THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1952

THE SIZE OF THE NURSING PROBLEM

ONE PROBLEM in the field of health that keeps bobbing up every time the subject is discussed is how to provide good nursing care for Negroes and rural dwellers as well as to the people who live in the cities. An especially acute problem is the staffing of the many small rural hospitals that are being built over North Carolina under the sponsorship of the Medical Care Commission.

At the recent regional conference in Raleigh, Mrs. Marie B. Noell, executive secretary of the N. C. State Nurses' Association, said that the number of nurses can be increased, and that there are four ways to do it: (1) by improving and expanding the nursing education program, (2) by the more efficient use of personnel, (3) by intensified recruitment programs, and (4) by getting inactive nurses back to duty.

But the solution is not so easy as it sounds. Here is why, as Mrs. Noell explained it:

Fact 1. North Carolina needs 1,200 new nurses each year; only 723 were graduated last year.

Fact 2. One out of every three students entering nursing schools will fail to become a registered nurse. Most of them will fail before graduation; nine per cent will fail the state board examination.

Fact 3. Of North Carolina's 37 state-accredited schools of nursing, only 14 have been given national temporary accreditation.

Fact 4. On test pool examinations used by all 48 states, North Carolina ranked third from the bottom. Of the 104 students who failed in one or more subjects on state board exams last year, 104 came from schools which did not have national accreditation.

Fact 5. Many of North Carolina's nurses are ineligible for entrance into any of the U. S. university and college public health programs.

Fact 6. There is no place in North Carolina to train administrative and instructional staffs for Negro schools of nursing, and the financial incentive is not strong enough to import good personnel.

Fact 7. Nurses are used inefficiently. Head nurses spend as much as 75 per cent of their time in clerical duties, and regular nurses perform some 125 different jobs that could be done by maids or orderlies.

Fact 8. It is hard to recruit students when they must study for three years and prepare for a career dealing with human lives for which they will receive the same or less compensation as other students who attend business school for six months or a year.

Fact 9. It is also hard to get inactive nurses back on duty. Last year, the average N. C. hospital paid nurses who live at home $175 per month. By the time the nurse has paid someone to stay with her children, income taxes on her own salary and social security tax for her employee she would have less than $50 a month clear income for a 44 to 48-hour work week.

Were this simply a professional problem, it might be left up to the medical and nursing professions to solve. But the health of everyone is at stake, especially Negroes and rural dwellers. When the 1953 General Assembly takes a look at the five-year record of the Good Health Program, it will have to pay particular attention to the problem of getting more nurses and training them better. Else, the program will never reach its objective of giving better health to all of North Carolina.

AND NOW?

TALAMAR CAUDLE likes to talk. And the Wadesboro lawyer and former assistant attorney general, fired for alleged "incompatible" outside activities, presumably had much to tell the Chelf Judiciary Subcommittee which is investigating Justice Department irregularities. They questioned him for six days, including an unusual Sunday session. Possibly Mr. Caudle has talked the Chelf subcommittee into an awkward position.

For, although his testimony has not been made public, this much is known. He told his interrogators that some of the persons who put pressure on him were Congressmen. If past examples hold true, this involvement of Congressmen will lessen the ardor of the investigating Congressional committee.

Time after time a Congressional committee has raced along, in full cry, pursuing influence peddlers, thieves and what have you, only to find the tracks circle around and come right back to Capitol Hill. The usual procedure, then, is for the pursuing pack to bark (the minority growls) and back off.

Congressmen just hate to investigate other Congressmen. So, while yielding to Congressional pressure in no way excuses the actions of a government official, we shall be interested in seeing what the Chelf committee, which has worked diligently, will do now. Will it carry through with investigation of Congressional influence? Or will it just skulk off?

SUNDAY FUNERALS SHOULD BE DISCOURAGED

YESTERDAY the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Ministers' Association, by resolution, discouraged Sunday funerals. We feel that the ministers have backed the resolution with sound reasoning, and should be supported in their effort to decrease, if not eliminate, the Sunday funeral.

Their position does not result from dissatisfaction with their heavy personal schedules on Sunday. Rather, they are concerned about the 35 florists, the staffs of the six funeral homes and four cemeteries, and the grave diggers, who are often required now to work on Sunday, and the families of these workers.

The ministers feel that these persons should, if at all possible, be permitted to spend Sundays with their families, being at liberty to attend church services or do what they will. When one or more of the parents must work on the Sabbath the children, for one thing, may not be able to attend Sunday School, and the family is denied what should be its day of worship and rest together.

