THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 1949

MR. TOBIN'S WAGE LEVELS

IF Congress believes its right hand knows what its left hand is doing, it had best take another look.

A new bureaucratic wrinkle, strictly legal under a previous Congressional act, has enabled Secretary of Labor Tobin to circumvent the statutory minimum wage law and boost minimum wages in certain key industries much higher than the law provides.

The operation came to light this week as the Government opened hearings on a union request to boost the minimum pay on Federal contracts in the aircraft industry to $1.15 an hour.

Under the terms of the Walsh-Healey public contracts act, the Secretary of Labor can determine what the "prevailing rates" are in industries doing business with the Government. Only employers paying those rates can get contracts.

Congress is at present studying an increase in the minimum wage law which provides a floor of 40 cents an hour in interstate industry. The Administration wants it boosted to at least 75 cents; opponents want it held where it is, or at least not boosted to more than 60 cents.

But while the debate rages, Mr. Tobin merrily goes his own way. Just this week he announced new rates for a portion of the iron and steel industry of $1.04 an hour for apprentices in the South to $1.23 for skilled help in the North and Midwest. The previous "prevailing rates" had been 45 and 62 cents an hour respectively.

And now the aircraft workers want their base pay raised to $1.15 an hour, considerably higher than the Administration's fondest hopes for the national minimum wage level.

As the General Electric representative testified at the hearing:

"While Congress is being told to set minimum wages by law at 60 to 75 cents an hour, Mr. Tobin is using a device which, if successful, may effectively establish the minimum wage in industry after industry at levels up to almost double that amount.

"While Congress is seeking general waste elimination in the Federal budget and demanding a one billion cut in military expenditures, Mr. Tobin—with apparently no interference from the White House and Secretary of Defense—seems to be seeking to raise costs of military purchases over the current market.

"This of course fits nicely into the union's drive for a fourth round wage hike and the Administration's open advocacy of the pump priming approach to a situation where economy is what Congress and the public desire."

TAR HEEL POLL TAXES

NORTH CAROLINA has little stake in the present Congressional battle over abolishing the poll tax other than our concern for preserving states' rights in the matter. This state long ago decided that the poll tax should not be a prerequisite for voting.

But now that the subject is in the news again, it's an appropriate time to renew our long, and so far fruitless, campaign to get the silly thing taken completely off the books in Tar Heelia.

In a recent issue of *The State* magazine, Mecklenburg's Victor C. King related the history of the poll tax in North Carolina.

It was first adopted in 1738 as a source of revenue to defray the expense of Colonial courts. All individuals over 16 years of age had to pay the tax but—mark this, men—Indians, slaves and women were exempted from the tax.

At that time the ownership of property determined a man's right to vote. The poll tax had nothing to do with it, so it was called at that time a "head" tax. Subsequently the General Assembly repealed the tax, but it was included in the 1868 State Constitution and the revenue was allocated to the care and upkeep of roads. If you couldn't pay the tax, you had the right to work on the roads for two days per year. Or you could furnish a team and wagon and thereby relieve yourself of the necessity of paying the tax.

As it stands today, the tax is levied on males between 21 and 50 years old, and the amount it produces is so piddling that the thing is more of a nuisance than a revenue producer. Mecklenburg County charges up slightly more than $44,000 to its taxpayers. At $2 a head, that means only about 22,000 of the eligible males are trapped. The City of Charlotte charged up last year slightly over $11,000 at $1 a head. And if there aren't more than 11,000 men between the ages of 21 and 50 in Charlotte, the census people are way off.)

The tax ought to be abolished.

1. It's a head tax, and no American ought to have to pay a tax for the privilege of being an American.

2. It is discriminatory in that it applies only to males in the 21 to 50 age group.

3. It cannot be enforced. Unless you own real property or purchase an automobile, there are no records for the tax collectors. Thousands of men never pay it at all.

4. It is a petty tax, producing a small amount of money, yet requiring the tax collection offices to set up complicated bookkeeping systems to keep poll tax accounts apart from other revenue. The extra bookkeeping costs certainly absorb a part of what little the City and County Governments do collect.

We would suggest to Governor Scott that it would help us Go Forward if he would throw his weight behind a movement to rid the people of this nuisance, a hang-over from an era in which we didn't know any better.

FEARLESS FOSDICKS?

WE are mightily pleased that Governor Strom Thurmond of neighboring South Carolina didn't mean what the newspaper accounts of his speech on the movies last week had him saying.

"My remarks . . . were misinterpreted," the Governor said, explaining that "I did not intend to convey the impression that I was advocating state control or censorship of movies."

