THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher · J. E. DOWD, General Manager · WILLIAM M. REDDIG, Editor

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1948

'Now We See Through A Glass, Darkly'

Court Recognizes Our Emergency

THE Supreme Court may be suspected of following the world trend as well as the election returns in the light of its decision yesterday, unanimously upholding Federal rent controls.

After more than a year of official peace, "the war power sustains this legislation," declares the opinion written by Justice Douglas, which rejects the contention that Congress lost its rent control powers on December 31, 1946, when President Truman declared hostilities at an end.

"Whatever may be the consequences when war is officially terminated, the war power does not necessarily end with the cessation of hostilities," Justice Douglas held.

That is an important distinction by the Court which recognizes the war emergency still is far from over and which strengthens the hands of the Congress and the Administration in dealing with the crisis in which we now find ourselves. The immediate effect of the decision was to end the effort to kill rent control on the ground of its constitutionality, at a moment when Congress was moving to extend the life of this measure beyond Feb. 29. However, the Court's action has wider significance than its bearing on rents. If it had found that rent control is unconstitutional under the "war power," it would have shut the door against restoration of other wartime controls at the very time when the nation is being forced to reconsider the need for these emergency measures.

The growing seriousness of the postwar emergency is illustrated by the rent control issue. The House Banking Committee yesterday voted to extent the present rent law a month and Chairman Wolcott predicted that Congress would continue the curbs at least a year. The leadership of both parties now seems agreed that rent controls are in the public interest. According to Senator Morse, the Republicans were convinced of that fact by a showing that rents would soar 100 per cent if the ceilings were removed. No one needs to have a picture drawn of what a devastating effect that would have on our already inflated economy.

The recent American price break has sobered all with the realization of how quickly inflation could turn into a depression, creating a situation in which we would need control powers as drastic as any used during the war to stave off disaster. President Truman underscored that ominous fact yesterday in his appeal to the American mayors to support the Administration's anti-inflation program. Chester Bowles, former OPA Administrator, made it more emphatic with his call for a program to carry the nation through a recession which, he believes, has been made inevitable by our inflation.

The wisdom of the Supreme Court's decision was highlighted in other developments showing just how far we are from real peace. It was reflected in the President's report to Congress that more money for military assistance for Greece and Turkey will be requested, in General Eisenhower's warning that America must prepare itself against a lightning war, in the nervousness of the markets, and in other ways. It is good to know that Congress still has the war emergency power.

'Farmer Bob' Stays On The Job

NORTH CAROLINA is pleased that Rep. Robert Lee Doughton has decided to stand for another term in Congress. He now is the oldest man in Congress, 84, and the second oldest in point of continuous service. Rep. Adolph J. Sabath of Illinois entered the House of Representatives four years before North Carolina's "Farmer Bob" took his seat March 4, 1911.

With the announcement of his candidacy in the 1948 campaign, Representative Doughton is seeking his twentieth term. In the 38 years covered by his service in Washington, America has grown from a nation of 92 million population to 144 million, weathered inflation, depression and two World Wars, developed into the world's industrial giant and emerged from relative isolation to the position of world leader in virtually all important respects.

Congressman Doughton has seen it all from a ringside seat and has figured conspicuously in the dramatic political spectacle which has been such a large part of the American cavalcade, but time and change have rested lightly on Representative Doughton himself. The wear and tear of the years and the confusion of Washington have made such a slight impression on him, in fact, that he keeps the same strenuous working schedule that he followed when he first went to Congress nearly four decades ago.

Tar Heels are happy to see Mr. Doughton making plans for two more years in Congress for many reasons. They like to have him around. They are proud of his long and distinguished record in the House. They think it is highly appropriate that North Carolina should be represented before the nation by a man who gives a notable demonstration of sturdiness, industriousness and hard-headedness. They regard his nickname, "Muley," as an accolade and not an epithet, for they find stubbornness a virtue when it is combined with the kind of common-sense that is bred in the bone of this farmer-businessman-banker-statesman from the Ninth District of North Carolina.

The nation, as well as the Old North State, should be pleased at the news that stubborn "Farmer Bob" is staying on in Washington at this time of all times, when we have less than enough of the fiscal knowledge that he has to offer, and when we need it more than ever before in our history. His abilities in this field served the nation well during the long period when he was chairman of the House Ways & Means Committee, from the 73rd to the 79th Congress inclusive. He remains the ranking Democratic member of that Committee and is alternate chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue. His continued presence in Washington is a guarantee that fewer mistakes will be made in the present complicated tax-fixing task which confronts the 80th Congress. His return to the next Congress will increase the hope that practical steps will be taken in the long over-due task of placing our Federal tax structure on scientific basis.