We would think that, although the ministers are concerned about others rather than themselves, many of them would appreciate a Sunday schedule which does not include funerals. As one remarked, "I preach three sermons on Sunday and can certainly also conduct a funeral—but my third sermon that day will probably be quite dull."

The Sunday funeral is traditional in some communities, probably as a holdover from the days when it was difficult to get off work for a funeral, and travel was slower. Certainly Sunday funerals do not stem from any Biblical precedents. To the contrary, they were avoided in Biblical times, and the day was devoted to worship. The recommendation of the Ministerial Association, if agreed to by Mecklenburg County, should permit at least some persons to keep the Sabbath as it then was, and is still meant to be, kept.

BATTLESHIPS VS. BUNKERS

THE OLD NAVY was never like this. Have a look at the Far East Naval Forces summary of one day's operations:

"The battleship U.S.S. Iowa, with destroyer U.S.S. Preston and U.S.S. Tingey in company, skirted the storm and returned to a position off the eastern front lines, arriving just before dawn. Sixteen-inch day fire missions were directed against 76-mm. guns and their supporting bunkers. Some were engaged while firing on friendly observation posts. Five bunkers were destroyed, seven were damaged and unobserved damage was inflicted on other positions hidden by a reverse slope. Tingey delivered call fire and reported fair coverage on one active bunker.

"Destroyers U.S.S. Barton and U.S.S. Soley returned to Wonsan to lay direct fire on caves, troops and one gun position."

Salty old admirals used to exchanging lead with warships miles away, leading convoys through submarine-infested water and maneuvering battle flotillas, probably think this business of fighting land soldiers is out of their province. Young sailors, hugging the Korean earth as they direct fire from the ships lying offshore, probably wonder if they didn't go in the wrong recruiting station and are really Marines or Army men.

But the Navy, which one hears little about in this strangest of recent wars, is playing an important role in the Korean War. Its remarkably close support of troops is a tribute to the U. S. Navy's versatility, as well as unification of the services.

From The Chicago Daily News

BEWARE THE ILK

WITH a political campaign under way, we are beginning to hear more of our woodland friend, the prong-horned ilk. We encounter him, for instance, in the Alsop boys' column: "Senator McCarthy, Senator Jenner and other Republicans of their peculiar ilk."

Watchers for the other side will also be spotting ilks, skulking around the fringes of respectability. Alert woodsmen will be describing the antics of "President Truman and his ilk" in their native habitat.

Amateurs seeking information about the ilk encounter difficulty. *Webster's New International*, for instance, says that use of the Scotch word "ilk" as a noun to mean "of the same breed or class" is a mistake arising from a misunderstanding of the expression "of that ilk."

Fowler in *Modern English Usage* is more specific. He says "ilk" means same; it does not mean family or kind or set or name. "Of that ilk" is a form constructed for the case in which proprietor and property have the same name. "The Knockwinnocks of that ilk" means the Knockwinnocks of Knockwinnock.

Obviously, he who fools around with the ilk is on dangerous ground. Nevertheless, because politicians rush in where angels fear to tread, we expect to see a lot more ilk-baiting in the days ahead. Despite everything, writers and speakers will try to harness an ilk and use it to carry a sneer to the opposition.

All this is very hard on the ilk. Perhaps in the better days ahead the nation will extend its security blanket to cover them, and the English-speaking peoples will enroll voluntarily in the benevolent and protective order of ilks.

Grueling Finish In The Marathon

People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The News reserves the right to condense.

Democrats Try Distraction

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

RECENTLY you have had letters from one writer who has been especially vitriolic in his attacks upon the Republicans and, in particular, Eisenhower. These attacks have been so "below the belt" in many cases that it makes one wonder if much of it is not being written to distract our attention from the many unsavory aspects of the Democratic Administration.

This practice of continually smearing everyone who happens to think differently from the Dealers, both New and Fair, is becoming more than a little tiresome, and certainly is not contributing anything of a constructive nature to the problems which confront us.

Unfortunately, letters of this type have a disturbing way of intimidating certain readers who are not as firm in their own convictions as they should be. Some of us are increasingly aware that many Democrats are actually hoping for Eisenhower's election, but they, themselves, cannot quite find the courage to vote for him because of that old habit of marking the straight Democratic ticket.

Too, there are actually many people who want to know if they can "legally" vote for a Republican if they, themselves, are registered Democrats. Amazing, yes, but I have heard that very question asked. This in an age of enlightenment such as ours!