The Governor was referring to his speech before the S. C. Sheriffs' Association at Charleston at which he was quoted as saying:

"Pictures presented in this state should portray the law enforcement officers as heroes, not as scoundrels."

He called such movies "detrimental to society," said they should portray officers as "fearless, decent" men, and promised to "go to bat" for the Sheriffs to see what he could do about getting them treated more respectably by Hollywood.

It now develops that the Governor was really thinking about taking the matter up with the movie people. "If results could not be obtained in this way, then other steps could be taken . . . In view of the known desire of the movie industry to regulate and censor its own productions, I feel certain the industry can be persuaded to accomplish this purpose without recourse to official censorship."

Well, we guess no harm will be done if the Governor wants to file a complaint with Hollywood. Everyone else seems to be doing it these days, and one more taboo in the long list of Hollywood taboos won't make movies any less courageous documentaries of our civilization than they already are.

But we've an idea that the South Carolina sheriffs aren't quite so sensitive about their movie models as the Governor is. They probably get as much of a bang out of the big-footed, bumble-headed, "Uh-huh" police sergeants whomped up by Hollywood as we do.

And we suspect that they are quite aware that among their own numbers, as indeed among all men of all vocations, there are some who don't deserve the "fearless, decent" standard Governor Thurmond would have the movie people adopt.

For our part, if and when we run across real-life officers who are villains, we'll write stories about them. Failure to do so would be a good deal more "detrimental to society" than the truth.

From The Raleigh News & Observer

A COLLEGIATE ILLUSION

MANY junior college teachers still labor under the illusion that a junior college is simply the first two years of the senior college," says Dr. J. X. Magnifico of the Richmond Professional Institute. Maybe that is pure illusion but a lot of other folks are under that illusion, too. In fact, the idea that a junior college is just a sawed-off college seems to be the prevalent impression. If junior colleges are something else altogether, not only such junior college teachers but the public also needs some enlightenment.

There can be no question that the increasing number of junior colleges in this country are serving a valuable educational purpose. Also there seems little doubt that there are all sorts and all grades of junior colleges. Some definitely bring their students to the reality of higher education and others merely extending secondary education just a couple of years longer.

It may be that the junior colleges themselves and not merely some teachers in them need a clearer idea of exactly what their special function is. It would be magnificent if this Dr. Magnifico could provide it.

A small town is the place where a man doesn't have to explain how he received a black eye. The natives have already heard. —*Jackson (Miss.) Daily News.*

Mowing the yard in this kind of weather leaves the mower in worse shape than the yard was in. — *Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News.*

The head of the Ku Klux Klan has offered his assistance to the Government, and if the Government has any rock it needs broken, it should take him up. — *Dallas (Texas) Morning News.*

'Guess I'm Sure Of Another Term, Anyhow'

James Marlow

Years Of Tension

WASHINGTON

AMERICAN planners are looking forward to years of tension between the West and Russia.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Army chief of staff, said this clearly in his statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday.

He was urging Congress to approve speedily this country's plan to arm Western Europe against any Russian attack. And he said:

"With our allies, strong or weak, as they may be, we face a long period of tension.

"Now that the Atlantic Pact has been formed we can surely anticipate that any aggressor (he didn't name Russia) will alternately press and quell the crises, hoping to hold the signatory powers in perpetual irresolution."

But how long will it take to arm Western Europe? Defense Secretary Johnson told the same committee about four or five years.

So, if the plan starts this year, Western Europe should be pretty well armed by 1953 or 1954.

This doesn't mean that by then the armies of Western Europe would be strong enough to defeat Russia, if she attacked.

It means—according to the American planners—that Western Europe would be strong enough to hold off the early stages of an attack until this country could go to its defense.

Bradley said it would be up to the armies of our allies to bear the brunt of the early attacks until we could mobilize.

In the meantime? Bradley said we'd swing into action with the atomic bomb and our long-range bombers.

But, meanwhile, what about the Russians? If Europe were armed and we could bomb Russia with the atomic bomb, would Russia be likely to attack at all unless she too had an atomic bomb?

That raises the question of time and Russia's ability to make the bomb. And it brings back a warning which isn't mentioned often now but was issued only two years ago this month.

In July, 1947 a committee of five men, appointed by President Truman to study this country's aviation needs, issued a report, called "Survival in the Air Age." It said:

"We should have an air arm in being capable of dealing with a possible atomic attack on this country by Jan. 1, 1953."

An earlier commission appointed by Mr. Truman—called the President's advisory commission on universal training—had warned that other powers (and that meant Russia) would have atomic weapons between 1951 and 1957.

But Secretary Johnson said Western Europe, through our arms plan, would be armed by 1953 or 1954.

