



The Indianapolis Times

A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER
Owned and published daily except Saturday by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co.
214-220 West Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, in Marion County. 2 cents a copy; elsewhere, 3 cents; delivered by carrier, 12 cents a week.

BOYD GURLEY, ROY W. HOWARD, FRANK G. MORRISON,
Editor President Business Manager

PHONE—Riley, 5561

Member of United Press, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Newspaper Enterprise Association, Newspaper Information Service and Audit Bureau of Circulations.

"Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way."

Keep the Faith

Tomorrow will welcome the biennial session of the legislature, more important this year because the people have given an unmistakable mandate to the lawmakers.

That the senate and the house are of different political complexions should not prevent the enactment of laws which the people emphatically have declared they desire.

If the Republican majority in the senate is wise or endowed with any political sagacity, it will impose no obstacles to the platform pledges made by the victorious party in November. The veto power of the Governor is no more than a gesture of protest. It can not be effective against a majority vote.

The people were promised and have every right to expect some very definite action.

In the forefront is a registration law to give honesty in elections, a demand made by the League of Women Voters.

Next is the old age pension act, sponsored by the Eagles' Lodge and a law in numerous progressive states.

There also is the promise of an income tax law to replace property taxation in raising state funds, important to the farmer and the owner of real estate.

These things are contracts with the people. There are other reforms which should be given by a legislature dedicated to the welfare of the state.

This city should have the right to own and operate its street car and transportation system under nonpolitical management, with strict civil service for employees.

The pardoning power should be taken from prison trustees and placed in the hands of a separate board. The highway commission should be changed so experts have the job of spending more than twenty millions a year, instead of turning over these funds to those whose sole recommendation is their political regularity and their friendship for certain material interests.

There is a general contract underlying the specific contracts. That is to give decent government in place of partisan, political plundering.

The Expected Happens

That postmasterships have been sold by congressmen, or rather one congressman, should not occasion any surprise to those who understand the history of Indiana politics.

The moral viewpoint of the state from the time that D. C. Stephenson took charge of Republican politics would not condemn such practice, even if federal law frowns upon it.

The state has only in the last election finally freed itself from the vicious influences brought in by the apostle of hate. Nor is it wholly free now. The men who bargained and consorted and conspired with the most famous guest at Michigan City still run the party.

One phase on which the public should be enlightened is why the state and national committees last November spent time and money in trying to re-elect the congressman who now is charged with such betrayal of his powers of office.

The matter can not end with the discharge of those who paid. There still are many weeks before congress adjourns. Conceivably the vote of this one member might decide the laws of all the people.

A federal grand jury now, not after the statute of limitations has run, or his term expires, should investigate. Government by the venal and corrupt never can be good government, probably not representative government.

Obnoxious, Says Court

The United States supreme court's denunciation of illegal search and seizure as "obnoxious to the fundamental principles of liberty" is gratifying, particularly so in light of some of the court's earlier decisions. It may be that the court has rediscovered the fourth amendment to the constitution, designed to protect citizens in their homes.

The decision came in a case where prohibition agents had entered offices with a defective arrest warrant, claiming it to be a search warrant, and confiscated books and papers designed to show a conspiracy to violate the prohibition law.

The high court, reversing a lower court, ruled that the documents must be returned and that they can not be used in evidence.

Noteworthy in the opinion of Justice Butler was his declaration that the fourth amendment forbids issuance of warrants on "loose, vague or doubtful bases of fact."

"It emphasizes," he said, "the purpose to protect against all general searches, since before the creation of our government such searches have been deemed obnoxious to the fundamental principles of liberty. They are denounced in the Constitutions of every state in the Union."

The need of protection against them is attested alike by history and present conditions. The amendment is to be construed liberally and all owe the duty of vigilance for effective enforcement, lest there be impairment of the rights for the protection of which it was adopted."

The decision of the court should have a far-reaching influence in restraining the "legal lawlessness" of federal agents, which has become so common, and which many believe is a primary cause of the breakdown in respect for law.

