THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1950

STATE 'SOCIALISM' IN SOUTH CAROLINA?

IN ONE RESPECT, the new outbreak of hostilities between the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. and the Santee-Cooper Authority is a matter of interest to South Carolinians only.

The Santee-Cooper Authority is a state agency, created by the South Carolina General Assembly. True, it used Federal loans and grants to build its hydro-electric system, but its management and all its policy decisions are at the state level.

South Carolina is the very bedrock of States' Rightism in this nation. It was first to fight for States' Rights nearly a century ago, and it has been fighting for them ever since. Two years ago, it even furnished the Presidential candidate for a States' Rights Democratic ticket that carried four Southern States.

If the charges hurled by the S. C. E. & G. Co. last week-end are true, if the Santee-Cooper is really trying to put a private utility out of business by building transmission lines parallel to and duplicating those private lines already in existence, then this is State "socialism" rather than national "socialism". And it is "socialism" in a state, by a state, and for a state that has consistently stood foursquare against national "socialism".

The job of the S. C. E. & G. Co., then, is to convince the people of South Carolina and their General Assembly—the Frankenstein of this story—that the "monster" is getting out of hand. For the present, at least, we are disposed to let the people of South Carolina settle the argument and either put the brakes on their own state power authority, or open the throttle wide.

In another respect, the battle in South Carolina presents a question of national interest. The original object of the Rural Electrification Administration was to extend electric service "to persons in rural areas not receiving central station service". Farmers could band together, borrow long-term Federal money, and build their co-operative lines, buying their power either from private utilities or government power projects.

More recently the REA has been branching out. In the Santee-Cooper case, REA funds will be used to build high-potential transmission lines. In the far West, REA loans have been made available to government hydro-electric projects to install steam generation equipment.

That seems to us to be getting away from the spirit of REA, if not from the letter of the law. If the Congress feels that public transmission lines should be built, then the Congress should authorize the projects one by one. If the Congress decides that steam generating plants are needed, then the Congress should make appropriations specifically for that purpose.

It is not right to use REA money to accomplish by indirection what the Congress has refused to authorize on more than one occasion.

NO PLACE FOR SENSATIONALISM

IF TRERE is to be a full-scale inquiry into Federal employment of sexual perverts, we would second the suggestion that Senator Clyde R. Hoey's special subcommittee be assigned to the task.

Sexual perverts are not dangerous in the same way that dedicated Communists are dangerous. They are not deliberately seeking to sell the United States short. They are regarded by responsible public officials as poor security risks, however, because they fear exposure and might surrender to blackmail threats in order to protect themselves.

Perversion is the result of physiological and psychological influences. Hence, the pervert is to be pitied rather than pilloried.

It would be easy, in an inquiry of this kind, to grab off big headlines with sensational charges and exposures. But it would be a mistake.

That's why we would favor giving the job to Mr. Hoey's subcommittee. The venerable Tar Heel proved, in the "5 percenter" inquiry, that Congressional investigations can be kept within judicial limits. Mr. Hoey's group did much of its work behind closed doors, and did not open the doors until it had threshed the real evidence from the accompanying chaff.

Much evidence of interest and importance to the public may be turned up in this inquiry, but there will be more of a sordid, sensational and unimportant nature. The distinction can best be handled by a man of proven judicial temperament like Senator Hoey.

THE GAMBLING INQUIRY

EVERYONE from poets to psychiatrists has had a fling at trying to figure out why the human race is so inordinantly fond of gambling for money, so we're not going to concern ourselves with motivation and morals. What we'd like to know is why the public allows its officials to permit racketeers to conduct gambling joints in states and communities where such enterprises are illegal.

There is no question about the existence of such illegal gambling. There is no question about its connection with local and state political machines in many areas. The question is this: What will the Congressional investigation into organized crime do about it?

U. S. News & World Report, an independent weekly news magazine published in Washington, was dubious about it this week. The magazine said:

> "Syndicates that operate gambling rackets just about blanket the nation, except in thinly populated areas. Those syndicates, in turn, have ties to politics. Whether the country is to learn all the details of these ties in a forthcoming Senate investigation is problematical. The inquiry promises to run uncomfortably close to important city political machines. But it is generally agreed that gambling and associated crime cannot exist without political protection."

The magazine adds that "The Senate Committee . . . is likely to find solid legal foundation for any proposal to take Federal action against gambling racketeers."

But that doesn't cover the matter completely.

