

# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

FRIDAY, APRIL 8, 1949

## PROGRESS IN FIGHTING ALCOHOLISM

THERE is a great amount of uncertainty about the possibility of curing an alcoholic—justified uncertainty, to an extent—for it's possible that there are some drinkers so completely under the domination of alcohol that escape is blocked.

But there are some persons who insist that you can't help an alcoholic. And with this attitude most thinking persons will take issue. Alcoholics Anonymous, for instance, has proved that an alcoholic is seldom hopeless, that wise guidance and the availability of opportunity can pull a man out of the deepest hole.

However, it is this view of alcoholism—that it is beyond hope and that it deserves no help—which is going to prove dangerous, we fear, in legislative attempts to establish the long-needed special facilities for alcoholics at Camp Butler.

A measure now before a House Finance subcommittee would authorize new facilities for the treatment of alcoholics, presumably at Camp Butler, and would increase the liquor tax by one-half of one percent to provide the funds.

One can almost assume that the bill has been enacted into law, for it is not only a measure, why it should not be. Legislators have in this bill that ideal situation in which the man who is served—and the man or woman who may be served—pays for the service.

And the need is evident. Last month, for

instance, a considerable amount of trouble was raised at Dix Hill, a State hospital for the mentally ill where North Carolina sends its alcoholics. A woman—an alcoholic—was found confined in a ward for the mentally ill, where she could have received an extremely dangerous mental shock.

No one knows exactly why she was put there; doctors at the hospital said they knew of no medical or psychological reason for confining the alcoholic in a ward for the mentally ill.

And it will solve nothing to blame the staff of the hospital for it; with alcoholics and the mentally ill thrown together in one institution such things will happen.

James Street, a novelist who lives in Chapel Hill, spoke for the special facilities bill, calling upon the committee to "get the alcoholics out of Dix Hill."

Rep. John Umstead, a member of the Hospitals Board which would control the institution, said that alcoholics need "something to do along with . . . treatment." At Butler, he said, the patients would be able to engage in farming, building, plumbing and other occupations.

Credit is due Rep. Frank M. Kilpatrick who introduced the bill. It is an enlightening attempt to get the state out of the mental mud in which all progressive movements to regenerate alcoholics have bogged down.

## THE WRONG TARGET

GOVERNOR SCOTT'S blast against the lobbyists who frequent the rotunda of the State Capitol, and who are called by name, primarily because he called them by name. Other than that, the Governor merely directed attention to a situation which has existed for a long time.

Everybody knows that all lawmakers, local, state, and national, are at one time or another, individually and collectively, subjected to the cajolery, persuasion, flattery or threats of paid lobbyists. The North Carolina General Assembly is no exception.

The lobbyist has not only assignments—to influence legislation. His ability is measured by his influence on lawmakers, and his remuneration is determined by his success and by the importance of his work to the client.

He is part and parcel of the American political machinery, and is recognized as such by the laws which require him to register and identify the clients he represents.

It is undoubtedly true that he generally places the interest of his clients above that of the public—whenever there is a conflict between the two—but that is his job.

Governor Scott's vexation with the lob-

byists—he called them "The Third House"—stems from his disappointment over the slow progress of his Go Forward program, especially in the Senate. It is quite understandable.

But when he blames the lobbyists, he diverts attention from an even more serious issue of public exposure and censure—the lawmaker who permits himself to be influenced to act against the interest of the public. Not that those who oppose parts of the Go Forward program are acting against the public interest. Some of them are sincere in their opposition, believing that Go Forward has set too fast a pace for the State.

An ideal lawmaking body would be one composed of individuals who are completely impervious to appeals by individuals and pressure groups and whose every decision on pending legislation would be measured by their convictions on the merit of such legislation.

It is quite likely that we will never attain such a high, impracticable level in the development of our democracy. But the difficulty of attainment should not discourage or dismay us; rather it should challenge us to greater effort.

## COMPROMISE IS IN ORDER

THE State Senate was in character yesterday when it refused to concur in House amendments to the road bond issue measure which separated the \$300 million bond public debt and the one-cent increase in the gasoline tax.

Once before the Senate had expressed its disapproval of the House view by tabling the two original House bills, and everyone knew that the action would be repeated. Now the controversy will go to a conference committee of the two Houses in an effort to reach a compromise.

It is impossible to know what form such a compromise will take, or even that there will be a compromise.

The opponents of the road program in the Senate have been ready for every move to leaving the bond election and the gas tax increase tied together, provided that the Senate will agree to delete from the ballot any written reminder that approval

of the bond issue will mean an automatic increase in the gas tax.

It is doubtful that the House will be satisfied with the relatively mild concession by the Senate. On the contrary, any agreement which is reached may involve other pending legislation on which the two houses differ.