Federal police will be less likely to resort to invasions of personal rights if they know the courts will not support them, and the higher-ups in the bureaus at Washington will act with more circumspection.

The Packer's Decree

Packers will be permitted to go into the wholesale grocery business under a decision of Justice Jennings Bailey of the District of Columbia supreme court, modifying the "consent decree" of 1920, subject of so much litigation and dispute.

The decree was an agreement between the packers and the department of justice, under which packers consented to give up dealing in all commodities except meat, if the government would drop threatened antitrust proceedings.

Although the packers express themselves as satisfied, they won only a partial victory. They will not be permitted to resume control of stockyards, terminal railroads, and market newspapers. Nor will they be permitted to engage in retail trade—and this is one of the most important parts of the decision.

The packers will be able to use their selling and distributing forces, and their branch houses throughout the country, in packing, handling and distributing all kinds of food to the doors of retailers.

Unquestionably they will become an important factor, with their vast resources, in a situation complicated by the growth of the chain store systems, and the decline of the independent merchant and wholesaler.

Justice Bailey forbade retail trade, fearing annihilation of independent dealers, and development of monopoly. But he saw no evidence of monopoly now, nor danger of it.

What the ultimate result of Bailey's decision will be, time alone can tell. At first blush, it is difficult to see how the consumer can suffer, if there is genuine competition among the packers, if they are to come into competition with chain stores and independent wholesalers, and if the independent retailers are to be preserved.

It was to preserve competition that anti-trust laws, under which the 1920 decree was entered, were designed. Wholesalers, naturally, are not pleased.

It should be noted that the judge took cognizance of changing business methods, and apparently tried to adjust the decree to conform to them as well as to the purpose of the anti-trust laws.

The packers argued, and with seeming logic, that during the last ten years conditions of production and marketing have undergone material changes, citing the tendency toward mergers, and the growth of chain stores, and that they were at a disadvantage with the restrictions imposed on them.

The Issue Clarifies

Out of the ruck of infancy and maternity aid bills now before congress emerge two measures. One is the Jones bill, almost certain of passing the senate, a bill that safely can be supported, since it re-enacts in all essentials the highly successful Sheppard-Towner act of 1921-29.

The other is the Cooper bill, a house measure that has been brought into recent prominence by letters broadcast by Mrs. Aida Breckinridge, saying that this measure "alone has the President's approval." It includes general rural health in its scope and turns administration over to the United States health service, instead of to the children's bureau.

It is interesting to know, but difficult to understand, why the President should cast his lot with the small group of medical men and others seeking to strip the children's bureau of a function it so ably administered for seven years.

One suspects the influence of Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, a medical man, who in a speech last June came into the open long enough to voice a rather remarkable doctrine.

"The care of children," he said, "is primarily a problem for trained men and women—for physicians; it is not primarily a problem of welfare, it is a medical problem."

It is said to the everlasting credit of Miss Grace Abbott, chief of the children's bureau, that she sees with more than a microscope and hears with more than a stethoscope. Had she not administered the Sheppard-Towner act with a view toward education, sanitation and social welfare as well as medical science, that act today could not be credited with the staving of 25,000 babies and more than 300 mothers annually.

Science, of course, is the answer to the disgraceful death rate of babies and mothers in the world's richest land. But since when has science been only medical? Social science, that sees also germ-laden slums, unsanitary homes, ignorance and poverty, will save these precious lives better than any unassisted medical bureau.

The matter can not end with the discharge of those who paid. There still are many weeks before congress adjourns. Conceivably the vote of this one member might decide the laws of all the people.

A federal grand jury now, not after the statute of limitations has run, or his term expires, should investigate. Government by the venal and corrupt never can be good government, probably not representative government.

Editorial

The United States supreme court's denunciation of illegal search and seizure as "obnoxious to the fundamental principles of liberty" is gratifying, particularly so in light of some of the court's earlier decisions.