If the Committee does find "solid legal foundation" will it recommend Federal action that is bound to raise hob with some of the big city political machines? If it does recommend Federal action, will Congress provide the laws?

It looks as if the integrity of the committee and of the entire Congress will be put to a test. It will be interesting to note which Congressmen oppose legislation to break up gambling syndicates.

HOW TO GROW VERY OLD

PONCE DE LEON should have waited around a while; it might be that a New Jersey chemist has found "The Fountain of Youth".

The chemist, Dr. Thomas J. Gardner of Nutley, N. J., says he may be able to double the human life span—if only someone could turn up a comparatively measly $3,000,000 for his research program.

Dr. Gardner is no quack. He spoke before the Passaic Valley members of the American Chemical Society and his happy prediction was carried in *The New York Times*. He told the chemists and the world:

> "The potential life span has not been approached. If there is no change in the rate of growing old, but utilizing the organs to the maximum, the average life span should be about 120 years. However, if the rate of growing old can be reduced, the average life span increases correspondingly."

Then followed a technical discussion including such terms as cholesterol, lipotropic factors, choline and inositol which would be of meaning to chemists only and they probably know about them already.

Assuming that Dr. Gardner can produce and assuming that most of us would be willing, if not anxious, to have another 70 years or so added to our lives, there are still mighty economic and social problems with which we would have to wrestle. A healthy, pyramiding population would mean a job force far beyond the capacities of American industry. Our natural resources would be depleted rapidly. Housing would become an even greater problem. People would bulge every corner of our cities.

Dr. Gardner, by way of proof, added, incidentally, that he had increased the life of fruit flies by 46 per cent with his techniques. Maybe it would be best if Dr. Gardner just kept on creating venerable fruit flies.

From The St. Louis Globe-Democrat

BUSSING VEEP

VICE-President Barkley says he plans to go right on kissing queens of apple blossom, cherry, cotton, or name-your-own festivals. Marriage has put no crimp in his operation osculation. And he doesn't expect any interference with this gallant ex officio practice.

Anyhow, he informs, Mrs. Barkley has not interposed any remonstrance, veto or even wifely sniff. The Veep says his "charming, gracious and liberal-minded" wife hasn't complained, although she has been on hand to see "that it didn't go too far." Now Mr. Barkley is a veteran operator in government, politics and the milieu of the gay and ubiquitous buss. But no man is above or beyond a fraternal tip. He had better begin eschewing these fond gestures for casual queens, anyhow tapering off.

It is a pretty proven consensus that domestic tranquility has room for only one queen, and not even so celebrated a honeymoon can last forever if the Veep continues on his merry tour of the beauty tournaments.

People's Platform

News Editorial Taken To Task

DAVIDSON

Editors, The News:

I WAS glad to read the recent Charlotte News editorial for the first time in The Mooresville Tribune, which reprinted the article. I had not had an opportunity to read it before, although I have heard a great deal about it.

The editorial states, discussing Frank Graham, that "Smith himself knows that many of the things he is hinting about Frank Graham, and most of the things his state campaign manager is saying, just aren't true."

After admitting that Smith's campaign is a negative one aimed at discrediting his opponent and composed entirely of lies, fabrications, and vicious mud-slinging, the editorial yet declares its support of Smith. What in the world is going on?

This either means that the editorial favors lies, fabrications, and mud-slinging, and thinks they are a good thing, or else the paper believes that after all we have so many Senators in Washington of no moral backbone or political scruples that one more won't hurt.

The editorial seems to say about Graham: he s the most capable man for the job, certainly, but Smith will kowtow more to the special interests, and we cannot afford to have in Washington a man of integrity and sincerity who will stand on his own two feet and tell the lobbyists what for, when they deserve it.

Then, about Smith, the editorial says, "We take him for a conservative." "Take" is right: nobody knows what Smith stands for, as far as any positive beliefs are concerned. He has completely failed to present to the people of North Carolina any platform; he has not told us what he believes in or what he stands for. We must only conclude that he is afraid to, because he knows his ideas, such as he has any of his own, are basically in conflict with the wishes of the people. He did state, as late as 1947, that a forty-cent minimum wage in North Carolina, sixteen dollars a week, was "harsh, unreasonable, and unnecessary."

Further, the editorial states that Frank Graham is "for all the things that Truman is for." Can we just stare through the facts as if they did not exist? Can we blandly ignore that Graham opposes FEPC, socialized medicine, and the Brannan Farm Plan, while Truman has again and again emphasized these very parts of his campaign in his recent tour of the country?