It is not a healthful situation, when a part of our country has been solidly one-party, when any mention of the other can have such an effect upon an individual. One would almost think that a person is considered leprous if he admits to being a Republican.

It is a good thing to have a two-party system, and I think one party has been in power long enough. Going back 20 years to harp on the mistakes made by the Republicans is ridiculous in the face of the catastrophic errors that have been made since that time.

We can't all agree on all points, ever, to be sure, but let us try to be more Christian in our thinking and in our attitudes, and less one-sided and vicious in our attacks upon the opposing party.

—MRS. MARY G. LANDER.

We Named Wrong Man

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

ON the editorial page of your Sept. 5 issue, you stated that "and rabble-rousing Rep. Eugene Cox, who went to Washington back when Cal Coolidge arrived there, was beaten by Rep. Tom Abernethy, a 10-year man."

May I suggest that you apologize to the Hon. Eugene Cox and that you retract your statement.

For your information, Eugene Cox is not and has never been a rabble-rouser. Mr. Cox and the gentleman you intended to name, Mr. John Rankin of Tupelo, Miss., have served their country well.

Rankin was one of the first men to call attention to the Communists in the corrupt administration of Roosevelt and Truman, and he has consistently fought the idea of "equal rights" which many are advancing so there will eventually be free inter-racial intercourse in every state.

If you are a defender of the Communists that were in the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations, and if you are for free inter-racial intercourse, then it is easy to understand why you referred to the Hon. John Rankin as being a rabble-rouser and an old fogy.

—A GENTLEMAN FROM GEORGIA.

(The News erred in saying Representative Cox was defeated by Representative Abernethy, and apologizes to Mr. Cox for this. Mr. Abernethy beat Representative Rankin, a rabble-rouser. Editors, The News.)

Is McCarthyism 'Mere Trivia'?

PINEHURST

Editors, THE NEWS:

IN the debate between Pittsboro and Pinehurst, this writer selects "typewriters" and leaves the "albatrosses" to the gentleman from Pittsboro. The letter from the said gentleman, in your issue of Sept. 4, has been carefully read—all eight paragraphs. Many issues are covered, some of which are agreed with, while others are debatable, but all of them entirely ignore the only question in debate which is simply this:

Is "McCarthyism" and all that the term implies "mere trivia", (something to be brushed aside as of no consequence), or is it something to give concern to those who still have regard for the bill of rights, justice and decency?

—ELMER M. SIMKINS.

Minnesota Farmers Will 'Wait And See' About the Candidates

By JOSEPH ALSOP

(See "History Quiz Winners" In Adjoining Column.)

KASSON, Minn.

IT IS PROBABLY a good idea for this reporter to confess right off that he is not sure what was the real news at the Kasson Plowing Contest. The headlines, no doubt, will concentrate on the fact that Dwight D. Eisenhower and Adlai E. Stevenson made almost identical promises to the farmers of America. But was not the occasion itself, were not the farmers themselves, more notable than the speeches?

It was hard not to have this feeling, for the plowing match at Kasson and the people who attended it gave you a sense of the real glory of America —, and the phrase is not exaggerated.

The setting was superb — a rich almost park-like rolling country. Here on a little rise that commanded long green-and-golden prospects, a magnified and more businesslike county fair had been set down. Here, tens of thousands of farmers and their wives and children had come far more to look over the new farm machinery, as well as look over Presidential candidates. And the people, if you consider them rightly, were as superb as their setting.

A ten-year-old struck the note at the Methodist ladies' excellent luncheon stand. He remarked that his hands were numb from testing a new tractor, and explained shortly, but with pride, that he had persuaded his father to buy a different make. "Naw, I'm not going to the speaking," he added. "I got more work to do."

THRIFTY AND PROSPEROUS

These people were hard-working, shrewd in their work and very prosperous — tractors selling for close to $3,000 were going like hot cakes. They were cheerful, totally unpretentious and very sure of themselves. They were shrewd also about politics, and very far from ready to be swept off their feet by anyone. "I guess we'll wait and see," and, "He'll get our votes when we're sure he means it," were the characteristic comments.

When you also remember both Eisenhower and Stevenson spoke to huge, patiently standing outdoor audiences, it is not exactly surprising that neither candidate set the prairies on fire. None the less, both sides being on occasion to be celebrated, this plowing match at Kasson was an extremely interesting political event.

Eisenhower, to take the speakers in their order, was an utterly different man from what he had been before his southern trip. The uncertainty was gone. He had his stride. He seemed sure of what he had to say. And no one who has travelled for even a few days through the Midwestern farm districts can doubt that what he had to say was what the farmers wanted to hear.

