe as a great moral asset, but her commercial advantages. It offers the bored tourist an opportunity to see and bet on horse races, as well as to legally evade the restrictions imposed by Mr. Volstead.

Doubtless, some tourists are attracted to Tia Juana for this reason, but not so many.

'Mother of the Soul'

Seventeen miles inland is Miramar ranch, home of E. W. Scripps, where Mrs. Scripps still resides.

Fourteen miles north is La Jolla, where Miss Ellen D. Scripps, though 91 years of age, still exercises personal supervision over her extensive interests and philanthropies, especially the latter.

You can hardly go anywhere in or around San Diego without running across evidence of the refined generosity of this wonderful lady, whom Uncle Bob Payne has no aptly described as "the mother of the soul of the Scripps-Howard newspapers."

Two Issues Dominant

San Diego is vitally interested in two questions right now—first, whether to create a civic center on the water front, as John Nolen's plan provides; and, second, the Boulder dam.

The civic center problem 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.

Six States Affected

Boulder dam is a national problem because it affects the interests of six States and many more communities.

As a reclamation project, its practicability is not disputed, but there seems to be a determined, if concealed, effort to take it out of the Government's hands and make it a private enterprise. It requires no occult power to suspect that the combined efforts of certain electric corporations are responsible for sidetracking the bill by which Boulder dam would be built and operated by the Government.

According to the best information, Congress is ready to pass this bill but can't seem to get it reported back by the committee. What is the matter and why doesn't somebody ask Herbert Hoover where he stands?

Federal Rule Needed

There is something to think about in connection with Boulder dam besides the production of so much electricity and the impounding of so much water for irrigation purposes.

The Colorado River and its tributaries draw water from six States. Each State feels it has a just claim to a certain proportion of the water. If the Boulder dam is built, however, before the claims are adjusted, who will safeguard the interests of the respective States? Who can safeguard them as well as the Federal Government?

Then there is the question of how the power should be distributed, and at what rates. Many cities and sections feel they are entitled to a share, and most of them certainly are. Beyond that, they feel they are entitled to the benefits of cheap production, which the dam would involve.

Such problems are too intricate and too definitely bound up with vital public interests for private enterprise to solve, or to be subjected to the arbitrary rules of profit making.

How did the State of Georgia get its name and who were the founders?

It was named for George II of England. A Spanish expedition under De Soto traversed the region in 1492. Georgia formed a portion of the tract of land granted to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina in 1663 and 1665. The first charter was obtained by James Oglethorpe, an English soldier, who formed a colony there.

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



If This Be Happiness, Do Not Find Fault With Stage and William Hodge

By Walter D. Hickman

There is one hope for me as a critic. And that is I do not rob the other fellow of getting real enjoyment out of the theater.

Here is the idea: If this be happiness, do not find fault with the stage and William Hodge.

The drama lovers may tell me that Mister Ibsen puts his ladies of much dramatic laughter in the well of the ocean.

They 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 is a little sea-sickness.

Let William Hodge be another "Able's Irish Rose." I don't care if he is an entire bouquet.

Let a play from about every strict point that I know about criticism, "The Judge's Husband" be as good as "Able's Irish Rose."

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 as "Able's Irish Rose."

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. Everything is in both as in the rainbow. There is color, hope and even thought. From a dramatic standpoint "Able" is terrible and so is "The Judge."

But I do not care about that as I tell you the theater. William Hodge knows that the theater has the right to be happy, although the playwright is as notorious exponent of happiness as the author of "Able's Irish Rose."

"The Judge's Husband" will not live as long as "Able," but William Hodge will live in the memory of those who buy decent and real entertainment in the American theater.

Hodge is not identified with any one brand—he is just good theater. I for one am not going to yell from this department just because Hodge at the box office for William Hodge in "The Judge's Husband" will have an experience of happiness in the theater. The highbrow may say that it is all applesauce. That may be true. But as long as there are critics in New York who have never seen "Able's Irish Rose" then there is hope for the American play going public.

"The Judge's Husband" was written or arranged by William Hodge for his very own purpose of making people who go to the theater have a very good time. When a man as well as a star does that—then he is not a failure.

As a play, "The Judge's Husband" is plain applesauce covered over with more sauce than apple. It is the unsound policy of a judge trying his own case. But the case is different. The judge is a woman. The theme does not ring true. It is a theme that to the last act when Hodge as a playwright and actor tells and acts the troubles that mere man has as the husband of a female judge.

The courtroom scene with the woman presiding in her own divorce suit and with her own husband opposing her is most simple theater. But in the hands of Hodge both as a playwright and as an actor it becomes most effective theater.

"The Judge's Husband" is just a piece of a vehicle that you would expect William Hodge to be in. He is an institution of happiness on the stage.

And as long as he is such an institution and as long as he insists upon writing his own plays of a certain successful type for himself and as long as "Able's Irish Rose" exists in New York, then I will find no fault with Bill Hodge, as a playwright.

William Hodge stands for happiness with all of his tricks of the

Stage Verdict

LYRIC—Mary Haynes with her wise cracking characterizations is scoring a splendid triumph on this bill, a splendid entertainer.

ENGLISH'S—"The Judge's Husband" is a poor play done as good theater.