Although the rural road program in its present form was originated by Governor Scott and was not a main point of contention in the primary last year, it has definitely become a public issue over which there is a difference of opinion. That difference is nowhere more apparent than in the General Assembly itself.

In view of the inability of the legislators to agree on the issue, the wiser course would be to adopt some compromise and then let the people settle the question. That is the only way in which we will ever get a final answer.

## REMEMBER TO REGISTER

PROPER registration is a necessary preliminary to the exercise of the franchise; without it, there would be no way to have an orderly election, free from duplicity and multiple voting.

It imposes on the voter the obligation of getting his name on the registration books if he wishes to participate in elections. Yet it requires a minimum of effort and time.

Because of the recent extension of the city limits, it has been necessary for every voter in the city to register anew—no matter how many times he has registered in the past. An entirely new set of books, conforming to the new precinct lines, is to be filled in before the forthcoming city primary and election.

Despite the wide publicity given by every conceivable means, there are still many people in Charlotte who do not exercise the simple fact that they cannot vote in the city primary and election unless they register again.

The only danger to our form of government—local, state, or national—is the apathy of citizens who do not exercise their right to vote. If all the people take part in electing their public officials, there can be no error.

Unless there is an awakening to the urgency of this new registration, it is entirely possible that the city primary will be decided by a distinct minority of those qualified to vote.

The News urges each of its readers to

take advantage of the special schedules arranged by the County Board of Elections, and register some time in the next two weeks.

Farm auctions, community sales and buildings built for their convenience over the county comprise a mammoth business. They have been our local community sales barn the ones conducted in Sullivan, Charleston and Taylorsville for years. Their sales run from \$30,000 to nearly a hundred thousand dollars if a single day. A newcomer in the area is the initial sale held in Newton last week when over \$200,000 worth of used farm machinery alone was sold in one day. Over 1,000 persons attended the Newton sale, swamping restaurants and available food was sold by 12:30 o'clock. *Mattson (The) Journal-Gazette.*

This may seem like repetition but Charlotte, the milk man, has lost his place again and offers us a quart of undiluted milk to advertise the fix he's in. He is sure that he neither dropped them into the milk bucket or lost them on the route and advised his customer to examine the milk and path to the front door and report any trace of them that may be detected. *Omega (Ga.) News.*

Corn believed to be more than 4,000 years old, says an AP story, has been reported found in central New Mexico . . . radio comedians, please note.

## 'Get Out My Clean Uniform.' I Might Be In Society'



## Roundup And Review

### Three Months Of Congress

WASHINGTON  
PRESIDENT TRUMAN has a score of seven runs, nineteen hits, and two errors in the first three months of his dealings with the 80th Congress, a roundup by Congressional Quarterly shows.

Out of 63 legislative items which the President has asked Congress to act on, 35 have been completed on five and started on nineteen, of which six have progressed as far as passage by one house or the other. None of the legislative points has received action, though it's agreed on all sides that the big fights are still to come.

Of the 35 items, two victories and two defeats in skirmishes with Congress over items which were not a part of the formal legislative program to set against the public interest. Some of them are sincere in their opposition, believing that Go Forward has set too fast a pace for the State.

An ideal lawmaking body would be one composed of individuals who are completely impervious to appeals by individuals and pressure groups and whose every decision on pending legislation would be measured by their convictions on the merit of such legislation.

It is quite likely that we will never attain such a high, impracticable level in the development of our democracy. But the difficulty of attainment should not discourage or dismay us; rather it should challenge us to greater effort.

On the other hand, the President struck out with the Committee on the National Security Resources Board and with his recommendation that the Senate change the rule to limit debate by a similar majority vote. The Senate Armed Services Committee tabled the bill, and the President's recommendation was not acted on.

As the first deal Congress ended its first 90-day session with a record of 35 items completed, 19 started, and 35 items pending. The President himself, along with the Vice-President and Speaker of the House, got a pay raise in January.

COMPLETED ACTION  
The five points of the Presidential program on which action had been completed were:  
1. Authorization for a \$100,000,000 contribution to the U.N. for relief of refugees from the Palestine fighting.

2. Extension of export controls.  
3. Extension of authority for industry agreements on voluntary allocations of scarce materials.

4. Extension of authority for transportation priorities and allocations.  
5. Extension of rent.

There was some dispute over who won the rent control fight. In signing the bill, the President said it represented a slight defeat for the real estate lobby. But Robert P. Gerlach, chairman of the President's National Security Resources Board, said the "Congress turned aside the plea for a tightened and tougher rent control bill, and wisely set a pattern for decisions which the House must follow if they see fit."

When the House during the first three months were a National Science Foundation bill approved by the Senate and the Reciprocal Trade Bill, Governmental Reorganization bill and also tax relief, approved by the House. The House also met the other Presidential program items, including the extension of the Taft-Hartley Act, which he said the Administration did not have enough votes to repeal.