'Overtime' Rate For Doctors

WITHOUT going through all the bother of collective bargaining, calling on the services of a Federal concilator or signing a contract with the party of the second part, the doctors of the Rowan-Davie Medical Society at Salisbury have taken steps to solve their overtime problem.

This reform has been accomplished by setting up a new system of fees for Sunday and holiday calls, effective last Sunday. The new rate is $5 for Sunday and holiday house calls from 8 A. M. to 7 P. M.; $5 for house calls from 7 P. M. to 10 P. M. and $7 for house calls from 10 P. M. to 8 A. M.

Fees for office calls remain at $2 and for house calls between 8 A. M. and 7 P. M. at $3. The increase therefore represents something more than the time-and-a-half pay rate which union labor gets in the hours worked beyond 40 hours a week under the Fair Employment Practices Law.

"The increase is not made with the idea of increasing the cost of medical care to the patient," the society's statement says. "The one and only reason for these charges is to discourage unnecessary calls in the evening, nights, Sunday and holidays that could be made during daytime during the week."

The society also points out that "medical fees to the doctor in general have not increased in proportion to general living expenses."

Admittedly, our doctors are overworked and something should be done to give them time for recreation and relaxation. It is also clear that they are so burdened because there is a scarcity of practitioners and there will be no real relief in this condition until we have more doctors and better public health programs. Meanwhile, it is doubtful if doctors are wise or fair in taking unilateral action to remedy their situation which penalizes individuals who are unfortunate enough to have emergencies over the week-ends and holidays. Perhaps the new fee schedule will discourage some "unnecessary calls." It may also have the effect of putting off until Monday the rush call that would save the life of a man whose heart is behaving queerly, of a woman who has symptoms of acute appendicitis, or of a child who is stricken with a dangerous infection.

From The Louisville Courier-Journal

Another McKellar Drive On TVA

SENATOR KENNETH McKELLAR'S record in Congress has established him as an implacable enemy of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The reason is not hard to see. He never has been able to make of it a gigantic field for his home state patronage. He never has been able to control it politically. His efforts to cripple it have met defeat. This has challenged and embittered him as only a stubborn old politician can be challenged and embittered. And he has warm support, of course, from powerful private utility interests.

As a result, any bill which he introduces in Congress touching TVA is suspect. And his current bill is more than suspect. Gordon R. Clapp, chairman of TVA, made clear when he visited Louisville this week that the McKellar bill quite literally threatens existence of what is perhaps the world's finest project in Government development of public resources.

The McKellar bill would convert TVA from an autonomous Government authority into political agency dependent on annual Congressional appropriations. It would strait-jacket TVA's personnel management, which has been something of a model. It would, as Mr. Clapp says simply, be disastrous.

There is plenty of evidence for Mr. Clapp to offer in support of TVA as it stands. He will have an opportunity to offer it when a subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee starts hearings March 15. But we hope the committee will visit the valley and see for itself what TVA is doing. For there in the valley is more dramatic evidence than statistics can afford of why TVA should be let alone.

A third world war might get us back where we started, swinging from limbs by our tails and not trying to finance any international projects.—*Louisville Times.*

People's Platform

Equal Rights Under The Law

ELON COLLEGE

Editors, THE NEWS:

AS A citizen of our democratic nation, I should like to point out in this letter certain infractions of our beliefs that we must hold as Americans and also what can be done to make our nation worthy of its place of world leadership.

Believing in the Christian ideals of the brotherhood of man, and also having faith in our democratic processes, I believe immediate changes are necessary in the United States today if we hope to develop our spirit as a free nation.

One need not state the injustice being done to the members of our country, North and South; however, my particular motive for this statement concerns the South.

Strides have been made in granting more privileges and opportunities to the minority group in Southern states, but these are undone by the continuance of inequalities and injustices detrimental to the moral fiber of the nation. There are those in high office who would continue to blast any proposals giving opportunities for equal and better working conditions and the simple upholding of rights and privileges granted by our Constitution. We should be ashamed of what they and others are doing to impede real progress.

We believe that all men are created equal and have the equal right to justice under law and that there should be freedom of thought, expression, and of worship. These and the right to a better way of life and equal rights, we believe also to be a part of democracy. Who can truthfully say that all the privileges and opportunities of this system of government are accepted and granted by those who administer them?

The United States is working with other nations who desire an enduring world peace and the freedom of man. An United Nations Commission on Human Rights is preparing an international covenant which will be a binding force giving human rights to all people.

America is leading this work, but surely with hidden hypocrisy.

Individuals, church groups, and organizations in the South are giving voice to their disapproval of existing laws, customs, and practices directed to the minority.