KEITH'S—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 Bernicia in the Premier Revue.

And as poor a play as "The Judge's Husband," I recommend this same play to those who enjoy happiness upon the stage.

The cast is as satisfactory as one would expect in a William Hodge play. The one outstanding person in addition to Hodge is Gladys Hanson, and she magnificent, especially in the last act.

"The Judge's Husband" is on view today and Wednesday at English's.

LOOKING OVER NEW EVENTS AT KEITH'S

A clown has always held the favor of the public from the beginnings of the stage to the present day, and perhaps in this day of nervous tension the relief afforded by the antics of the comedian are even more appreciated. On the bill at Keith's for the week we have one of vaudeville's finest examples of the age old profession of clowning, billed as Al K. Hall. It is apparent that Mr. K. Hall takes his humor seriously. His efforts and the results he gets prove that.

It is all hokum and not a serious business the fun that is started at the first of the act and continues. In company with two women and another man Hall becomes the center of the stage and the laughs fly thick and fast.

One of the women in the act is also clever at her own brand of slapstick and with Hall furnishes much of the comedy present. Among the bits offered in the act are a burlesque Spanish dance, an original black bottom number, a burlesque impersonation of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and a wooden soldier number. For a gloom chaser this act would be hard to beat.

Some fast and snappy stepping is the offering of Harry and Denis Murphy and these two men can certainly do their stuff when it comes to intricate dance steps.

Grace Allen and George Burns have an act full of rapid comedy dialogue in which the two of them make lamb chops famous. They have a neat ending for the act in a clever little dance by Miss Allen.

Piano duets and a pleasing soprano voice are the features of Joan Jahn and the Baldwin Sisters. The two sisters are at the two pianos and Miss Jahn offers the songs.

Ed Healy and Allan Cross, with

their own idea of what a song should sound like, make a hit with the several numbers they offer.

Harry Kahne in his offering does so many things at the same time that we cannot keep up with him. How he can juggle figures and the alphabet around! Writes things backward and any old way on a blackboard and has it all done while we are just beginning to figure out what it's all about. He is a clever man at the things he does, such as finding the answers to impossible feats of addition, writing several words backward and forward at the same time, and so on.

The Del Orto open the bill with a number of Spanish dances and offer several good specialties. At the close of the act they have a surprise to offer to many of the audience.

At the close of the bill several of the acts have combined and are offering an afterpiece which is a travesty on "The Shooting of Dan McGrew."

At Keith's all week. (By John Hawkins.)

their own idea of what a song should sound like, make a hit with the several numbers they offer.

Harry Kahne in his offering does so many things at the same time that we cannot keep up with him. How he can juggle figures and the alphabet around! Writes things backward and any old way on a blackboard and has it all done while we are just beginning to figure out what it's all about. He is a clever man at the things he does, such as finding the answers to impossible feats of addition, writing several words backward and forward at the same time, and so on.

The Del Orto open the bill with a number of Spanish dances and offer several good specialties. At the close of the act they have a surprise to offer to many of the audience.

At the close of the bill several of the acts have combined and are offering an afterpiece which is a travesty on "The Shooting of Dan McGrew."

At Keith's all week. (By John Hawkins.)

MARY HAYNES STARTS A NEW CAMPAIGN

Mary Haynes has started a new campaign in her very own wise way. She is searching for daddies between the ages of eighty and ninety.

That is she is doing this in song in her new variety act. And believe it or not Miss Haynes has caught the wise spirit of the hour so successfully that she is a comedy knockout on any variety bill.

Mary in song admits that she is after them old, because the older the hour the more likely they are to understand her riddles.

Then she takes a Cook's tour and admitted in song that she made a awful mistake while in Spain, because she wore a red dress to the fight.

"Never was I so bored in all my life" she claims.

She also uses a broom and a dust rag over her head to do her impersonation of the "woman next door," who broadcasts the scandal of the entire neighborhood.

"And really," she states, "the woman next door has at least two dozen empty bottles on her back porch and they are not milk bottles either."

In other words I am trying to tell you that Mary Haynes with her very broad but mighty funny characterizations is having a big popular triumph at the Lyric this week.

Here is a woman who seems to have more pep ever year. She has the material of rapid and smart design which gets over but it is her own showmanship and personality which makes her a positive show stopping artist.

The Colleano Family is a remarkable organization of gymnasts who go whirling and jumping all over the stage. Their double and triple somersault work is remarkable. None better.

Sid Lewis is present with his eccentric stuff and his hat breaking stunt. He doesn't seem to click as easily as before with his audience.

"The Family Album" is a mighty clever and pretty dance offering as well as one of melody. An idea that is new has been worked out to present singers and dancers. Comes under the head of being a mighty good act.

Lillian and Henry Ziegler offer examples in modern equilibrium. "The Banjo and other instruments" have in the offer of Beeman and Grace. Emily Earle has worked out a splendid characterization offering in "The Table Turns." She is an artist in her work.

A right up to the minute good and corking show is at the Lyric all week.

LOOKING AT A DANCE OFFERING

We have often wondered what the dance act would look like that would (Turn to Page 7.)

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-x, but not when it has less.

Continuing yesterday's discussion, it should be remembered that the original two-bid is