He was also pleased about civil rights, minimum wages—which Truman wants increased to 75 cents an hour—and the national health bill. The Vice-President told a Washington Post reporter that he was "pleased" about the extension of the Taft-Hartley Act, which he said the Administration did not have enough votes to repeal.

When an employer underpays his workers, is he helping to create an unemployment problem and adding to the list of unemployment? If each individual felt his share of responsibility for the welfare of the whole, and when you see the crowd bringing, what is achieve perfection; but we would come much closer.

—DORA ELLIS.

People's Platform

Patching Our Society

Editor, The News:

I AM constantly amazed at us Americans, though we are a "pretty decent lot." We keep busy discussing means of patching instead of removing the maladjustment. I see nothing wrong with patching a break in any machinery, but why not at the same time correct the faulty arrangement which caused the break?

Just now there is a great deal being said about socialized medicine. Some doctors don't like it; but would it ever have become a suggested remedy if the doctors had not arranged medical practice on a co-operative of their own that wherever possible they would be secured without social insurance?

appropriation bills. The House whacked only \$779,000,000 million from budget estimates totaling \$179,000,000. And it promised to put most of that back if an expected 10 per cent drop in construction costs didn't materialize.

STILL AWAITING ACTION

Bills to carry that these other points on the President's program had been reported by committees in one of both houses and were awaiting floor action:

1. Farm storage facilities—reported in Senate.  
2. Comprehensive housing bill, including permanent public housing, farm housing, and housing research—reported in Senate.

3. Extension of the European Recovery Program—under debate in the Senate and reported in House.  
4. Payment of war damage claims of neutrals—reported in Senate.

5. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act—reported in both houses.  
6. Re-enactment of Wagner Act—reported in both houses.

7. Amendment of Wagner Act to prohibit jurisdictional strikes and "unjustified" secondary boycotts, to prevent use of economic force to decide issues arising out of interpretation of existing contracts, to settle or prevent strikes in vital industries and the public interest—reported in both houses.

8. Increase the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour and broaden coverage—reported in House.  
9. Statehood for Hawaii—reported in House.

10. Statehood for Alaska—reported in House.  
11. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
12. Statehood for Alaska—reported in House.

Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
12. Statehood for Alaska—reported in House.  
13. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

14. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
15. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
16. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

17. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
18. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
19. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

20. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
21. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
22. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

23. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
24. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
25. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

26. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
27. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
28. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

29. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
30. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
31. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

32. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
33. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
34. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

35. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
36. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
37. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

38. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
39. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
40. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

41. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
42. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
43. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

44. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
45. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.  
46. Pay raise for Congress—reported in House.

## Marquis Childs

## Prove Him Right

THE struggle began a long time ago in this country to regulate big business. Commissions were set up to umpire the coming competition in an effort to keep the free enterprise system free.

In a recent attempt big business won and the regulatory system took a heavy blow. The case, before the Federal Power Commission, involved the right of Government to force competitive bidding on a \$60,000,000 bond issue put out by the powerful banking house of Dillon, Read & Co.

The bonds were those of the Texas Gas Transmission Co., which is financing through Dillon, Read a pipeline extension. Another big bond issue, the \$100,000,000 bond issue put out by the powerful banking house of Dillon, Read & Co.

Instead, Dillon, Read contacted with twelve large insurance companies to take the whole issue at a higher interest rate. Shortly before the contract deadline, the Federal Power Commission was asked to approve the transaction.

Chairman Nelson C. Smith and Commissioner William Wimbrey joined to veto the majority of the Commission's decision. Draper was seriously ill and Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan disfigured himself by having a previous connection with one of the parties to be served by the pipeline.

Smith and Wimbrey found that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know it until they find an increase in their gas bill.

The cost of financing the pipeline, which will serve consumers in the North states, goes into the total cost on which rates are based. If it costs more to finance than it should, then rates will be higher than they should be.

A strong undercurrent drive is on in Congress to free natural-gas producers of regulation. As a start, bills have been introduced to take certain producers out from under regulation. There are those who see a chance to make a big killing and a quick killing in the deregulation of the early railroad promotions.

But here, too, as Old suggests, the average citizen is likely to miss it. If you can exempt the financial deal, then the commission will be in a position to enter into the question of reserves. But what happens to hundreds of thousands of Households who are affected by such a decision? What happens if the supply runs out?

Old's claim on the commission is that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know it until they find an increase in their gas bill.

The cost of financing the pipeline, which will serve consumers in the North states, goes into the total cost on which rates are based. If it costs more to finance than it should, then rates will be higher than they should be.