President Truman has shown a positive program for the correction of the stigma of segregation in his statement listing action desirable and feasible at this time. Only after the report of the Committee on Civil Rights had made extensive study of the situation, did the program emerge.

In part, it asks Federal protection against lynching, the establishment of a permanent FEPC, strengthening of existing civil rights statutes and protecting more adequately the right to vote.

Are these radical departures from established ideals of democracy? One need only to examine the Constitution.

And yet Southern leaders and individuals cry out that all "true Southerners" must take a stand against the passage of any laws granting these rights. Others are saying that these proposals are ridiculous and unthinkable. There are also individuals and organized groups actively protesting any change for the South, contesting that the South should remain as it is today.

You can change this unpleasant picture in several ways. United effort in urging those of position to discontinue action against the South's minority is vitally needed. This united effort can be taken to the polls in electing people who will on local, state and national levels of government be leaders in democracy. Support organizations and individuals which are wisely seeking to control this undesirable situation which must be solved. Voice your support of the Civil Rights Program.

I believe that you realize the necessity of America discarding its hypocritical practices as quickly as possible with the wisest and most expedient courses of action.

—C. BAXTER TWIDDY
Virginia
Student at Elon College

A Newcomer's Plight

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

HAVE been in Charlotte for several months, and would like to make a complaint.

Have a very good job here, and like Charlotte very much, but living conditions are terrible. Am not living with my wife, on account of not being able to find housekeeping rooms. Have been trying to board. The last place I went to board, the lady took me in very nice. Her price was $10 per week. I paid it gladly, and asked about meals. She informed me that she only served two meals per day. I thought I could get by on that. My job is at night, so I only get breakfast and cold lunch to take with me. This evening when I finished my nap and came down for my lunch, the cook informed me that she did not serve meals from Saturday morning until Monday morning. I was so disgusted and pure mad that I could have "cussed."

Why do people in Charlotte gouge the newcomers? Isn't there a law, sir, against such practices? If there is, I wish you would give me the information as to whom to contact.

If your good paper will help me to find a light housekeeping room, I will gladly say you for the ad. I want get my wife back to help me, and be my pal. If I don't find something soon, I may have to give up my good job, and break in jail.

—HINES W. WILLSON
Night Watchman

Rudeness On Busses

CHARLOTTE

Editors, THE NEWS:

THIS is to try to do something about the present conditions of bus travel in this City of Charlotte. Today (Feb. 14) while on one, the driver shouted none too quietly, "If you want to get off this bus you had better get off that cord." This is no way for anyone to act in public regardless of their personal feelings.

I have seen and heard others say they have seen a woman with a small baby get on a bus and the driver started before she could get seated. This naturally would throw anyone off balance. It also could lead to injury to both mother and baby.

I would like to see all such happenings reported to this paper and to the Duke Power Co. to see if we can better this situation.

This is not to say that all the drivers are this inconsiderate, for we do have many that are truly fine people and a credit to any community but this isn't the Charlotte that used to treat people as people.

—ERNEST D. McSWAIN
326 E. 9th St.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Morgan Man To Govern Federal Reserve

WASHINGTON

WHEN FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT first entered the White House, one of his toughest feuds was with the J. P. Morgan banking firm, which a Senate probe disclosed as having wiggled out of thousands of dollars of income taxes. All during his long administration, Roosevelt kept the Morgans at arm's length—much to the consternation of his mother, who was a great friend of several Morgan partners.

In contrast, Harry Truman will soon have a Morgan-made man governing the system of the United States. That will be the situation when likable Tom McCabe steps into his new job as governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

Most people around Washington haven't realized it, but McCabe's brilliant climb up the ladder, plus his equally meteoric rise in Government has been due not only to a winning smile and shrewd business technique, but to the constant backstage backing of the House of Morgan.

The smartest move McCabe ever made was when as sales manager for the Scott Paper Co. in 1927, he floated a loan with Drexel & Co. (part of the Morgan combine) and with that loan became president of Scott Paper.

Simultaneously McCabe transferred the company's advertising to J. Walter Thompson, pet advertising concern of the Morgan firm, and also worked out one of the biggest dividends in stock-market history, exchanging one share of stock for ten. Prior to the Drexel-J. P. Morgan loan, Scott Paper stock had been closely held by only about 60 people. But with the loan the stock was sold widely. McCabe, as president, got the outright ownership of 560 shares and a "beneficial" ownership of 88,074.

The Hand Of 'J. P.'

MCCABE and the Scott Paper Co. have stuck close to the Morgan crowd ever since. And working together they have made Scott the foremost tollette tissue company in the world. From a volume of about $5,000,000 when McCabe arranged the Drexel-Morgan financial hookup in 1927, the company now has an annual volume of around $60,000,000.

