

1888—Sixty-Fifth Anniversary Year—1953
THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher
J. E. DOWD, General Manager
R. S. GRIFITH, Executive Editor
C. A. MCKNIGHT, Editor

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1953

'Steady Now, Pal — Don't Hamstring Me In My Work'

Stalin Tried To Honor Yalta, But Mao, Tito Disobeyed Him

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALOP

TWO WAYS OF VOTING ON LIQUOR

THE ONLY element of surprise in the introduction of a statewide liquor referendum bill yesterday was the disposition of it. Traditionally, such measures have been assigned to the House Proprietors & Grievances Committee. One of the favorite legislative pastimes each session is to examine the membership of the P & G Committee closely to determine whether it has been "packed" by the Speaker.

Yesterday Speaker E. T. Bost Jr. crossed to the experts and assigned the measure to the House Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns. Although Mr. Bost did not immediately explain his decision, there is a sound logic in it. As a result of postwar elections, several towns and cities in dry counties now have ABC systems. Mr. Bost may have figured that this development makes the liquor referendum a county-municipal question.

As to the merits of the bill, it is superior in just one respect to past referendum proposals. It is an all or nothing proposition. The state would be all wet, or it would be all dry. The Prohibitionists have sought to stack the deck. They wanted to offer the people a choice between drying up the state completely, or leaving the county option system as it exists.

For our part, we hope the General Assembly does not pass a referendum bill. Quite candidly, we fear that the Prohibitionists would win and that Mecklenburg would be once again in the lead.

We have tried both systems in Mecklenburg County in the past ten years. Neither Prohibition nor legal control is a perfect answer to the age-old problem of alcohol. But out of observation, we believe that ABC systems have rid the community of the big bootleggers who once held sway, that useful revenue which once went into the pockets of the bootleggers and Fort Mill liquor dealers now finds its way to local state tax coffers, and that general community morality, if not higher, is certainly not lower than it was during Prohibition.

Forced to choose between Prohibition and legal control, we enthusiastically favor legal control. Denial by the Legislature of a statewide

referendum is not, as the Drys put it, a denial of the right of the people to vote. They have that right today. Any county in North Carolina can vote itself wet or dry at any time it chooses. And there is no more cherished institution of democracy than local government.

The people of Mecklenburg expressed themselves on this issue in 1947. There is every reason to believe that they would express themselves in the same way and far more emphatically today. It would be a grave disservice to Mecklenburg, and to the other counties who have chosen legal control as the lesser of two evils, for the Legislature to abandon the county option system which works so well.

FREEDOM AT LAST

HE MAY HAVE looked with lustful eyes when he watched her walking along the road, but there was absence of any overt act constituting an offer or attempt to do injury to the person or persons. We cannot convict him on an criminal offense solely for that we may have been in his mind. Human law does not reach that far."

In that commensal, yet profound, paragraph, Chief Justice W. A. Devin gave the State Supreme Court its decision on the widely-publicized conviction of a Caswell County shagrapper, Mack Ingram, for assaulting a young white girl by "leering" at her from a distance of 65 feet.

In reversing the Superior Court which found Ingram guilty last November, the Supreme Court put the facts in proper perspective. The evidence was not sufficient, wrote Devin, to constitute assault, and he added: "It cannot be said that a pedestrian may be assaulted by a look, however frightening, from a person riding in an automobile some distance away."

Thoughtful North Carolinians will be relieved that the Supreme Court has set the Caswell County precedent. It is to be hoped that the General Assembly either repeal or tighten up the archaic statute under which a jury of twelve men convicted him.

GOODMAN'S SOUND INSURANCE BILL

THE PERSON who carries hospitalization insurance bought it with the expectation that it would defray part of his expenses in the event of illness. And if he answered the application questions honestly and in good faith, he has every right to collect. At present, however, all hospitalization insurance is sold subject to cancellation by the company. Through the years, this newspaper has received many complaints from persons whose policies were arbitrarily canceled after their first hospitalization. In some cases, real personal tragedies resulted.

Rep. Arthur Goodman of Mecklenburg proposes to change this system. He has introduced a bill to prevent cancellation of such insurance policies on short notice. Under Mr. Goodman's formula, an insurance company would be required to give notice equal to half the life of the policy—five years' notice

if the policy had been held for ten years; two-year notice for a four-year policy, etc.