A strong undercurrent drive is on in Congress to free natural-gas producers of regulation. As a start, bills have been introduced to take certain producers out from under regulation. There are those who see a chance to make a big killing and a quick killing in the deregulation of the early railroad promotions.

But here, too, as Old suggests, the average citizen is likely to miss it. If you can exempt the financial deal, then the commission will be in a position to enter into the question of reserves. But what happens to hundreds of thousands of Households who are affected by such a decision? What happens if the supply runs out?

Old's claim on the commission is that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know it until they find an increase in their gas bill.

The cost of financing the pipeline, which will serve consumers in the North states, goes into the total cost on which rates are based. If it costs more to finance than it should, then rates will be higher than they should be.

A strong undercurrent drive is on in Congress to free natural-gas producers of regulation. As a start, bills have been introduced to take certain producers out from under regulation. There are those who see a chance to make a big killing and a quick killing in the deregulation of the early railroad promotions.

But here, too, as Old suggests, the average citizen is likely to miss it. If you can exempt the financial deal, then the commission will be in a position to enter into the question of reserves. But what happens to hundreds of thousands of Households who are affected by such a decision? What happens if the supply runs out?

Old's claim on the commission is that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know it until they find an increase in their gas bill.

The cost of financing the pipeline, which will serve consumers in the North states, goes into the total cost on which rates are based. If it costs more to finance than it should, then rates will be higher than they should be.

A strong undercurrent drive is on in Congress to free natural-gas producers of regulation. As a start, bills have been introduced to take certain producers out from under regulation. There are those who see a chance to make a big killing and a quick killing in the deregulation of the early railroad promotions.

But here, too, as Old suggests, the average citizen is likely to miss it. If you can exempt the financial deal, then the commission will be in a position to enter into the question of reserves. But what happens to hundreds of thousands of Households who are affected by such a decision? What happens if the supply runs out?

Old's claim on the commission is that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know it until they find an increase in their gas bill.

The cost of financing the pipeline, which will serve consumers in the North states, goes into the total cost on which rates are based. If it costs more to finance than it should, then rates will be higher than they should be.

A strong undercurrent drive is on in Congress to free natural-gas producers of regulation. As a start, bills have been introduced to take certain producers out from under regulation. There are those who see a chance to make a big killing and a quick killing in the deregulation of the early railroad promotions.

But here, too, as Old suggests, the average citizen is likely to miss it. If you can exempt the financial deal, then the commission will be in a position to enter into the question of reserves. But what happens to hundreds of thousands of Households who are affected by such a decision? What happens if the supply runs out?

Old's claim on the commission is that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know it until they find an increase in their gas bill.

The cost of financing the pipeline, which will serve consumers in the North states, goes into the total cost on which rates are based. If it costs more to finance than it should, then rates will be higher than they should be.

A strong undercurrent drive is on in Congress to free natural-gas producers of regulation. As a start, bills have been introduced to take certain producers out from under regulation. There are those who see a chance to make a big killing and a quick killing in the deregulation of the early railroad promotions.

But here, too, as Old suggests, the average citizen is likely to miss it. If you can exempt the financial deal, then the commission will be in a position to enter into the question of reserves. But what happens to hundreds of thousands of Households who are affected by such a decision? What happens if the supply runs out?

Old's claim on the commission is that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know it until they find an increase in their gas bill.

The cost of financing the pipeline, which will serve consumers in the North states, goes into the total cost on which rates are based. If it costs more to finance than it should, then rates will be higher than they should be.

A strong undercurrent drive is on in Congress to free natural-gas producers of regulation. As a start, bills have been introduced to take certain producers out from under regulation. There are those who see a chance to make a big killing and a quick killing in the deregulation of the early railroad promotions.

But here, too, as Old suggests, the average citizen is likely to miss it. If you can exempt the financial deal, then the commission will be in a position to enter into the question of reserves. But what happens to hundreds of thousands of Households who are affected by such a decision? What happens if the supply runs out?

Old's claim on the commission is that the F.P.C. did not have power to require competitive bidding on the bonds. But Commissioner Leland B. Smith, who was on the commission had taken the opposite stand only a month before in another case.

In his dissent Old used vigorous language that rises above the technical jargon ordinarily employed in such matters. What he thinks of the old Commission members is so acute:

"The record in this case presents a spectacle of an applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity deliberately abused the Commission's review of the initial financing and endeavoring to render the Commission's respect to one of the basic issues of the proceeding. I cannot recall a more flagrant abuse of the public utility authority. If this applicant is successful in frustrating commission

approval of its financing, there is no reason why another applicant cannot use the same stratagems as this applicant. A pipeline project, such as construction, road, gas, or electric, etc."

This kind of news that ordinarily finds its way onto the financial pages where the average citizen is likely to miss it. But, as Old points out, millions of Households are affected by such a decision. Usually they don't know