

# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

J. THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher  
H. R. DOWD, General Manager  
B. S. GRIFFITH, Executive Editor  
C. A. McKNIGHT, Editor

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1949

## A DIFFICULT DECISION

EACH passing day brings closer the time when many of us must make our choice between two very nearly matched candidates for mayor—Mr. Shaw and Mr. Baxter.

Not in a long time have Charlotte voters turned themselves in such a perplexing quandary.

We consider their character and moral fiber: both are honest, upright gentlemen. We look at their record as citizens: both have been active in behalf of the public and have led directed many worthy community projects.

We examine their claims for the job: Mr. Baxter claims a record of progressive programs. Mr. Shaw has not been in office, lays down an equally impressive pledge for progress.

We study the big issues: there are none, either than the mild, friendly, somewhat satirical bantering at one another you can expect in any campaign.

We even seek to find an answer to that profound question: "What to do about new taxes?" of the mayor? But no answer emerges. Both gentlemen are so photogenic that it is reasonably sure the winning man's contentment will grace the paper next week during the next two years.

Faced with such a difficult choice, and with full knowledge that the affairs of the City will be in good hands no matter who is elected, The News finds itself unable to lean one way or the other to its readers.

The third candidate, Mr. Dunaway, made his certain defeat even more assured when he announced he would try to oust one

administrative official. That is a matter for the incoming Council and we would be suspicious of any candidate who sought to prejudice the efficiency and faithfulness of any City administrative or salaried employee.

In any event, we must remember that the Mayor of Charlotte has little positive power. It is his duty to preside over Council meetings, and to represent the city at a multitude of functions. The mayor can, of course, lead and inspire the Council and the people of the city, but the Council's decisions are supreme.

For that reason, The News would urge its readers to examine the list of candidates for the Council with utmost care; to meet them and talk with them if possible; to note what pledges they make in the papers or on the air or in printed material. Charlotte, like every other American city, is facing difficult days. Pent-up demands from the war years, plus new demands caused by a fast increasing population, call for extensive public projects which will run into the millions. Yet sources of revenue are limited, most of them having been appropriated by the Federal and State Governments. We will need new sources of revenue. We will also need an uncommonly wise and prudent one.

There is every reason to believe and hope that the pool of candidates for the Council contains seven or eight men, not the long list of available candidates, seven men who will find it pleasant and profitable to work harmoniously with the affable, personable man who will be our next mayor.

## A WORKABLE COMPROMISE

THE members of the 1949 General Assembly who are wending their weary ways back to Raleigh today for what may be the last week of this session still have one major issue to settle before they can pack their bags and go home for good.

They must decide what's to be done with that \$30 million postwar cushion fund. A bone which has been determined in the present dispute. In all probability a compromise will be worked out whereby education will get more than \$5 million—perhaps \$15 million—of the original \$30 million. The House originally sought.

It is estimated that \$18 million would be enough to permit the State to establish the \$2,200-\$3,600 salary scale for its school teachers, as proposed by Governor Scott.

This would be made possible by reducing the number of new teachers from 1,600 to, perhaps, 800 or 800, a course which would appear to be wise anyway, since it is doubtful the State could find 1,600 well qualified new teachers in the next two years, or that there is classroom space for them.

Let us hope that some such compromise will be worked out. The Senate's reluctance to spend the whole reserve fund on current expenses is understandable. It would set up a scale of State services which would probably prove to be maintained in future years without additional taxes.

But it would be safe, and wise, to take approximately half of that amount for boosting our low teacher salaries in the interim, and hold the remaining half until 1951. That would accomplish three things:

1. Give the teachers a better living wage;
2. Leave \$15 million as protection against a drop in or no new teachers;
3. Reduce the reserve fund to the point that it wouldn't be sought after so hungrily by supporters of various causes.