We are not prepared to debate the specific details of the measure. Mr. Goodman's formula may be too rigid, or it may not be. And it seems that the bill should give the insurance company some protection against the person who fraudulently gave incorrect answers about prior illnesses. But we do believe that the bill is a good one. The greatest offenders in this matter appear to be some of the fly-by-night out-of-state firms. The two North Carolina Blue Cross companies do not make it a practice to cancel policies on old customers who may develop serious, lingering illnesses.

The insured person deserves protection against capricious and arbitrary cancellation of his hospitalization policy. The law does so now give him that protection. It should do so.

OUT OF SCHOOL, AND INTO PRISON

I RECOMMEND that be included in the Maintenance Appropriation Bill... funds to employ watchmen at the percentage in number to enforce effectively the school attendance law...

There is more to the governor's meritorious proposal, made in his Budget message Tuesday, than immediately meets the eye. It lies a long history of inadequate law, unenforced by law officials and evaded by delinquent parents, many of whose children went to prison instead of to school.

School attendance in North Carolina is compulsory for all children between the ages of seven and sixteen. The penalty for violation of this law is patently inadequate. Offending parents may get a \$25 fine, or a 30-day stretch in jail, but because there is no effective program to enforce the law, it is winked at.

Despite the need for attendance workers, their numbers are being decreased. In the 1949-50 school year 28 counties and 34 cities maintained these officers. This school year only 26 of the 100 counties, and 23 of the 72 major cities in the state employ them. Some are the result of pay cuts, imposed by social work training for the job of remedying non-attendance. In school units out of attendance workers other school officials, burdened with full-time tasks, are charged with this added responsibility.

Last year the Institute for Research in Social Science at UNC compared attendance and drop-out figures in the state and arrived at this conclusion:

"Attendance workers tend to reduce the number of absences. They do not, however, affect the percentage of drop-outs. This may be because they do not work in this particular field, having no contact with the counselors and guidance personnel. Surely there is a need for an overall definition of policy or responsibility."

"This definition and execution of policy is long overdue. About five students out of every 100 drop out of school each year. All too often, society next hears from them when they appear in the juvenile or regular courts. Parole Commission W. F. Blandford's average educational level among state prisoners is the fifth grade. In other words North Carolina (with 94,000 illiterates and 434,000

citizens who have not had an education beyond the fourth grade) is populating its prisons with many lawbreakers who saw early in life the school with which the compulsory school attendance law could be violated. Small wonder that these unschooled unfortunate went on to transgress other statutes. Thirty-three years ago, State Superintendent Charles H. Mohr made a point of it, reportedly, is still valid today. He said:

"In many cases the children are kept from schools by careless, indifferent parents, and sometimes by law parents, who compel them to work in cotton mills, while their fathers sit around the stores, talk politics, and discuss ways and means of preserving the government; when I think of these cases, I am compelled to conclude that the state ought to come to the rescue of these helpless children."

Superintendent Mebane got the compulsory attendance law he advocated. But too often it has been disregarded. The governor's request should, by all means, be granted. However, to make the funds work, the Legislature must accompany them with provisions for high professional standards and adequate pay for the part of attendance workers, and harsh penalties for lawbreaking parents.

A certain storekeeper reported a fire in his establishment the very day he signed a new fire insurance policy. The company accepted from him a check for \$100. The only thing the manager could do was to write the policy-holder the following note: "Sir: You took out an insurance policy from us on 10 A. M. and your fire did not break out until 1:30 P. M. Will you kindly explain the delay?"—Greensville (Tenn.) Sun.

"Oh, doctor, I'm afraid my husband is losing his hearing. Sometimes I talk to him for hours and then discover that he hasn't heard a single word I have said." "That's not an affliction, madam," replied the doctor, "That's a gift."—Green Bay (Wis.) Press Gazette.

Two duellists agreed to meet at dawn. "In case Jim a little late," said the challenger, sassy he had started this, "don't wait, or you'll be shot."—Aberdeen (W. C.) Citizen.



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.

See Jonas Saturday

WASHINGTON Editors, The News: On Saturday the 28th, I expect to be in Charlotte attending the Lincoln Day Dinner. I would like to ask it possible for my constituents who would like to do so to visit with me and discuss their problems.

I also wish to give everyone an opportunity to present for my consideration any views and ideas they may have concerning the issues of the hour.