That would mean it would be ready for an attack somewhere around the time the President's two commissions said Russia might have atomic bombs of its own.

But if, by the middle 1950's, we have atomic bombs, Russia has atomic bombs, Western Europe is armed, and Russia's armies are powerful, as they are now, what then?

It's anybody's guess. No wonder Bradley said we "face a long period of tension."

But Mr. Truman, Secretary Johnson and Gen. Bradley argue that there's less chance of Russia attacking at all if Western Europe is armed.

People's Platform

More On ABC Figures

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

IT'S right warm to be getting into an argument with The Charlotte News over the ABC situation—especially when a newspaper always has the last word.

In "Setting the Record Straight", your editorial of July 27, you indicated that my budget figures for $244,560 increase, in five budget items over the 1948 budget, were incomplete in that "it did not include ABC funds which subsequently came in and were budgeted".

May I say that you have failed to include in your figures supplemental funds which you know will also have to come in for this year's budget, "which will accordingly again increase these items in 1949-1950."

The point I made was that although the County gets half a million dollars from ABC, yet the tax rate continues to increase and even with your supplemental appropriations, shows a marked increase for this year over last.

Take one budget item increase of $105,676 for Aid to Dependent Children. Would it not be interesting if an actual case survey were made to show exactly how many of these poor children's plights were made worse or caused by the use of alcohol by the parent or parents? Do you really think that if Rowan votes in liquor stores taxes will go down?

Mr. Editor, I said in my little talk in the First Baptist Church in Salisbury Sunday that the legal sale of liquor was morally wrong, economically unsound and politically unwise. I wish you would print it all.

The late great statesman, the Hon. Josephus Daniels, repeatedly said, "A.B.C.—Alcohol Brutalizes Consumer". That wise statement still holds true.

—FRANCIS O. CLARKSON.

Note Of Appreciation

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

ON behalf of the Charlotte Lions Club, I wish to personally thank you for the splendid newspaper publicity that you accorded us in connection with the concert which the Rossler City High School Band gave at Freedom Park on July 12 under the sponsorship of our club.

We deeply appreciate this fine co-operation.

—E. B. GRAEBER
Past President Charlotte Lions Club

Highway Department Plans

RALEIGH

Editors, THE NEWS:

I READ with interest your editorial entitled "Miracle of the Law." It occurred to me you might like to know a few more details about the Highway Commission's plan for purchasing equipment.

Your editorial stated that the Commission will spend all of the ten per cent equalization fund, or $20,000,000 for equipment, thereby making it unavailable for the purposes outlined in the bond act. The Commission actually intends to borrow $5,000,000 from the equalization fund and pay this sum back through rental of the equipment to various highway divisions. This means the money will be spent for the purposes intended; and, also, that the equipment itself will be paid for by the counties in which it is used. Dr. Jordan has already made it clear that the Commission has no intention of spending $20,000,000 for equipment and it is unlikely that more than $5,000,000 will be required as a loan.

—WILLIAM D. SNIDER
Director of Public Relations

Solicitations Commission

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE just read your editorial in The News of July 28 on the "Solicitations Commission."

It's a fine one, indeed. To my mind it presents the problem for public consideration in the way in which it should be done.

Thank you for it. I know it will be helpful.

—FLOYD F. KAY
Executive Vice-President
Charlotte Chamber of Commerce

Editorial Criticized

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

I HAVE read with nausea and disgust your vitriolic and wretchedly peurile attack on the last great statesman on earth, Winston Churchill.

However, I recall you excoriated him in the same way for his Fulton, Mo., speech. The principles he put forth then have been adopted by the Western world in the form of the Atlantic Pact.

Furthermore, I predict that the voters of England will heed the words of Churchill in the next election and eradicate those woefully inept men who are administering Socialism to the English people with the aid of a capitalistic bounty provided by the USA.

—J. P. BALSE.

More On Radio Music

LINCOLNTON

Editors, THE NEWS:

I NOTICED a piece in the People's Platform recently about the early morning radio programs. I listen to them nearly every morning. Sometimes the records played are so lousy, I have to turn them off. There are an awful lot of mediocre records being made and the disc jockeys do not seem to have any ear for good tunes.

However, early morning is not the worst time on the radio by any means. Up in the day, the soap operas and other silly programs begin to come in. Perhaps the worse thing inflicted on a long suffering public are the vocal quartets. There are several of them, but they all sound like a bumblebee in a jug. No tune.

It would seem that the makers of radios and the sponsors of the programs would try to make them interesting. Not much use to advertise if the public has to turn them off in self defense because of the lousy script.

— G. N. RAMSEY.