Then again, The News' editorial says that the Truman Administration is committed to: 1. Extravagance in its budget; 2. A deliberate favoritism toward organized labor; 3. The extension of Federal authority in FEPC, Federal control of educational policy, socialized medicine, and socialism. With these criticisms of the Truman domestic policy we heartily agree. But the editorial goes on to link up Frank Graham with this policy! Nothing is further from the truth.

It is a matter of record that Graham has always stood against FEPC, socialized medicine, and the Brannan Farm Plan, ever since they were first proposed.

As for Federal control of education, Senator Graham believes in Federal aid to education, but not domination. A prominent educator himself, Dr. Graham, it seems to me, should know a little better what constitutes aid and what control, than should an editorial writer who has already grossly misrepresented Graham's views.

Furthermore, any historian knows that the Government has been practicing one form or another of aid to education since 1785, when provision was made for land to be set aside for schools in the Northwest territory. What in the world were the land-grant colleges, later, but recipients of actual monetary aid from the Federal Government? Is Cornell University, one of these land-grant colleges, dominated by the Government?

Then, as to extravagance in the budget, Senator Graham has repeatedly expressed his determination to have the budget reduced, without, however, endangering our national security by recklessly cutting our needed expenditures, such as our foreign policy and military preparedness items, which amount to seventy-one cents out of every tax dollar. He does support moderate and gradual reduction of these items.

Senator Graham has voted for and supports the various proposals of the Hoover Commission to cut down administrative expenses of the Government (all but two, which he opposes because he believes they will not cut down expenses and will definitely harm the effective functioning of the departments they would affect).

And finally, concerning "a deliberate favoritism toward organized labor" and "socialism", which I shall consider together. These two items lead to a consideration of Senator Graham's basic political philosophy. They deal with whether Senator Graham believes in the freedom of the individual and free competitive enterprise, or in the planned economy of the "welfare state". They deal with whether Senator Graham's attitude is one of fairness and equal opportunity for all the people, or of favoritism toward "special interests."

We can only quote from Senator Graham himself, who said in 1948 that the American "middle way" is to avoid all forms of statism (both right and left) and to give "equal opportunity of competitive enterprise to fulfill both the freedom of the individual and the welfare of the people." Do these sound like the words of a socialist or a "favoritist"?

We can, too, repeat the words of The News' editorial itself "Frank Graham is . . . patently a man of learning, character, tolerance, and integrity . . ." Is this sort of man a "favoritist" or a totalitarian?

Does Frank Graham favor labor? No! He believes in giving labor its fair share to participate in community, state, and national affairs—and no more.

He also believes in giving businessmen, farmers, Negroes—and mostly just plain people—their fair share in the opportunities of American life. He has always vigorously supported the rights and privileges of the people—and not either of government or of special interests.

Frank Graham believes in supporting the security of the people against the tyranny of both governmeant and special interests, so that they can be free to think and to act independenly.

Way back in 1934 (and of course, it is just as true now as then), Senator Graham said: ". . . Security is not to be achieved through tyranny and the regimentation of a dictatorship. . . . Real security never comes at the sacrifice of real liberty."

I wonder what Willis Smith was saying or doing about totalitarianism or Communism, about security or liberty, in 1934.

GEORGE F. BASON JR.

Note Of Appreciation

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News:

ON behalf of the Mecklenburg unit of the American Cancer Society and the Charlotte Woman's Club, its sponsor, I wish to express our thanks to you and your staff for the wonderful help you gave us during our recent Cancer Crusade.

We have reached our goal of $25,000. Our total collections amounted to $25,288.94. This insures a continuation and even an expansion of our three-point program of education, research and service.

We are proud to tell you that our campaign expenses were but a fraction over 2 per cent of the amount collected. Your fine editorials, special articles, reports and pictures, so prominently placed, did much to put us over the top in this campaign. We are very grateful to you for your generosity and co-operation plus courtesy.

—MRS. R. J. LUBBE,
County Commander.

A Plug For Alexander

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News:

WE, the readers of The News, are proud of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County. We want the best in newspapers and we want the best in our government officials. We want good, clean, honest, capable men like A. Query Alexander, candidate for Sheriff.

We don't want just another politician as our Sheriff, nor just another Sheriff. We want an active man in office that we can depend on in these days when there is so much to be done. Mr. Alexander is that man.