We have therefore arranged to be in the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce Room, 121 W. 4th St., from 10 A. M. to 12 noon on the 28th. If you are unable to attend, please write to me in that room from 2 to 4 P. M. I cordially invite all who are interested to see me then. CHARLES RAYNER JONAS

Cheek Explains Car Insurance Bill

RALEIGH Editors, The News: I would like the opportunity of discussing with the people of North Carolina, through the columns of your newspaper, the merits of Senate Bill 105, entitled AN ACT TO PROMOTE SAFETY ON THE HIGHWAYS, TO ENCOURAGE DRIVER RESPONSIBILITY, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE GIVING OF SECURITY AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY BY OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF AUTOMOBILES, which was introduced by Senator Charles W. Cheek, Godwin, Hogwood, Barnhardt, Pate and Hundley.

This bill is sponsored by the North Carolina Department of Insurance and is a measure that passes the legislature, but not until the people of North Carolina are fully acquainted with its provisions and the reasons for its merits and the protection it offers our citizens.

Throughout North Carolina there is a growing demand that something be done about the irresponsible motorist—some law to require all persons to carry liability insurance before being licensed by the state of North Carolina to drive an automobile. This can be approached by either an outright compulsory insurance law with all its resultant evils of increased automobile insurance rates. We fear that compulsory insurance laws are extremely expensive for our citizens to carry insurance and at the same time will not have any adverse effect on automobile liability insurance rates. We fear that compulsory insurance might cause our rates to go up beyond the reach of the average man and make it an undue burden on our people. This has been the experience in the one state now requiring compulsory insurance.

Senate Bill 105 imposes a definite responsibility on every driver of an automobile involved in an accident which results in death or injury to a person or damage to property in excess of \$100. This is true regardless of fault. The driver would be required to show evidence of his financial responsibility in the accident report. For example, if a person driving down the highway on his side of the road were run into by a car crossing the highway, the driver would be required to file accident reports. Both drivers would have to show financial responsibility—an insurance policy, cash, or surety bond in amount sufficient to cover the damage up to a minimum of \$10,000. Upon failure to comply within 60 days the operator's license would be revoked.

Many feel that this is an unjust imposition on the "innocent man." However, the person who is innocent may establish his innocence without delay and thereby avoid the penalties of this Act. Frankly, I do not believe that the present legislature will pass this bill unless enough of our people are acquainted with its obligations as well as the penalties, and still want it passed in order to be sure that everybody carries insurance to protect the public against injury or damage to property. If the people of this state are willing to accept this obligation, a satisfactory solution to the insurance problem has been found for every accident where there is injury to persons or damage to property to the extent of \$100 regardless of fault in order to have insurance force, then this bill may receive favorable consideration.

Any comments with respect to this bill will be welcome. WALDO C. CHEEK, Commissioner of Insurance

Thanks From The Dime Marchers

CHARLOTTE Editors, The News: ANOTHER March of Dimes campaign has come to a close in North Carolina with, we believe, a satisfactory result.

Because of the unprecedented high incidence of polio in the nation last year—more than 55,000 new cases in the United States and about 46,000 in the U. S.—the need for financial assistance—North Carolina volunteered a goal of 30 cents per capita for the 1953 March of Dimes.

Based on the 1950 census, this amounted to approximately \$1,216,000—the highest goal ever volunteered in the history of the March of Dimes.

It is still too early to predict, with any accuracy, whether or not this goal has been reached. The workmen have done a splendid job of raising support from the state press. I can hardly conceive of how greater co-operation could have been given to helping make our fund-raising drive all the more successful.

So, once again, we say: Thank you for your help. MRS. PHILLIPS RUSSELL, Director of Organization, N. C. March of Dimes.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON GRIM, gray Alcatraz, arising from the midst of San Francisco Bay, is the nation's toughest prison, may be closed as part of the Republican economy war.

The U. S. House has recommended the closing of the Senate Judiciary Committee by James Bennett, Director of Federal Prisons, who said the recommendation is extremely expensive. Bennett also revealed that the old bread-and-butter diet for incurables has been replaced by an unpalatable "spinach diet."

"There are a great many objections to Alcatraz from administrative and operating standpoints," he explained. "It is located way off on the West Coast on a dreary rock island, and is extremely expensive to operate. We have to have water taken in there. In addition, the personnel do not like it. We almost have to order men to go there, and it is an administrative, monstrously."

