

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher
J. S. DOWD, General Manager
D. B. GRUFFY, Executive Editor
C. A. MCKENRY, Editor

THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1960

A TIME FOR CAUTION

There is so much we don't know about the various efforts to transport natural gas to Charlotte and other Carolina cities that we hesitate to say very much on the subject.

Yesterday, the City Council heard a presentation from the Piedmont Natural Gas Corp. Piedmont wants to buy Duke Power Co. gas franchise in Charlotte. Duke is willing to sell Piedmont proposes to get its gas from the big Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp. line that passes a few miles from Charlotte on its way to the big cities of the East.

There are two other companies in the field, Carolina Natural Gas Corp. and Public Service Corp. of North Carolina. In general they want to serve a somewhat larger area of the Carolinas, and also hope to get their gas from Transcontinental.

Details of their plans are not essential to our purpose today, however, that purpose being merely to caution the City Council to proceed with great care and without undue haste in this very important matter.

For the full, we should remember that the Carolinas were not essential to our war boom in natural gas started. They were still asleep—the two state governments, the power companies, and the various municipal governments and chambers of commerce when the Federal Energy Commission approved for its big pipeline to the East. That line was to be built right through the industrial Carolinas—and at first there was no thought of industrial gas.

Having slept for so long, and having now become naive participants in a game of high financial and political stakes, it would be the wiser course for the Charlotte City Council and the other city governments in the area to examine all the proposals with scrupulous care before going along with any one of them.

Here are some of the things the Council should consider:

1. The total volume of natural gas available, not only for the present but to come to Charlotte to explain (and, as we get it, defend) his report. Then some preliminary studies are offered to pay the bill. They want Mr. Howson here because his main recommendation—that the City expand and redesign its sewage disposal facilities to handle all industrial waste without pretreatment—suits them exactly.

We hope he comes after all some \$5,000 of the people's money has already been spent on the Howson survey, and the Council is right in hearing what he has to say about it. If having heard him, the Council still doesn't like his proposal, it may toss it aside and adopt another one.

We don't know whether Mr. Howson's proposal is practical or not. We don't know whether his cost estimates are in line. All we are interested in is getting the stench out of Charlotte's creeks, so that vast numbers of persons who live along their banks can enjoy an atmosphere free of the unpleasant, and perhaps insidious, vapors which emanate therefrom in hot dry weather.

The Council, listening, said it wouldn't pay Mr. Howson \$130 a day and expenses

BETTER SOCIAL SECURITY

There are still hurdles to be surmounted by a joint House-Senate conference committee in the wiggling \$1 to 2 Senate majority for Social Security expansion heralds early agreement between the two Houses on wider coverage and more liberal payments.

Differences between the House and Senate measures are not irreconcilable. The bills differ mainly in detail, with the normally conservative Senate showing a little more generosity than did the House. In an election year, the House will likely accept the Senate's version rather than whittle it down.

Most everyone is agreed by now that an expansion of the Social Security structure is necessary. Business is backing it. One of the reasons for this is that the Social Security Act was passed by the normally conservative trade publication, Business Week. The agreement has come about for several reasons:

1. The present scale of payments, set in the '30's is obviously too low for this era of inflation.

2. The willingness of the company to expand distribution facilities aggressively in competition with electric power and coal companies. Natural gas is a marvelous thing for the home-owner. In many areas of the nation, homes can be heated and food can be cooked by natural gas more cheaply and more satisfactorily than by any other method. Unless the company is willing to enlarge the woefully inadequate Duke Power gas lines, the City will be little better off with natural gas.

the future. Charlotte will benefit little, if the franchise is turned over to a company which cannot provide an ever-increasing quantity of gas.

2. The willingness of the company to expand distribution facilities aggressively in competition with electric power and coal companies. Natural gas is a marvelous thing for the home-owner. In many areas of the nation, homes can be heated and food can be cooked by natural gas more cheaply and more satisfactorily than by any other method. Unless the company is willing to enlarge the woefully inadequate Duke Power gas lines, the City will be little better off with natural gas.

3. The proposed rate structure for residential and industrial use. Adequate data is available from scores of other cities approximately the same distance from the natural gas fields as Charlotte. This data should be obtained and compared with the various proposals offered to Charlotte.

4. The question of a public referendum on selling the franchise. A referendum may not be necessary. But it wouldn't hurt to get the approval of the people on any matter so potentially important to their future welfare.

5. Finally, the Council should give some thought to municipal ownership of the natural gas distribution system. We don't advocate municipal ownership. We don't know enough about how it has worked elsewhere. But we do know that the trend is in that direction, and that results have been good. Furthermore, the plan has revenue-producing possibilities.

This natural gas question is a big problem for a City Administration already weighted down with other major problems. In general, we have needed this Administration to get a move on and complete some of its pending projects. In this case, we urge the Council to proceed with caution and with deliberate steps so that the people of Charlotte will get the best possible deal.

LET'S HEAR MR. HOWSON

When engineers disagree on technical matters, the laymen is of necessity somewhat confused. Hence we do not expect to take sides in the argument over the best way to dispose of industrial wastes in Charlotte.

We have urged aggressive action by the City Council to clear up the creeks, to hear. We shall continue to do so. But if the city is to be kept clean, it is up to the man in person the Chicago engineer who recently made a \$5,000 survey on waste disposal, it's all right with us.