Robert C. Ruark

Prefixes! Suffixes! Bah!

NEW YORK

GOT up the other day feeling pretty gruntled. The sun was shining and I felt fairly sheveled as I tied my tie. Reasonably kemp. Not peccable at all. Only a man with a neck full of feck can know exactly how I felt.

This is not to say that I am without daunt, but merely that I am with feck. I've got as much feck as feck in my neck. And if I blush to say it, even if I am the fellow whose argument is sometimes footful, quite often my constituents are dainful of me.

But even all these odd attributes do not prevent me from knocking the English language, which is gradually working itself out of a job. It is bobbytrapped today with a flock of words and housenules I would just love to mothball in the Smithsonian Institute.

Disgruntled, for instance. Ever know anybody who was gruntled? Cuspidor, for Pete's sake. Who cusps? Feckless. You know anybody's got a hunk of feck? Ever try to buy a half-pound of daunt? If a man is sometimes feckless, footless or disdainful, when does he possess a nominal amount of feck, foot or dain?

PHOOEY ON WHOM

Ever since I was old enough to cuss I have been sore at the word "whom." It is unnecessary as a chaperon on a honeymoon. It means exactly the same thing as "who", but it is an awkward word that sneaks and creeps and peeks around in a sentence, like a Peeping Tom.

Same thing with "which", "what" and "that". I've been eating off a typewriter since I was 20 and I'm still not sure of when to use them. To avoid the bother of fretting over the correct choice, I'd gladly settle for either "which" or maybe "niich" and save everybody a lot of needless trouble.

My original impression of language was that it was designed to carry messages. But the shapers of speech gradually got so impressed with their importance that they weighted it down with a flock of formal trivialities and by-laws that serve no purpose except to annoy.

This business about prepositions, which and or that you're not supposed to end a sentence with—Who walks at the head, tail or middle of a sentence? And that "whom", again. I've spent half of my reading life reshuffling sentences, trying to get the "whom" sorted out of the clutter.

Does a man say "to whom do you suppose she is married, now?" when all he wants is a simple answer like "No" or "Joe Smith"? He does not, indeed. He says "Who's she married to now, y'know?" because an answer as cheap as either "no" or "Joe Smith" is certainly not worth a lot of brain belaboring.

I BEFORE E

We come presently to the "I" before "E" except after "c" stupidity that they hit the kids with. It can make no tiny difference in the word "receive" if it is spelt that way, or if it is spelt "receive". Same letters. Same number of letters. Same sound. Same meaning. Who gets cheated?

When you say "a bunch of people were fighting in the street" you are dead wrong, and have to go prowling all the way back to the head of the sentence to remember that "bunch" is singular and must agree with the other end, so it comes out "a bunch WAS fighting." Phooey. Everybody says "were" unless they are showing off for the preacher.

I am still knocked for overlasting the word "ain't." "Ain't" is a fine, hardworking, dues-paying word, the actual social superior of "am not" which connotes superfluous refusal to comply, or the assified "aren't". But both "ain't" and "aren't" carry a parasite, a nasty little mark called an "apostrophe", a pipsqueak squiggle that has been lining off the relatives for years and should be fired into the street.

You will forgive my outburst, but alone I am a kind of bootcatcher of the language, my neck bows when they overload the hod with inferior bricks. The prettiest sentence I can remember, in the modern language, was when the apeman looked at the girl and said, quote, me Tarzan, you Jane." That one had everything, and it wasn't weighed down a lick by functionless frivolities.

BETTER ENGLISH

By D. C. WILLIAMS

1. What is wrong with this sentence? "Over and above these facts, let me present these figures."
2. What is the correct pronunciation of "florid"?
3. Which one of these words is misspelled? Resilience, radience, experience.
4. What does the word "emasculate" mean?
5. What is a word beginning with sub that means "to conquer by force"?

ANSWERS

1. Say, "In addition to these facts." 2. Pronounce the o as in on, not as in no. 3. Radiance. 4. To weaken; to destroy the power of. "These measures, if not emasculated by amendment, will help restore prosperity." 5. Subjugate.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

GOP Still Rowing Over New Chairman

WASHINGTON

ALL is not harmony inside the Republican National Committee as it nears the job of picking a new chairman. It was hoped that when Pennsylvania's Hugh Scott, a Dewey man, resigned, diverse GOP factions would bury the hatchet and pull together. But they haven't.

Today, there is just about as much inside dissension as there was over controversial Hugh Scott.

This time the feuding is over the top candidate for the chairmanship—Guy Gabrielson of Bernardsville, N. J., national committeeman from New Jersey.