He is known to thousands of good citizens of this big county as the right man for the office. We are all wanting a still better County Government than we have, and are only waiting until Primary Day to nominate Mr. Alexander to the office of Sheriff.

—B. W. JENNINGS.

Appeal To Prejudice

GREENSBORO

Editors, The News:

ALL that we have heard of Willis Smith is that he was once president of the American Bar Association and that he has made his million from fees from corporations. That would not disqualify him, but for me the kind of fight he is making, his appeal to race and other prejudice, do not qualify him above a man of such accomplishments and principles as Frank Graham.

I have just listened to a radio speech by Hiden Ramsey which was most refreshing after having heard the news about The Charlotte News position in the campaign.

—W. G. WHARTON.

Union Man Backs Reynolds

RALEIGH

Editors, The News:

I AM a member of Local 9 of the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers of the A. F. of L., and have been a member in good standing since 1944.

For eighteen years I have had occasion to observe former Senator Robert R. Reynolds, and know that he has always been a consistent friend of labor and I wholeheartedly endorse him for nomination in the Democratic Primary of May 27 to the United States Senate.

I was working a great deal of the time in Washington when he was in the Senate of the United States, and know that he always did what he could for the laboring man.

—I. D. ROYALL.

Graham—A 'Great Man'

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News:

I AM not particularly articulate, but even if I were I could not better express my views on behalf of our most noble neighbor, Sen. Frank P. Graham than your using the words below as my feeling about the qualifications of this great man whom we are now privileged to have as one of our trusted public servants. I've had the poem for over 30 years and I am not sure of its origin. Thank you.

—J. L. WILLIAMSON.

* * *

GOD GIVE US MEN

God give us men, is the urgent cry,
Men who are honest, who will not lie;
Men who are strong, noble and true,
Men who have courage to dare and to do.

God give us men who stand for the right,
Men who are ready all evil to fight;
Men who are clean, whose word is a bond,
Men who when called, are sure to respond.

God give us men whom money can't buy,
Men who have faith and are willing to try;
Men who have honor, virtue and power,
God give us men, is the cry of the hour.

The People's Platform is available to any reader who cares to mount it. Communications should be less than 300 words typewritten if possible, and on only one side of the paper. Libel and obscenity will be deleted—otherwise anything goes. Each letter must be signed.—Editors, The News.

State-Defense Dept. Fight Weakening Foreign Policy

By STEWART ALSOP

WASHINGTON

THE APPARENTLY interminable row between the State and Defense Depts. over a Japanese peace treaty is the sort of thing which raises the question whether the United States is really capable of having a foreign policy at all. An immediate consequence of the deadlock between the two departments has been to place Secretary of State Dean Acheson in a thoroughly ridiculous position in London.

Acheson has had to tell his British and French opposite numbers that he really cannot talk about Japan simply because the American Government cannot make up its large, amorphous, mind. Since it is nonsense to discuss the Far East without mentioning Japan, the London discussion on the Asiatic situation have been about as meaningful a production of "Hamlet" with the title role eliminated.

This is bad enough. But the future consequences could be a great deal more serious. A full eight months ago Acheson agreed with British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin that a Japanese peace treaty had become urgently necessary. The Defense Dept. then intervened, objecting to a treaty on security grounds, and the present deadlock began. And in the eight months' interval of delay, precisely those things have begun to happen which Acheson, Bevin and their advisers feared might happen.

Neither Acheson, Bevin, nor anyone else in his senses ever proposed that the United States should withdraw from Japan entirely. Instead, a vetoless peace conference (which would not be subject to Soviet obstruction) was to confer on Japan all the trappings of sovereignty. The weary apparatus of the American occupation was to be withdrawn entirely from Tokyo and the other big cities. But a bi-lateral American-Japanese treaty, a sort of Siamese twin to the peace treaty, was to grant the United States the right to maintain bases on the Japanese islands.

MACARTHUR PREDICTION

When he took over the occupation of Japan almost five years ago, Gen. Douglas MacArthur shrewdly predicted, in effect, that the occupation would begin to lose its usefulness within three years, and would be threatened with disaster if it lasted five years. Any recent visitor to Japan can attest MacArthur's remarkable prescience.

The occupation has long since lost its initial drive and enthusiasm. The attempt to supervise every aspect of Japanese life is being politely sabotaged by the Japanese. And beneath the surface politeness, the contrast between the standards of life of the conquerors (most of whom "never had it so good") and the conquered is contributing to tensions which could, in time, become explosive.