Eisenhower's endorsement of high farm parities, the promises to extend support prices to crops not now covered, and the other points in the Eisenhower program, added up to "me-too-ism", naked and unashamed. But Dewey lost the farm vote in 1948 because he was not "me-too" enough, and who can blame Eisenhower for seeking to avoid Dewey's disastrous tactical error?

As for Stevenson, he spoke more soberly and with fewer flights of eloquence than usual, and he made almost precisely the same promises as Eisenhower. So that there were moments when one asked, "Wasn't this where I came in?"

LEERY OF GOP CONGRESSMEN

Yet with his greater natural eloquence, Stevenson got perhaps a shade better response; and at one point he got what Eisenhower never got, a really big hand. Significantly, this was when Stevenson mocked Eisenhower for "plowing under" the farm plank in the Republican platform; warned of the reactionary farm views of the Republicans in Congress; and rhetorically demanded how anyone could tell what farm policy would finally be adopted by "the two Republican parties."

This doubt about real intentions of the Republican Party seemed, indeed, to be the real advantage of the Democrats and the big problem for General Eisenhower and his high command. If one can base a judgment on the accidental evidence gleaned by talking to many of these Midwestern farmers here and in Wisconsin, the natural inclination of the farmers this time is to vote Republican. But every one of them is also conscious of his great gains in the last 20 years. The slightest suspicion that these gains may be taken away will produce a stampede of farmers into the Democratic fold.

The situation is made still more uncertain by another phenomenon, pithily explained by a sharp old party in dungarees, with a wallet that looked big enough to choke a horse. "Being a Democrat still ain't very respectable round here," he remarked. "so I guess with us voting Democratic is kind of like sin—everybody talks against it, but a hell of a lot of people commit it."

On the whole, the best way to sum up the situation at least for the present, is to say Eisenhower has taken a long step towards gaining the farm vote that Dewey lost, but the final outcome is still as uncertain as almost everything else in this uncertained election.

Congressional Quiz

By Congressional Quarterly

Q—Is it very often that a woman runs for Congress to fill a term left unexpired by the death of her husband?

A—Four present lady lawmakers did so. Reps. Vera Buchanan (D-Pa.) and Elizabeth Kee (D-W. Va.) succeeded their husbands after special elections in 1951, and veteran Reps. Frances P. Bolton (R-Ohio) and Edith Nourse Rogers (R-Mass.) got their start that way in 1940 and 1925, respectively. The last two won re-election to each succeeding Congress.

Q—Are many Members of Congress women?

A—Only one Senator, Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith (R-Maine), is a woman. But in the House there are 10 women—Reps. Reva Beck Bosone (Utah), Vera Buchanan (Pa.), Elizabeth Kee (W.Va.) and Edna Kelly (N. Y.), Democrats; and Frances P. Bolton (Ohio), Marguerite Church (Ill.), Cecil M. Harden (Ind.), Katherine St. George (N. Y.) and Ruth Thompson (Mich.), Republicans. Representative Thompson is the only "Miss."

Q—Is it all right to call a Congresswoman a "Congressman"?

A—Yes. A lady Representative to Congress can be addressed as either Congressman or Congresswoman, or as Mrs. or Miss, as the case may be. In formal House sessions, where direct address is not usually used, a Congresswoman is referred to as "gentlewoman" —"the gentlewoman from Ohio," for example.

Q — Why is it that two Connecticut Senators will be running against each other?

A—It happened this way. Sen. William Benton (D-Conn.) is seeking re-election, since his term expires Jan. 3, 1953. William A. Purtell won the GOP nomination to run against Benton. Meanwhile, Senator Brien McMahon (D-Conn.) died, and Gov. John D. Lodge (R-Conn.), Dec. 29 appointed Purtell to fill the vacancy until a permanent successor is elected in November to the McMahon term, which expires Jan. 3, 1957. So Purtell, a Senator at least for the present, is running against Benton, also a Senator.

Q—When does a legislator named to Congress while it is in adjournment go on the payroll?

A—Immediately. Although Congress adjourned July 7, William A. Purtell (R-Conn.), appointed Aug. 29 to fill temporarily the Senate vacancy left by the death of Sen. Brien McMahon (D-Conn.) and ex-Sen. Garrett L. Withers (D-Ky.), who Aug. 2 won election to fill a House vacancy, both started drawing pay from the time of appointment or election. The pay is a yearly $12,500, plus $2,500 for expenses.