It may be that the court has rediscovered the fourth amendment to the constitution, designed to protect citizens in their homes.

The decision came in a case where prohibition agents had entered offices with a defective arrest warrant, claiming it to be a search warrant, and confiscated books and papers designed to show a conspiracy to violate the prohibition law.

The high court, reversing a lower court, ruled that the documents must be returned and that they can not be used in evidence.

Noteworthy in the opinion of Justice Butler was his declaration that the fourth amendment forbids issuance of warrants on "loose, vague or doubtful bases of fact."

"It emphasizes," he said, "the purpose to protect against all general searches, since before the creation of our government such searches have been deemed obnoxious to the fundamental principles of liberty. They are denounced in the Constitutions of every state in the Union."

The need of protection against them is attested alike by history and present conditions. The amendment is to be construed liberally and all owe the duty of vigilance for effective enforcement, lest there be impairment of the rights for the protection of which it was adopted."

The decision of the court should have a far-reaching influence in restraining the "legal lawlessness" of federal agents, which has become so common, and which many believe is a primary cause of the breakdown in respect for law.

Federal police will be less likely to resort to invasions of personal rights if they know the courts will not support them, and the higher-ups in the bureaus at Washington will act with more circumspection.

REASON

BY FREDERICK LANDIS

POLITICAL conditions in Chicago are clearing rapidly. The Republicans failed to agree on a candidate to beat Thompson for the nomination for mayor, Big Bill now having three opponents.

If all three stay in the fight, Thompson will be renominated.

And then Bill's enemies will go into a huddle and decide to elect the Democratic candidate as has been done before.

It involves no party loyalty, inasmuch as Thompson openly favors Ruth Hanna McCormick in her late fight for the senate, supporting James Hamilton Lewis.

Factional fights among Illinois Republicans are about the most savage and complicated affairs in the nation, this being due, not to any unusual barbarism among the statesmen, but to the great G. O. P. majority and the absence of a state boss capable of swinging the whip of authority.

The need of protection against them is attested alike by history and present conditions. The amendment is to be construed liberally and all owe the duty of vigilance for effective enforcement, lest there be impairment of the rights for the protection of which it was adopted."

The decision of the court should have a far-reaching influence in restraining the "legal lawlessness" of federal agents, which has become so common, and which many believe is a primary cause of the breakdown in respect for law.

Federal police will be less likely to resort to invasions of personal rights if they know the courts will not support them, and the higher-ups in the bureaus at Washington will act with more circumspection.

The packers express themselves as satisfied, they won only a partial victory. They will not be permitted to resume control of stockyards, terminal railroads, and market newspapers. Nor will they be permitted to engage in retail trade—and this is one of the most important parts of the decision.

The packers will be able to use their selling and distributing forces, and their branch houses throughout the country, in packing, handling and distributing all kinds of food to the doors of retailers.

THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

M. E. Tracy
SAYS:

The Mexicans Find it Hard to Believe Our Intentions Are Good When Our Manners Are So Bad.

EL PASO, Tex., Jan. 7.—Except that the Mexicans don't want to sell any territory; couldn't if they did, since their constitution expressly forbids it, and regard every move made by Americans with that end in view as a gratuitous insult, Senator Ashurst's proposal to buy Lower California and part of Sonora is all right.

People in other sections of this country may be able to ignore it, or laugh at it, as just one more of those useless affronts which have played such a prominent part in our attitude toward Mexico, but down here, they can't.

Down here, where so many activities and enterprises hinge on a good understanding between the two countries, they can't see the funny side of irritating Mexico with suggestions which humiliate her, but which have no possible chance of success.

Not Fair to Mexico

IT is quite true that the Colorado river flows some miles through Mexican territory before emptying into the gulf of Lower California, which entitles Mexico to some share of the water and complicates the irrigation problem.

The economic and political advantage we would gain through exclusive control of the river is obvious. So, too, is the economic and political advantage we would gain by acquiring the fertile land which lies adjacent to it, as well as the rich mineral resources of Lower California.