These tensions are still largely subterranean, and only a few months ago it would have been possible to make the arrangement for bases without serious trouble with the Japanese. This is no longer the case. An election is scheduled in Japan on June 4. And not only the Communists, but powerful anti-Communist parties, are campaigning on a "no bases for any foreign power" line.

Thus even if Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and Gen. Omar Bradley, after their trip to Japan next month to confer with MacArthur, decide to reverse the present Defense Dept. stand, great harm will already have been done by the delay. Whatever the results of the forthcoming Japanese election, powerful forces within Japan will have been committed to opposing a bi-lateral security treaty with the United States. And it is highly significant that a few days ago, for the first time in the history of the occupation, a directive from the Supreme Commander was voted down by the Japanese parliament, despite maximum American pressure.

There is some mystery about the attitude of MacArthur in these circumstances. But the State Dept., at least on the basis of talks between MacArthur and Assistant Secretary of State Walton Butterworth, is convinced that MacArthur recognizes the need for an early peace treaty. MacArthur's public statements would seem to support this assumption.

As for the Defense Dept., there could in fact be only one intelligible justification of its position — the expectation of war within the very near future. But if the defense planners really expect war soon, then the policy of reducing American military strength has been more than foolish — it has been down right criminal.

It is more likely that the Defense Dept.'s stand has derived from inertia and the instinctive military reluctance to dispense with a direct chain of command. Republican adviser John Foster Dulles has been assigned to take over from Butterworth the task of negotiating with the Defense Dept. on Johnson's and Bradley's return. Presumably some time this Summer the issue will be settled by the National Security Council and the President. But if it is left unresolved much longer, the price of the deadlock may well be a universal anti-Americanism in Japan, which will undermine all the undoubted accomplishments of the occupation, and soften Japan for ultimate Communist conquest. That will be a heavy price to pay for inertia and indecision.

Frittering Away Time May Not Be Altogether Wasteful

By HENRY C. MCFADYEN

ALBEMARLE

I THINK IT is fun to nose around in elementary school class rooms. They look so different from the high school rooms that I am used to. The most noticeable difference, of course, is the bright-colored art work that covers the walls of the rooms in the lower grades. Some folks might not want to admit that it is art, but I think a whole lot of it is.

The lower the grade, the more likely it is to be real art. The pictures will be crude, of course, but they will express an original idea. They won't be copied from anybody else. First-grade pictures, for instance, are likely to portray the artist's daddy mowing the grass or his little sister playing in the sand box. They will be painted out of the experience of the child and not copied from a magazine.

If these paintings don't do anything else, they at least make the rooms and halls of elementary schools bright and attractive places. Children who work hard at making their school rooms attractive are going to build more beautiful towns and cities than we live in now. Children who have lived with color all around them are not going to be satisfied with drabness when they grow up.

The other day I was in the library of an elementary school. It was an inviting place, decorated with several paintings that had been done by children in the sixth and seventh grades. One picture caught my eye at once. It was in bright greens and showed a deep valley with a road running through it and rows of wooded mountains rising on each side. The whole thing was done in an individual style that would be hard for another person to copy. One of the teachers saw me looking at the painting and came up to me. "The boy who did that can hardly read," she told me.

RESPECTED MEMBER

Painting is not for those who can't do anything else, but here was the case of a boy who lacks some abilities but who has one skill that not everybody else can master. He cannot read much, but he is not laughed at by the rest of his class. Because he can paint pictures he is a respected member of his group. That is more important than learning to read.

Across the room I saw another picture. It was of a gaunt bare tree standing against the background of brown and red hills. A boy had painted that picture too. I knew that as soon as I saw that there was a mountain lion up that tree, lying close to a limb and snarling at a big dog on the ground. I guess it was a mountain lion, thought it had spots on it.

The spots are not important. The important thing was that the mind of a boy who lives hemmed up in an industrial town had gone ranging into a world where he himself has never been. The picture cannot show it, but I know that as that boy painted, in his imagination he was there too, shooting that mountain lion and nailing its hide to the bunk-house wall.

Just frittering away his time? I don't think so. What can a school do better for a boy than to encourage his mind to go adventuring.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Pressure Groups Hurt Hoover Plans

WASHINGTON

HERBERT HOOVER is angry and hurt at the way Republican Senators deserted him on his great engineering plan for Government, the Hoover Report.

In private talks with Washington friends and in a talk before the Sales Executives Club in New York, the ex-President complained bitterly about the "pressure groups, paid propagandists, and organized minorities" which killed his reorganization plans in the Senate.

