

The Coalition In '47

HOPE on the Republican agenda, tagged for "immediate action" when the 80th Congress convenes in the Case Bill, passed by the 79th Congress and vetoed by President Truman. Its principal provisions: Re-establishment of a Federal Mediation Board to replace the U. S. Conciliation Service; prohibition of strikes and lockouts for 60 days after a request for collective bargaining in a labor dispute; prohibition of strikes and lockouts in public utilities until five days after recommendations have been made by a Presidential commission; exclusion of supervisory employees from Wagner Act protection; legal liability of Wagner Act protection for employees engaged in an authorized strike; application of anti-trust laws to unions engaging in price-fixing, secondary boycotts or restrictive practices. Along with the Case Bill, the G.O.P. has also tagged for "immediate action" amendment of the Wagner Act to outlaw closed shop contracts. Further major revisions of the Wagner Act will be scheduled for committee hearings.

This adds up to drastic revision of the Federal labor code, and labor unions, of course, will fight the program to the death. In the event of expediency, if for no other reason, President Truman will probably veto the Case Bill and the major amendments to the Wagner Act. The fate of the Republican labor program, then, will depend upon G.O.P. ability to muster a two-thirds majority in Congress to over-ride the President.

The Republicans, of course, do not have such a majority in their own ranks. Moreover, regardless of Party policy, many Republican Congressmen from industrial districts will probably heed the cries of the union voters they represent. To sustain its labor program the G.O.P. will have to look to a renewal of the 79th Congress coalition with dissenting Democrats. Then, will depend upon G.O.P. ability to muster a two-thirds majority in Congress to over-ride the President.

There has been no major change in the composition of Southern Congressional delegations; the great Republican landslide missed the Solid South, as usual, and except for a few who were removed by death or political accident, the South will send to the 80th Congress the men who represented it in the 79th. Their original

vote in favor of the Case Bill was overwhelming, not was it affected materially when they faced that final test of Party loyalty, a vote to over-ride a Democratic President. Here's the vote, by states:

	To Over-ride	Over-riding
Virginia	8	0
North Carolina	8	0
South Carolina	8	0
Alabama	8	0
Florida	5	0
Tennessee	6	2
Georgia	6	0
Mississippi	4	0
Arkansas	7	0
Louisiana	7	0
Oklahoma	6	0
Texas	6	0
Total	86	11

In all probability the Southern vote will represent the balance of power, in labor matters at least, in the 80th Congress. In swinging that balance between Republican labor legislation, the Southern bloc will certainly be following the desires of its constituents; the South is, as it always has been, anti-labor, and the current attitude of John L. Lewis has lent that attitude a new violence.

But, regardless of the merits of the Republican labor legislation, the figures demonstrate once again the manner in which the South's one-party system reduces the system of party government to chaos. The Republican labor program represents one extreme, the Administration the other. If the Party system were working the clashing of these two extremes would probably result in some sort of compromise. As it is the vote seems likely to be on an all-or-nothing basis, with Republicans seeking to take advantage of the major breach in Democratic discipline to ram through their program in toto. If it falls, the Southern Democrats, who might have served as a conservative voice in the other Party, will be, as usual, out in the cold.

The effect of a one-party system is to prevent orderly change, and frequently any change at all. It may very well serve, in this instance, to preserve the present status quo in labor legislation. And here again we have a tremendous inertia, with Republicans seeking to take advantage of the major breach in Democratic discipline to ram through their program in toto. If it falls, the Southern Democrats, who might have served as a conservative voice in the other Party, will be, as usual, out in the cold.

An Investment In People

THE current crisis in education, brought on by the shortage of teachers and the need for increased salaries to bolster public school facilities, is nation-wide. But in the South, caught as always with a limited income, is facing a peculiar threat—the danger of increasing the cost of education between educational levels in the region and elsewhere.

Teacher pay is a fairly exact measurement of educational standing; where pay is high schools are good, where pay is low schools are poor. And, even though the Southern states, working against great odds, have been steadily climbing in the national ratings, they still remain at the bottom of the heap. (North Carolina's 1944 teachers pay scale was 32nd in the nation, a gain over 1940's 36th place. South Carolina was 49th.)

Pulling abreast the national average is, in itself, a long-range goal. But the danger of losing sight of it in these hectic days when the discussion is of an emergency nature, and large and impressive surpluses are being poured into the treasury. Moreover there is the usual reluctance to face up to the fact that any permanent improvement is going to mean new taxes.

It is encouraging, therefore, that 100 Chambers of Commerce in the South are now tackling the problem, beginning with complete surveys of educational conditions in their home communities. And, although they too are steering away from any official discussion of new taxes, they are

nevertheless facing one of the prime realities: The fear that increased local or state taxation will hamper the South's effort to attract new businesses and industries.

By indirection at least, Laurence P. Dickie, director of the Southeastern Division of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has advanced the thesis that money invested in education, even if it requires higher taxes, may be the best method of insuring industrial growth. He admits that many businessmen "look upon school taxes as a poor investment, because dividends come only years later when school taxes are complete. His answer to that is immediate emphasis on adult education "which pays off almost immediately."