## NEW BEER - WINE LAW

THE news was almost lost amid the big battles over roads, school buildings, and teacher salaries, but one of the best pieces of legislation passed by the General Assembly was the bill placing beer licenses under the State ABC system.

The measure does not take away from county governments and municipalities the joint power to regulate the sale of beer. It does, however, place the issuing of licenses, and a concurrent power to revoke them, in a new mail division of the ABC Board of General Agents, and a large number of special enforcement officers with full police authority.

Public hearings will be required on all new licenses; strict qualifications for license holders are prescribed; existing licenses where beer is sold will be carried out.

From The Sportsman Herald

## IS TEMPERANCE WINNING?

WE are told the liquor makers are running ahead of consumption, the people are still drinking, but drinking has decidedly less than in years past. Consumption of liquor last year was less than the year before, and the year before, it was less than the year before that, thus showing a continuing decrease in the amount of liquor being consumed.

There has never been any argument with those who advocate temperance, even for temperance sake, because it is sane, and decent and becoming more and more a standard attitude among thoughtful people.

Then there is another influence at work.

## TOFT AND NEW DEAL

PROBABLY more than anyone else, Sen. Robert Taft of Ohio has the reputation of the Republican Party. Therefore, when he called for a broader social program in an

"Get Something We Can Switch To In Case Of A Thaw?"

Joseph Alsop

## The New Old South

WASHINGTON  
ONE of the most significant political phenomena in Washington this week has been the announcement that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has passed the Taft amendment to the European Recovery authorization bill. The bill, which was introduced by Sen. Walter George of Georgia, would increase the amount of money available for the program to \$10 billion. The bill has been passed by a vote of 60 to 37.

In order to grasp the meaning of George's new line, which is the policy now being followed by the country, it is necessary to go back to the past. It was George, for instance, who participated in the negotiation of the British loan agreement; fought the battle for the loan in the Senate; and, when the bill was passed, he went along with every major foreign policy measure since that time.

There has been, of course, the Southern conservative tradition. At the beginning of the New Deal administration, there was still a marked difference between right-wing Southern Conservatives and Northern Conservatives, even on domestic issues. The House of Representatives and the Senate were filled with the old-fashioned agrarian political defeatist of Wall Street. Franklyn Roosevelt in the early New Deal years.

The labor issue, and the connected racial issue, ended all that. By the close of the second Roosevelt administration, when domestic questions were the order of the day, right-wing Southerners were well to the right of most of their Southern brethren. Yet in the dangerous months before Pearl Harbor, men like Harry Byrd and James Eastland were leading interventionists. Although the anti-Wall Street attitude had been replaced by the more moderate, the old-fashioned agrarian political defeatist of Wall Street. Franklyn Roosevelt in the early New Deal years.

NEW ALLIANCE  
George's line of questioning in the Foreign Relations Committee might signify an important new development. The issue of foreign policy is now an issue of domestic policy, the

Miserable Example  
WASHINGTON  
THE award of the week for blockading and tackling and general all-around obstruction must go to Sen. Paul McCarran. Although the House has passed the McCarran bill, the Senate has not yet acted on it. McCarran's bill would require the State to establish a salary scale for its school teachers, as proposed by Governor Scott.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

The House group approved moving the date to July 1, 1949, as it is in the present law. The House group also made it possible to admit those who have lived from Curtin counties in the State of origin since the end of the war.

This country is creating a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.

McCarran's stubborn stop at the Senate has been making a miserable example of a House Judiciary Subcommittee which approved changes that would be prepared to increase the present law, eliminating the present law, and increasing the present law to 100 percent of persons admitted must of an agricultural background and 40 percent of the total must be from the State of origin. McCarran has made it virtually the first order of business to push for more jobs.



Roscoe Drummond

## The New Farm Program

(Reprinted from The Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON  
IF the Administration's new farm program can do all its advocates say it will it is hard to escape the conclusion that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan has turned up with a sure-fire formula for perpetual motion.