But it is our idea of international equity and fair play to wave money in a neighboring government's face and demand the right to buy some of its territory every time we see an economic or political advantage?

Of course it isn't, but how are we going to make the Mexicans or Latin Americans understand that it isn't with proposals like that of Senator Ashurst cropping up every so often?

See Sinister Move

TRAINED to be subtle, and naturally polite, the Mexicans misconstrue our crudeness. What appeals to us is no more than a coarse bit of humor, or a little windjamming, cuts them to the quick.

They find it hard to believe that intentions can be good where manners are so bad. Taught never to put the worst foot forward, they assume that no one else does, and they can't get over the idea that there must be something more sinister behind the scenes than appears on the stage.

If the Colorado moves us to bid for Lower California and a part of Sonora, they argue, why won't the Rio Grande move us to bid for half a dozen more of their states some day, and if we can't buy them, why not let us try to take them just as we did a third of their territory in 1848?

All things considered, the Mexican and Latin Americans have a far more genuine excuse for some of their alarms than we have for some of our bullying, browbeating antics.

Rio Grande Has Value

THE Colorado represents exactly the same kind of problem as the Rio Grande, though on a rather smaller scale, and could be handled with rather less difficulty.

The Rio Grande flows between the United States and Mexico for about 1,000 miles, not only separating them, but contributing something of great value to each.

When our government built the Elephant Butte dam, ninety miles above El Paso, it agreed to allow Mexico a sufficient share of the water to irrigate 25,000 acres of land at all times, which is about one-sixth of the whole.

That was no more than fair, since 80 per cent of the water now being used in the Brownsville country comes from Mexican tributaries of the Rio Grande.

Editor Times—Democrats and Republicans in the next legislature should remember that the controlling issues of the last campaign were economic and the "upssets" were a protest against waste, extravagance, and excessive taxes. Another "protest" will come in two years if relief is not given.

When there is so much unemployment, such a slump in business and farm products, the lowest in twenty years, it seems presumptuous, the height of folly, to talk increased public expenditures. And yet every state legislature is holding up its hands for more money for "pressing needs."

A lot of these "needs" are for new "power plants." Some promoters are trying to "work" the state for some "patent" system, when the old plant is good for years. And now comes Purdue university and asks for an increase of a million dollars over the last appropriation. These theoretical educationalists seem to believe that money grows on trees. I am not opposed to education. I want all the children to have the best training possible. I have helped a dozen students get through college, but I decidedly am opposed to this waste and extravagance in our schools from the township to the universities. Look at the budget of Purdue. For the next two years Purdue asks for \$591,682 for "special expenditures" in lands and buildings. And yet four years ago it got for state schools a "special" tax of 2 cents to run for ten years—amounting to \$15,000,000 for "building purposes."

This levy was granted on the proviso that it was "in lieu" of special appropriations for building purposes for ten years. Why this demand now for more? The agricultural experiment and educational departments are asking \$150,000 more. This is for the purpose of sending a lot of young "theoretical" men out over the state to teach the farmers how to set a hen or raise a pig.

Farmers know more about their work than the "traveling agents" and "walking delegates" of this institution. Purdue was established by the national government in 1870 as an "agricultural college" and if managed as such the federal appropriations would support it. But it wants to teach everything under the sun.

Of the 4,544 students now enrolled only 395 are in the school of agriculture. Let us open the books. The annual report of Purdue for the year ended Sept. 30, 1929, shows total expenditures of \$5,023,484.91. Taking present enrollment of 4,544, this means an average of \$1,100 a student a year.

Of this amount \$195,647.47 was spent for athletics. Among the items was \$6,158.83 for "competition expenses." Was that for buying football players? Iowa university was outlawed for that practice. The budget committee has a sacred and important duty to perform. Too often such committees are "packed" for special interests, like the state schools. Their work is more perfunctory than accurate or practical.

What is the average height of the Japanese people? Five feet, one inch.

</