Bennett also reported on the other 31 prisons in the federal system. He made no comment about the recent outbreak of prison riots, though he indicated that he believed Alcatraz penitentiary is the worst trouble spot.

Expensive Acatraz Plan May Be Closed

"Our principal problem at Alcatraz," he pointed out, "is that we have about 500 inmates in 100 cells, and that makes for relatively few single cells, and that makes for trouble, not having any space for men where they can live by themselves."

Holland bill for tidelands oil, now want to extend the drilling limit 250 miles out to sea.

This is because there is no important oil off the coast of Texas unless you go about 12 to 14 miles out, and the Holland bill gives Texas only 10 to 12 miles. The bill also gives Louisiana only three miles, as it does the other states, and there is no important oil within three miles of Louisiana coast.

The only state the Holland bill really benefits is California, which has oil right close to shore.

All this is the reason behind the latest lobbying drive to extend drilling limits two or three miles, but 250 miles, and give each state sovereignty over underground deposits that distance away.

Just a quarter of a century ago, however, a small run-cutter called the "Tm Alone" was chugging down Texas coast. The Gulf of Mexico was shut up by federal prohibition against drilling for oil.

Which became a famous international incident, may stand in the path of Texas and Louisiana today.

How About Russia?

FOR, though the "Tm Alone" was suspected of being owned by the Sam

much-attached promise to Stalin. He said he would approve a special Soviet position in Manchuria, which the Soviet Far Easterners were in a position to take anyway. On the other hand, Stalin made certain equally vital promises to Roosevelt.

He promised, first, to bring the entire body of the Russian fleet into full power of the Russian flag, as strongly desired by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Stalin also promised to recognize and support the Generalissimo's government as the only legitimate government in China, and to give no aid or comfort to the Chinese Communists. If this Yalta bargain had indeed been made, the Chinese would now hold the China and most of Manchuria, and the world as we live in would be a very different place.

The Yalta bargain is important because it proves conclusively that Stalin intended to keep his Far Eastern bargain that he made at Yalta. What Stalin urged the Chinese Communists to do was precisely what Chiang Kai-shek had been asking them to do for years—enter into a coalition government after denouncing themselves as power by dissolving the Communist armies. But the Chinese Communists boldly defied Stalin; and a good deal later Stalin was pleased that they had done so.

Just what Stalin's first thought to keep his Far Eastern bargain is also suggested by another opinion. "It is quoted as saying: 'This man, the Yalta bargain, was right and the Yulgovs. It is true, we have also made mistakes. For instance, after we had signed our famous declaration and Greece had been taken under American protection, we had previously objected to the order, but Stalin insisted strongly.'

Stalin would not agree with the Yulgovs' opinion that they should further help the Greek partisans. He is quoted as saying: 'It is true, we have also made mistakes. For instance, after we had signed our famous declaration and Greece had been taken under American protection, we had previously objected to the order, but Stalin insisted strongly.'

Stalin would not agree with the Yulgovs' opinion that they should further help the Greek partisans. He is quoted as saying: 'It is true, we have also made mistakes. For instance, after we had signed our famous declaration and Greece had been taken under American protection, we had previously objected to the order, but Stalin insisted strongly.'

Stalin would not agree with the Yulgovs' opinion that they should further help the Greek partisans. He is quoted as saying: 'It is true, we have also made mistakes. For instance, after we had signed our famous declaration and Greece had been taken under American protection, we had previously objected to the order, but Stalin insisted strongly.'

Stalin would not agree with the Yulgovs' opinion that they should further help the Greek partisans. He is quoted as saying: 'It is true, we have also made mistakes. For instance, after we had signed our famous declaration and Greece had been taken under American protection, we had previously objected to the order, but Stalin insisted strongly.'

Stalin would not agree with the Yulgovs' opinion that they should further help the Greek partisans. He is quoted as saying: 'It is true, we have also made mistakes. For instance, after we had signed our famous declaration and Greece had been taken under American protection, we had previously objected to the order, but Stalin insisted strongly.'

Ferdy Land States Righters Want Minerals On Federal Domain

BY MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON WITH the states right banner flying high the Congress will soon pass a measure turning over to the states the rights of mineral lands on Federal lands. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.

By the all-embracing claim covered by states rights will not stop transfer of the mineral lands to the states. Persuasive spokesmen for the states, both in and out of Congress, are confident that the bill will pass. That was a pledge in the Republican campaign last Fall.