Mr. Brannan, testifying before the Senate and House Agricultural Committees during the past week, is saying:

"That American farmers can be continuously guaranteed high prices... That American consumers can be assured lower prices... That all this is not going to cost any more, perhaps less, than the Government has been paying out in support program during the war years."

Well, that's something. In fact, it is more than something. It is nothing less than political paradise and economic utopia all wrapped in one lovely package.

All we have to ask is whether it is done with mirrors, or in a concealed panel in the magician's box?

It is an entirely straight face. Secretary Brannan says he has nothing up his sleeve, that there is no sleight of hand in his argument when he calmly tells Congress what many Congressmen like to hear: that all he has to do is a way of guaranteeing more food at lower prices to the producer.

WHO HOLDS THE BAG  
AND who holds the bag? If the farmer is to gain and if the consumer is to gain, who, exactly, pays the difference? Mr. Brannan doesn't exactly bear down on this point. In fact, it can be said that he touches it very lightly. But it seems that Mr. Brannan has said of his new program thus far, this is the way it would work:

First, the Government no longer would try to keep up the market prices of major farm commodities. They would be allowed to decline to a normal level dictated by supply and demand. This is just what the consumers would welcome and there are, 140,000,000 of them. Next, the farmer would continue to get, not the lower consumer-market price for his major commodities, but high "parity" prices. These would be guaranteed by the Government and, when the market prices were lower than the guaranteed parity price, the treasury would make up the difference. This is just what the farmers would welcome. There are 10,000,000 of farmers. Certainly the farmer couldn't lose here.

Finally, and here Mr. Brannan slips quietly into generalities, the Secretary of Agriculture gives the impression that it would be economical to the extent that it may cost less than the price-support program now in operation.

There was no hedging in Mr. Brannan's statement, or a little more closely.

PERHAPS it is right here that the mirror is being turned a little bit at an angle; that right here there may be at least a tiny, little concealed panel in the magician's box.

Somebody is going to have to pay, and we might as well find out who.

## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON  
A TIP-OFF that the Democrats are definitely planning a special session of Congress this Summer was let out by the bag the other day by Senate Majority Leader Scott Ladd. There had to be a special session because the Republicans, as Sen. James Eastland, Mississippi Democrat, said:

"Eastland stopped Lucas in the Senate cloakroom and said to a man on the Republican side who had any idea of politics, 'Lucas added, "As long as they are men like Wherry (Minority Leader Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska), they're not going to get it.""

"We're going to let them go on like they are until we adjourn," he continued. "Then we'll call a special session and come back and pass the President's program. After that, we'll go on the Republican side and have a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

"There had to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate," he continued. "Then we'll call a special session and come back and pass the President's program. After that, we'll go on the Republican side and have a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

## Quote, Unquote

Special Judge W. H. S. Burgwyn attests to his own justice. Could it not be, Judge, that the law is being applied to the women?—Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News.

This emphasis on "lightness" in beverages was unknown back in the home town, where anything under 90 proof was regarded as a skimmed whisky.—Athens (Ga.) Citizen.

There would, of course, be controls over production. But if they are used to hold production down very consistently they will be more than the farmers have been willing to accept in the past, and if the controls are not substantial, the amount which the Treasury will have to pay to maintain the subsidy will be greater and greater.

There is simply no gimmick by which farm producers' prices can be kept high and food consumer prices can be allowed to drop, unless somebody pays. The Treasury will pay, and that means that nearly everybody will pay.

Then why is Mr. Brannan's plan such sweet politics? For it isn't sweet politics—and I wouldn't say it wasn't—it is just about the most palatable method of spending the taxpayers' money yet devised.

There are several reasons why this proposal has been called "the most wonderful bill ever compounded in the pharmacy of politics." The benefits to the farmers and the consumers are immediate and clearly visible. The extent to which the farmers and consumers will have to pay for these benefits themselves out of their own increased taxes are deferred and invisible. There will be no item on the income tax return which will show the farmer and the consumer exactly how much his tax is paying to underwrite the farm subsidy.

