

THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher
J. B. DOWD, General Manager
S. S. GRIFITH, Executive Editor
O. A. MCKNIGHT, Editor

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1949

THE GRAHAM PEACE FORMULA

SPEAKING in St. Louis the other day, Senator Frank Graham renewed his plea that the United States take the leadership in strengthening the United Nations by (1) abolishing the veto in matters involving aggression, (2) insuring international control and inspection of atomic power, (3) strengthening the World Court, (4) widening the responsibilities of the General Assembly, and (5) organizing an international police force.

It was not the first time that Senator Graham had urged such a course of action. What was significant was that he said it should be done even at the risk of starting a third world war.

Frank Graham is a peaceful, gentle man who abhors violence in any form. Yet there is no incongruity in his forthright demand for revision of the United Nations.

He didn't say it in so many words, but the inevitable conclusion is that Frank Graham believes there will be a "monstrous totalitarian tyranny" (can) prevent the accomplishment of any effort to further the cause of world peace and world peace.

The world, then, is between the feasibility of a third world war or the leave the U. N. as it is, and the risk of a third world war if we force a revision of the U. N.

Not everyone will agree with these two alternatives. Benjamin Cohen, assistant Secretary General of the U. N., told the annual convention of radio news directors Saturday that:

"Newspaper reports indicate that United Nations is facing a series of successive failures."

THE CHANGE IN A MAN

JOSEPH C. HARSCH, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, is too good a newspaperman to be dazzled by his proximity to the major attractions around the capitol. He manages to keep his perspective, never, most capital correspondents.

The other day Mr. Harsch thumbed through his file on President Truman, turning back to the challenging days following the death of President Roosevelt. He found there a man who was anxious to be a "welfare statesman" who was anxious for the U. S. to return to normalcy, who wanted to get rid of all wartime controls as soon as possible, who wanted to get government out of labor-management relations and quickly, and who, most significant of all, starting liquidating all the "progressive" programs which were still around the White House and surrounding himself with conservatives.

The other day, in St. Paul, Minn., Truman made a talk in St. Paul, Minn.,

which he outlined his Fair Deal in ten general points, so phrased that you would find it hard to object to any one of them.

He was talking about the government's responsibility to the people, and he was talking about the government's responsibility to the people, and he was talking about the government's responsibility to the people.

But the mere preparation for war is an uncertain deterrent to war. Senator Graham would remove what he considers the main threat to peace. That he would do so at the risk of a third world war is a measure of his growth. It now recognizes, as a U. S. Senator, the true nature of a politico-economic creed which is too tolerated, as a university president.

Mr. Culbertson doesn't think revision would bring about another World War. He believes that the world organization, even if Russia should withdraw, would be so powerful in human and material resources for waging war that Russia would be deterred from any further aggression. And without aggression, Mr. Culbertson believes, there will be no cause for war.

In any case, our nation has dedicated itself to preparing itself, and the allies for another war. As long as the threat to peace exists, we will continue to do so.

But the mere preparation for war is an uncertain deterrent to war. Senator Graham would remove what he considers the main threat to peace. That he would do so at the risk of a third world war is a measure of his growth. It now recognizes, as a U. S. Senator, the true nature of a politico-economic creed which is too tolerated, as a university president.

in which he outlined his Fair Deal in ten general points, so phrased that you would find it hard to object to any one of them. He was talking about the government's responsibility to the people, and he was talking about the government's responsibility to the people, and he was talking about the government's responsibility to the people.

But the mere preparation for war is an uncertain deterrent to war. Senator Graham would remove what he considers the main threat to peace. That he would do so at the risk of a third world war is a measure of his growth. It now recognizes, as a U. S. Senator, the true nature of a politico-economic creed which is too tolerated, as a university president.

The man has changed. Perhaps it has been a change of the heart. We like to think that is it, anyway. But the suspicion lingers that Mr. Truman has found out that the best way to get rid of the wartime controls is to get rid of the wartime controls, and that getting votes is more fun than fighting for principles.

When we start squaring accounts some years from generations hence, we may very likely find that the welfare state is really for the welfare of the politician, rather than of the people.

INEQUITY IN HEALTH COSTS

IN a news editorial on consolidation of the two local health departments last week, it was pointed out that overall economic conditions could not be expected at first. In the long run, consolidation will prove more economical.

Some of the figures on costs quoted in the editorial bear out the impression that consolidation would make their health services cost more on a per capita basis than they cost at present.

In one sense that will be true. If the County Government should absorb the total cost of a consolidated department into its budget, county residents would bear one-fifth of the whole burden. Now they pay for one-fifth of the service rendered exclusively in the area beyond the city limits.

But it is interesting to note that health services in the "county" area are already costing more on a per capita basis than they are in the "city."

The Institute of Government report estimates Charlotte population at 139,529 and county population at 38,172. The amount budgeted for health within the city this year is \$200,541.02, or \$2.21 per capita. The amount budgeted for health outside the city is \$90,238 or \$2.36 per capita.

Since the "city" dwellers now pay for all of their own health service and more over pay for four-fifths of the cost of health service outside the city limits, they are in effect footing most of the bill for a service which is more luxurious on a per capita cost basis, than they get themselves.

This is just one of the inequities which consolidation would eliminate.

From The Louisville Courier-Journal

TAX-FREE 'CHARITY'

SUPPOSE a private university, to cite an example we know something about, uses its endowment funds to build a warehouse business, then leases that business to a great chain store, and pockets the resultant income without paying any taxes at all — is that a fair deal to competing warehousemen or to the taxpayer?

We think not. The university uses the income, of course, for a justifiable free purpose, the education of the young. But it is in effect entering the business field on a privileged basis, no matter how charitable a foundation it is. It operates the business. Extend the practice far enough, and the government will find itself increasingly short of taxable revenue.

That the practice is gaining is shown by a recent U. S. Treasury report. The amount of business now legitimately escaping taxation is estimated at nearly \$10 billion a hundred per cent in the last five years. It represents total receipts on which nearly 10,000,000 organizations are paying no income taxes whatever.

The organizations include a variety of charitable, educational and other foundations and associations, mutual sav-

'Mighty Fancy, Boss—Where Are We Going?'

DESPITE the differences between Administration and Senate Democrats on the issue of the location of the Capitol building, the House of Representatives today voted to support the Administration's plan to build a new Capitol building in the city of Washington.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

Senate Box Score

Party Unity

By Congressional Quarterly

DESPITE the differences between Administration and Senate Democrats on the issue of the location of the Capitol building, the House of Representatives today voted to support the Administration's plan to build a new Capitol building in the city of Washington.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.

The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan. The House vote was 341-100, with 100 Republicans voting against the Administration's plan.