It is the conservative GOP Senators who have long held up Herbert Hoover as their symbol of Government efficiency. It is also the GOP Senate conservatives who have repeatedly preached Government economy. Yet when Hoover worked out a plan to save the Government several billions and President Truman urged its adoption by Congress, it was these same GOP Senators who thwarted their ex-leader. On the other hand, liberal Republicans voted with him.

This is the record on the four Hoover plans now stopped by the Senate:

Plan No. 1—Transfer functions of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Secretary of the Treasury. Opposed by the American Bankers Association and every GOP Senator except three—Aiken, Vt.; Lodge, Mass.; and Williams, Del. The GOP leadership, Robert Taft, Ken Wherry, and Gene Millikin, all voted against Hoover.

Plan No. 12—Abolish the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. Fought by Senator Taft (though he was for it a year before), the National Association of Manufacturers, and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce. Only five Republicans voted with Hoover: Aiken and Lodge, Ives, N. Y.; Langer, N. D.; and Tobey, N. H.

Plan No. 7—Give executive powers to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Bitterly opposed by the Association of American Railroads and the Railway Labor Executives Association. Only two Republicans, Knowland of California and Williams of Delaware, favored it.

Plan No. 11—Give the Federal Communications Commission chairman executive authority. Fought by National Association of Broadcasters and American Bar Association. Only eight Republicans voted with Hoover: Aiken, Ives, Knowland, Langer, Lodge, Smith of N. J., Thye of Minn, and Tobey.

Hoover Explains

EXPLAINING his defeat to the Sales Extcutives Club, Hoover said: "All the pressure groups have got in their work on the reform that would affect them, while they proclaim their endorsement of all the other reforms. I promise you that, before we fail, I shall name by name and describe them (the vested interests) by the use of all the English language of which I am capable."

NOTE: One outfit that has done a bang-up job for the Hoover report is the lively Junior Chamber of Commerce. Clifford D. Cooper, the national president, has visited every state, organizing grass-roots pressure for Government reform.

Balloons To Russia

THEODORE H. SLOAN of Washington, Pa., who was chief development engineer for the Council of Defense during World War I, has written me a letter about his experiences in floating small balloons into hostile territory—such as Russia.

Mr. Sloan worked out a plan in 1917 for floating balloons into Germany carrying fire bombs to set fire to German forests. Eventually, Woodrow Wilson stopped the plan as inhuman.

"The balloon was about 60 inches in diameter, carrying an automatic ballast tank and release mechanism for the fire bomb," wrote Mr. Sloan. "The balloon would rise to about 60,000 feet, at which point the ballast held it at about this altitude, the prevailing wind causing it to travel easterly at about 100 miles an hour.

"A large number of these mechanisms were built and tested. On one test, 80 were sent up from Nebraska and dummy bombs were dropped along the Atlantic coast. We had attached a notice of a reward for each dummy bomb returned, and by this means got about 60 per cent back.

"The whole outfit," continued Mr. Sloan, "can be built for about $2 each and will carry about 10 ounces of dead weight. It has the following advantages:

"1. It is the cheapest method of transporting printed material into an enemy country.

"2. Human life is not jeopardized.

"3. The balloons are practically invisible at 60,000 feet; therefore, cannot be shot down."

NOTE—Many patriotic Americans have written this columnist offering to help get propaganda balloons into Russia.

Merry-Go-Round

AMERICAN Export Lines will soon launch two new luxury liners, the SS Independence and the SS Constitution, a tribute to American flag initiative on the high seas. After the war, in view of the world shipping surplus, many predicted no more passenger ships would be built for years. . . . A detective has been working under cover in the Senate, posing as an employee, to catch the bookie who is supposed to be operating there. So far, all the detective has uncovered is one numbers bet. . . . Congressman Usher Burdick's bill to investigate payroll abuses by Senate and House members has been quietly shelved by the House Rules Committee. It would expose too many colleagues. . . . Here is a sure-fire cure for absent-minded atomic energy officials who leave secret documents lying around on their desks. They are hauled out of bed and must return to the office and lock the secret papers in a safe. Seldom do they make the same mistake twice. . . . The Senate Small Business Committee has discovered that it is powerless because the Senate, in authorizing the committee, neglected to vote it any money or authority. The oversight is being corrected. . . . Senator Kefauver can't find office space on Capitol Hill for his new crime committee. The Senate office building is so overcrowded that typists are actually working in the halls and on stairway landings.