Last week the chairmanship appeared to be all set for Gabrielson. Since then, sudden and stiff opposition has developed. For one thing, it is strongly suspected that he is a Stassen man. Even more important, Republican Congressmen from New Jersey are almost solidly opposed. En bloc they called on ex-Speaker Joe Martin, and registered their objection. Usually it's an honor to have a national chairman selected from your state, but in this case New Jersey Congressmen wanted to forego the honor—if Gabrielson is to be the man.

Another strike against Gabrielson is the fact that he is from the East, and that Scott's resignation was forced because a mid-Westerner was needed as chairman. (Gabrielson was born in Sioux City, Iowa, but has lived in New Jersey for some time.)

Kansas' Darby Is Favorite

ANOTHER complaint is that at the last Omaha meeting of the GOP, Mrs. Reeve Schley of New Jersey, whose husband is vice-president of the Chase National Bank, wanted to be on the executive committee in place of Mrs. Worthington Scranton of Scranton, Pa. Accordingly, Mrs. Scranton was persuaded to resign in favor of Mrs. Schley, following which Gabrielson did not pass this choice plum to Mrs. Schley but usurped it for himself. This made many people sore.

Meanwhile, a lot of wires are being pulled to put Gabrielson across. His chief backers are Texas Committeeman Rentfro Creager, Arizonia's Novelist Clarence Buddington Kelland, Harrison Spangler of Iowa, Sen. Brewster of Maine, and Sam Pryor, former committeeman from Connecticut and vice-president of Pan American Airways.

Pryor has even secured the help of a public-relations firm, Andrew Gahagen of 270 Park Ave., New York, to put Gabrielson across and one of its representatives, Lee McCann, has been in Washington buttonholing the boys.

NOTE—Top candidate for the GOP chairmanship if Gabrielson doesn't make it is Harry Darby, GOP committeeman from Kansas, who is chairman of the Kansas City Airways and of the Kansas Palomino Horse Exhibitors Association. Darby is acceptable to Dewey and most other factions but doesn't seem to want the job.

John Foster Dulles' New Job

IT may or may not have been significant, but John Foster Dulles, the famed new Senator from New York, has been appointed to the Senate committee governing the District of Columbia. In voteless Washington this means that he will have a great deal to say about governing Washington—including its public utilities.

Significantly, it happens that the Dulles law firm, Sullivan & Cromwell, is attorney for the Washington Gas Light Co., also for the Potomac Electric Co., also for the Washington Railroad & Transit Co., which owns the Capital Transit Co.

At the time when Sen. Dulles was appointed to the District of Columbia committee these utilities are asking for rate increases, while the Washington Railway & Electric Co. proposes the sale of its 44 per cent interest in the Capital Transit Co. to outside interests.

In fairness to Sen. Dulles, it should be noted that he wanted appointment to the Foreign Relations Committee. When no opening developed, Sen. Schoeppel of Kansas was moved off the District of Columbia Committee, and Dulles took his place. Sen. Dulles remarked, incidentally, that he knew nothing about D.C. problems with the exception of the bill to kill the cherry blossoms in Washington. Though he liked birds, he said he did not not like starlings.

A General Wanted Promotion

HERE is one inside reason why Gen. Alden Waitt, chief of the Army's chemical warfare section, got suspended for dealing with Lobbyist Jesse Hunt, cousin of Gen. Harry Vaughan, White House military aide.

Gen. Waitt has been chief of the chemical warfare section for nearly four years, and ordinarily chiefs of Army bureaus are not reassigned. They are transferred to the field. However, Waitt wanted to continue in his lush Washington office in which—after quite a bowl—he had just installed a new tile bathroom, complete with shower, etc.

So Gen. Waitt appreciating Lobbyist Hunt's friendship with Gen. Vaughan and also appreciating Gen. Vaughan's power around the White House, asked Hunt to help in securing reappointment. Hunt in turn proposed that Gen. Waitt dictate a memorandum which Hunt would then send to Gen. Vaughan.

This Gen. Waitt did, using Hunt's secretary. The memorandum gave a glowing description of Waitt's virtues and achievements; also exposed the faults and failings of other candidates to be chief of chemical warfare.

One interesting point is that Gen. Waitt sat on an Army's evaluation board to pass upon his brother officers and had previously given high recommendations to the very same officers whose qualifications he deprecated in the memorandum which he dictated for Lobbyist Hunt.

NOTE—When Douglas MacArthur wanted promotion to the rank of major general, he asked his wife's stepfather, the wealthy Edward T. Stotesbury of Philadelphia, to intervene at the White House. Stotesbury, a J. P. Morgan partner, was a heavy GOP campaign contributor.