WELFARE DISTRIBUTION  
FURTHERMORE, the proposed farm subsidy offers a new device for the redistribution of wealth. It works out in two ways. The subsidy goes to the rich, relatively, but is paid for by the many, by all who pay taxes. This makes the share which the farmer pays for his subsidy proportionately lower than the rest.

It is very likely, indeed, in what amounts to a not paid for uniformly by the consumer in the form of taxes since the income tax, being graduated, does not fall uniformly upon all consumers.

Most farmers seem to welcome the Brannan program, but the farmer who gets a guaranteed annual income from the Government without heading into Government control of his farming, he is very likely to be a Republican. As for Senator Alben Barkley, the liberal Republican from the old-fashioned State of Kentucky, said: "If the Government is going to guarantee high prices to agriculture, shouldn't the Government guarantee high prices to industry?"

Special Judge W. H. S. Burgwyn attests to his own justice. Could it not be, Judge, that the law is being applied to the women?—Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News.

This emphasis on "lightness" in beverages was unknown back in the home town, where anything under 90 proof was regarded as a skimmed whisky.—Athens (Ga.) Citizen.

There would, of course, be controls over production. But if they are used to hold production down very consistently they will be more than the farmers have been willing to accept in the past, and if the controls are not substantial, the amount which the Treasury will have to pay to maintain the subsidy will be greater and greater.

There is simply no gimmick by which farm producers' prices can be kept high and food consumer prices can be allowed to drop, unless somebody pays. The Treasury will pay, and that means that nearly everybody will pay.

Then why is Mr. Brannan's plan such sweet politics? For it isn't sweet politics—and I wouldn't say it wasn't—it is just about the most palatable method of spending the taxpayers' money yet devised.

There are several reasons why this proposal has been called "the most wonderful bill ever compounded in the pharmacy of politics." The benefits to the farmers and the consumers are immediate and clearly visible. The extent to which the farmers and consumers will have to pay for these benefits themselves out of their own increased taxes are deferred and invisible. There will be no item on the income tax return which will show the farmer and the consumer exactly how much his tax is paying to underwrite the farm subsidy.

WELFARE DISTRIBUTION  
FURTHERMORE, the proposed farm subsidy offers a new device for the redistribution of wealth. It works out in two ways. The subsidy goes to the rich, relatively, but is paid for by the many, by all who pay taxes. This makes the share which the farmer pays for his subsidy proportionately lower than the rest.

It is very likely, indeed, in what amounts to a not paid for uniformly by the consumer in the form of taxes since the income tax, being graduated, does not fall uniformly upon all consumers.

Most farmers seem to welcome the Brannan program, but the farmer who gets a guaranteed annual income from the Government without heading into Government control of his farming, he is very likely to be a Republican. As for Senator Alben Barkley, the liberal Republican from the old-fashioned State of Kentucky, said: "If the Government is going to guarantee high prices to agriculture, shouldn't the Government guarantee high prices to industry?"

## Democrats Plan For Summer Session

WASHINGTON  
The Democrats are definitely planning a special session of Congress this Summer was let out by the bag the other day by Senate Majority Leader Scott Ladd. There had to be a special session because the Republicans, as Sen. James Eastland, Mississippi Democrat, said:

"Eastland stopped Lucas in the Senate cloakroom and said to a man on the Republican side who had any idea of politics, 'Lucas added, "As long as they are men like Wherry (Minority Leader Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska), they're not going to get it.""

"We're going to let them go on like they are until we adjourn," he continued. "Then we'll call a special session and come back and pass the President's program. After that, we'll go on the Republican side and have a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

"There had to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate," he continued. "Then we'll call a special session and come back and pass the President's program. After that, we'll go on the Republican side and have a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."

It was going to be a special session because the Republicans caused a sudden strike in the United States Senate."