Q—Can a Congressman ask federal employees in his district for financial help on his campaign?

A—No. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act makes it unlawful for anybody or the federal payroll either to solicit or receive campaign gifts from others paid out of the U. S. Treasury.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Military Finally Pools Its Purchasing

WASHINGTON

TODAY, at long, last the armed services will start doing what they promised to do six years ago—pool their buying of supplies instead of competing against each other.

Only after hearings by Congressman Eddie Hebert of Louisiana, backed by Chairman Carl Vinson of Georgia and Congressman Jack Anderson of California, plus a lot of badgering by this columnist, have the Army, Navy and Air Force finally consented to do the common sense thing—buy in co-operation with each other, not as if the other branches were parts of the Red Army.

This was one of the big arguments put forward when the brass hats begged for unification. Millions of dollars, they argued, would be saved.

Instead, as revealed by this column last February, the Army bought six different types of carpenters' squares—one for the Signal Corps, Ordnance, Transportation, Chemical Warfare, Engineers, and Quartermaster, at prices ranging from 65 cents to $2.19.

Boots And Nails

THE Air Force paid 12 cents a pound for 10-penny nails while the Navy paid six cents for exactly the same nails . . . The Marines buy a combat boot for $16.80; the Navy buys exactly the same boots for $24.65 . . . The Air Force dress shoe costs $7.19; the Navy dress shoe costs $6.08. They are almost identical except for some stitching on the heel. The Air Force bought 1,700,000 dress shoes, thus could have saved $1,700,000 if it had bought the Navy shoe . . . The medical services paid $21.75 each for blankets; the Air Force $14.15, the Navy $19.75.

The armed services also overorder, thus waste money on warehouse space. The Navy now has enough anchors to last 50 years, the Army enough of certain jeep parts to last 104 years . . . The Army, Navy and Marine Corps insist on having their own rival coffee-roasting plants . . . The Army and Navy operate separate medical supply systems, frequently buying the same scarce items in competition with each other. The Army has a medical supply base in Atlanta, Ga., yet when the Navy base at Pensacola, Fla., nearby, wants medical supplies, it gets them not from Atlanta, but from a Navy depot at Edgewater, N. J. . . . Likewise, when the Army at Fort Dix, N. J., wants medical supplies, it gets them not from the Navy at Edgewater, N. J., but from Schenectady, N. Y.

Amazing fact is that after the armed forces put across unification, they privately forgot all about one of their main arguments for unification. And the civilian heads of the defense department did little to make the brass hats co-operate. Even when this column published an expose of overlapping buying last Winter, it brought a series of Pentagon denials.

Inexcapable fact is that the biggest expenditures in government are by the military. In contrast, civilian expenditures are almost infinitesimal. But today, the military has finally admitted its mistake and will begin at least one saving by adopting a unified purchase plan.

Time For A Change

CERTAIN significant elections around the country already make it look as if U. S. voters really have decided it's "time for a change." Though the changes sometimes have gone against the Republicans, nevertheless the present temper of the American people is to end the political life of certain political phonies and hate-mongers. Here are some they have already kicked out:

Sen. Owen Brewster of Maine—After a quarter of a century of dominating the Republican Party in Maine, Brewster was ousted by progressive Governor Fred Payne. The people of Maine had got wise to the manner in which Brewster was working for Dictator Franco of Spain, Pan American Airways, and others.

Congressman John Rankin of Mississippi—This rootin'-tootin' hate distributor was considerably unbeatable in his district. He has spewed more intolerance than any other Congressman since Bilbo, was the man who first whispered that Eisenhower was a Jew because of a kidding reference in the West Point year book to like as a Swedish Jew." Last month, the people of Mississippi finally ousted Rankin.

The Republican machine in Philadelphia—Almost continually since the Civil War, the so-called city of brotherly love was ruled by a Republican machine. It was considered unbeatable. Last year, however, GOP corruption got so bad that the Democrats kicked the Republicans out. Philadelphia is now run by a new Democratic administration.

Sen. Kenneth McKellar—Down in Tennessee, doddering Senator McKellar, long considered unbeatable, had served in Congress for close to half a century. But despite the backing of the Crump machine, Tennessee voters have just kicked him out.

Senator McCarran's Nevada machine—For years McCarran has dominated the state of Nevada. But last week, a 31-year-old co-ed, Tom Mechling, relatively unknown in Nevada, defeated McCarran's last partner, plus the full weight of the McCarran machine. This was purely a Democratic fight, but it was indicative of the American public's desire for a change.