This, of course, is still cautious talk. But if the Chamber of Commerce carries out a great crusade based on its slogan, "Invest in People," it would certainly help to better down the greatest barrier to educational progress—the failure of too many of us to understand that, slow though the process may be, the tax dollar spent on education is the only one that pays dividends directly to the investor. Surely an investor interested in locating in the South would not be frightened away by an increased tax bill, if he were also assured that the return for his money he would have given access to a pool of skilled labor, a stable environment, and a market with steadily increasing purchasing power. There may be a little sociology mixed in with this, but it is a sociology that is sound. From here it looks like the acme of good, hard business sense.

Another Voice

Evolution Of The Language

THE SHELBY STAR raises an editorial eyebrow when noting that an opposing school team "pulverized" the Shelby school. Pulverized, remarks the editor on the authority of Webster, means to grind into tiny particles, or something like that. A group of young men who are literally pounded to powder must be something to behold.

But pulverized is merely one of many devastating terms employed by our ingenious sports writers. Gridiron terms, they assure us are "noised out," "overpowered," "smashed," "crushed," "routed," "man-handled," "pounded," "brushed aside," "walloped," "slapped down," "trounced," and "demolished." Others are subjected to an even more interesting rhetorical fate.

Which indicates the rapid evolution in the meanings of words since sports began to command such widespread popularity. While the statement in a sports news story that one team "pulverized" another might shock an English professor from England who knew nothing of American sports and the new language thereof, no football fan would be shocked by the verbiage employed.

Smoking Is Forbidden In The U. N. Council Hall

That has been that you see is possibly caused by rubbing together a couple of dry speeches.

People's Platform

Case For The Barbers

CHARLOTTE, Nov. 29.—The Citizens' Committee, I have dispatched the following letter to the General Assembly of North Carolina.

As citizens of North Carolina, we are requesting that the State Legislature amend a section of the Barbers Law, that imposes an unjust penalty or license fee upon barbers for the sole purpose of supporting the Barbers Board.

For several years the Barbers of this State have and are still bled with exorbitant license fees and other taxes imposed upon them to practice as barbers in North Carolina.

The following is requested:  
I. Examination and annual license fee for Master Barbers for the first year is \$20.

II. An additional \$5 annual fee, thereafter.

III. The town or city where the shop is located requires a license fee of \$10 per year.

IV. The State requires an additional \$2.50 annual license fee for the same chair.

V. The State Board of Barber Examiners requires every barber shop to pay an annual license fee to operate the shop.

VI. Every barber is required to pay additional tax on the purchase of equipment and supplies, plus a sales tax, income or earners tax, plus that of food, clothing and other necessities.

VII. The total cost for each barber, for each chair, to practice on the chair is, \$25.00 for the first year, and \$10.00 succeeding years, plus enormous taxes required for other necessities.

The only provision of the North Carolina Barber Law that has been in the section covering sanitary provision. This being the case we are requesting that the State, County or Town bear the expense of the barber inspection out of Public Tax Fund, and remove the unjust license fee imposed upon the barber which has for its primary purpose to support this private agency known as the State Board of Barber Examiners.

The enforcement of sanitary rules and regulations of restaurants and other establishments is financed out of public funds; why not for barbers and barber shops?

We challenge the State Board of Barber Examiners, the State of North Carolina, any agency or individual to point out any constructive features carried on by the State Board of Barber Examiners other than being empowered by the State of North Carolina to demand or impose upon barbers shop barbers by forcing them to pay unnecessary license fees for the sole purpose of supporting itself, and the State Board of Barber Examiners out of their shops since the establishment of the Board.

The State Board of Barber Examiners was created by legislative act in 1929, to regulate the practice of barbers in North Carolina at the expense of the poor barbers of North Carolina. The Board members are paid a fee during traveling expenses, plus hotel expenses, to ride over the highways of North Carolina to impose unjust hardships upon barbers at the expense of the barber.

Negro Barbers are required to share equally with

Question Or Guarantee?

CHARLOTTE, Nov. 29.—The Rev. Herbert Spangh said in his writing that Christ said to the thief on the cross, "This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" My Bible says: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

Statue To Harry Truman

ONE labor leader who won't forget his grudge against President Truman is silver-haired A. F. Whitney, head of the Railway and Trades Union. Whitney takes this story about a mythical statue to be erected to Truman in Washington.

Let's put the statue next to the Washington Monument. Proposed one member of the committee to honor Harry Truman.

"No, George Washington never told a lie," replied the committee member representing the railroad.

"Well, let's put it next to Roosevelt's statue," was another suggestion.

"No, Roosevelt always kept his word," replied the trainman.

"Finally, the trainman suggested that Truman's statue be put next to that of Columbus."

"Because," replied the trainman, "Columbus didn't know where he was going, and didn't know where he'd been when he got back."

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

Two Senator Tiffs

OHIO is now supposed to have two Senator Tiffs—Bob and

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.

It looks as if he has won the verdict in one of the latests tepid tempers in Capitol Hill annals.