Some members of the Council are a bit miffed at the engineer, Mr. Howson, because of a letter he wrote City Manager Yancey several days ago. Mr. Howson didn't like it because Mr. Yancey had in his municipal engineers and one outside consultant to examine and discuss the Howson report. And he said so in a letter which was eventually telegraphed and in spots, downright unfortunate.

The Council, listening, said it wouldn't pay Mr. Howson \$130 a day and expenses

BETTER SOCIAL SECURITY

There are still hurdles to be surmounted by a joint House-Senate conference committee in the wiggling \$1 to 2 Senate majority for Social Security expansion heralds early agreement between the two Houses on wider coverage and more liberal payments.

Differences between the House and Senate measures are not irreconcilable. The bills differ mainly in detail, with the normally conservative Senate showing a little more generosity than did the House. In an election year, the House will likely accept the Senate's version rather than whittle it down.

Most everyone is agreed by now that an expansion of the Social Security structure is necessary. Business is backing it. One of the reasons for this is that the Social Security Act was passed by the normally conservative trade publication, Business Week. The agreement has come about for several reasons:

1. The present scale of payments, set in the '30's is obviously too low for this era of inflation.

2. The willingness of the company to expand distribution facilities aggressively in competition with electric power and coal companies. Natural gas is a marvelous thing for the home-owner. In many areas of the nation, homes can be heated and food can be cooked by natural gas more cheaply and more satisfactorily than by any other method. Unless the company is willing to enlarge the woefully inadequate Duke Power gas lines, the City will be little better off with natural gas.

3. The proposed rate structure for residential and industrial use. Adequate data is available from scores of other cities approximately the same distance from the natural gas fields as Charlotte. This data should be obtained and compared with the various proposals offered to Charlotte.

4. The question of a public referendum on selling the franchise. A referendum may not be necessary. But it wouldn't hurt to get the approval of the people on any matter so potentially important to their future welfare.

5. Finally, the Council should give some thought to municipal ownership of the natural gas distribution system. We don't advocate municipal ownership. We don't know enough about how it has worked elsewhere. But we do know that the trend is in that direction, and that results have been good. Furthermore, the plan has revenue-producing possibilities.

This natural gas question is a big problem for a City Administration already weighted down with other major problems. In general, we have needed this Administration to get a move on and complete some of its pending projects. In this case, we urge the Council to proceed with caution and with deliberate steps so that the people of Charlotte will get the best possible deal.

People's Platform

Scott's Role in Primar Fight

Editorial: The New York Times... THURSDAY, June 22, 1960... Editor: The New York Times... THURSDAY, June 22, 1960... Editor: The New York Times... THURSDAY, June 22, 1960...

When Governor Scott was a candidate he repeatedly stated that the Governor of North Carolina should be elected by the people of North Carolina and not by a few top ranking machine politicians who, as he claimed, "hand-picked" North Carolina's Governor.

It is admitted that it was the Governor's privilege and prerogative to name a United States Senator to succeed late Senator J. B. Hunt. But the law of North Carolina, yes, even the law of fair play and the law of common sense, demands that the people of North Carolina be given the right to elect their own Governor.

The Governor enjoys many privileges, emoluments and luxuries of office. The dairy farmer who lives on a dirt road off Haver road, the Governor's mansion not suited to his tastes and so, in his instance and bidding, the State of North Carolina is making out a check for \$100,000 a year to pay for his upkeep.

The Governor rides in an expensive state-owned automobile, chauffeured by a Corporal of the State Highway Patrol, all at the expense of North Carolina taxpayers. And nobody is using that so long as Governor Scott is financing the automobile and the chauffeur.

There are these questions of inquiry significant or not? They are certainly significant. For months ago when Jeff B. Wilson, Director of Highway Safety, a Scott appointee and resident of Bacon, N. C., was making out a check for \$100,000 a year to pay for his upkeep.

There are these questions of inquiry significant or not? They are certainly significant. For months ago when Jeff B. Wilson, Director of Highway Safety, a Scott appointee and resident of Bacon, N. C., was making out a check for \$100,000 a year to pay for his upkeep.

There are these questions of inquiry significant or not? They are certainly significant. For months ago when Jeff B. Wilson, Director of Highway Safety, a Scott appointee and resident of Bacon, N. C., was making out a check for \$100,000 a year to pay for his upkeep.

THE Issue On Saturday

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

THE Lesson In History

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Wood To The Rescue

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Broad Phrasing of Genocide Convention Stirs Opposition

ONE OF THE

ONE OF THE characteristics of the Genocide Convention is its broad phrasing. It is an attempt to do what the framers of the Convention did in 1948—to define genocide in such a way that it would include all the crimes that have been committed in the name of race, religion, or political opinion.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of force to destroy a racial, political or religious group. It is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against the peace and the dignity of man.

Judicious Use Of Ye Old Rod Needed To Cure Ornerly Brats

BY ROBERT C. RUARK

IT IS difficult to dissent from the basic reason why so many of our teen-agers have suddenly become pouting brats who are asking and asking for more and more attention in the woodshed. I doubt if the heaviest burden of blame should be laid on the shoulders of their parents.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

What we know at the moment is that the children of the '50's are not the children of the '40's. They are not the children of the '30's. They are not the children of the '20's. They are not the children of the '10's.

More Coaching

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?

Editorial: THE News: There is a Senatorial campaign in extreme play—shall we keep American Democracy by electing Willis Smith or shall we continue down the road of the "New Deal"?