Thomas S. Gates Jr., a partner in Drexel & Co., is one of the Scott directors. Another director is Gilbert Kinney, vice-president of J. Walter Thompson, who helped set the Scott-Morgan wedding. Charles S. Cheston, a Morgan director, is also director of the Mead Paper Co., which in turn is Scott's partner in ownership of the Brunswick Pulp & Paper Co.

Another official of the Scott Paper Co. is G. Willing Pepper, grandson of the late Joseph Wayne, into whose shoes Tom McCabe eventually stepped as chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

It was also the son of a Morgan partner, Ed Stettinius, who gave McCabe his meteoric boost up the ladder of government. The Morgan interests had put Stettinius into the chairmanship of the U. S. Steel Co., and while still in that position, Stettinius became a member of the business advisory council to the Department of Commerce. He then helped get his friend Tom McCabe a similar position on the advisory council.

And from that point on, wherever Stettinius went, McCabe went with him. When Stettinius joined the Council of National Defense, McCabe became his executive assistant. When Stettinius became director of priorities, McCabe became deputy director. And when Stettinius let the big steel and aluminum crowd pull the wool over his eyes and postpone new steel and aluminum plants, McCabe, who also failed to back the big steel and aluminum combines, moved with Stettinius over to the Lend-Lease Administration.

There McCabe was deputy lend-lease administrator to Stettinius. Finally when the son of the Morgan partner became Secretary of State, McCabe moved into the State Department in charge of liquidating U. S. property overseas.

So, step by step, gracious, delightful Tom McCabe and his Morgan friends have moved down the lane of business and government together. It has been a pleasant and profitable association—for both. And it will be interesting to see who benefits most from Tom's new and all-important job as Federal Reserve governor—his old banking friends or the public.

What Became Of Vaughan?

THE President's swashbuckling military aide, Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, ducked out the other night on the ladies of the American Legion Auxiliary at Alexandria, Va. He was supposed to speak on universal military training, and a big crowd had gathered.

Even the mayor showed up—but not General Vaughan.

"He must be running some important errand for the President," hopefully suggested Mrs. Penn Howard, chairman of the American Legion Auxiliary.

But two hours and four substitute speakers later, she was still urging the ladies to be patient.

"He's from my own home town," she pleaded.

The general never showed up.

Merry-Go-Round

IDAHO'S Senator Glen Taylor has been passing out free sacks of Idaho potatoes, and one arrived at the Democratic National Committee. Chairman Sullivan got it in the Southern Democrats boiled over against the President's civil rights message. Wrote back Sullivan: "Thanks for the spuds! I think I'll put them in the cellar here, so if I have to hole up again in the Confederate Army, I'll have something to subsist on. Looks like the siege of the Potomac is on! . . . Congressman Gerald Landis of Indiana has turned the tide in favor of a higher minimum wage. The same key Republicans who last year blocked his efforts to raise the wage floor are now willing to accept a 20-cent boost—from 40 to 60 cents.

Bradley Bans Brass Hats

KINDLY Gen. Omar Bradley, known as the GI's best friend, had a birthday last week. He was 54 and his birthday fell on the same day as Abraham Lincoln's.

Having just been made Chief of Staff, the top brass of the Pentagon Building were in something of a twitter as to who would be invited to the General's birthday party. It was known in advance that a party was to be thrown in the Chief of Staff's office, but nobody could figure out who was on the guest list.

As the time of the party arrived, the mystery was easily solved. Those invited were the clerks, secretaries and enlisted men who worked in Bradley's office. None of the brass hats was present except for one man—Bradley's old friend, General Eisenhower.

Joseph & Stewart Alsop

Taft And Dewey--I

WASHINGTON

BOTH leading contenders for the Republican nomination, Governor Thomas E. Dewey and Senator Robert A. Taft, have now made significant changes in tactics. The changes assure something very important that was not previously in prospect — a major national debate on great issues of policy between the opposing wings of the Republican Party, with the outcome to be decided at the Philadelphia Convention.

Until recently, Dewey's tactics were to present himself to the nation as the busy Governor. The idea was that he might just possibly be tempted to undertake larger duties, yet was mainly preoccupied with the problems of New York state. This kind of transparent deception was excused by all the precedents of American politics, according to which the office must seem to seek the man, whereas in fact the man is running his legs off after the office.

As for Taft, there was no secret that his representatives were bidding hard in the great, quadrennial delegate auction of the South (an infinitely more remarkable event than the better publicized Southern tobacco sales). Elsewhere, also, Taft was seeking delegates, presenting himself as the leader of the Republican Congress, and standing on the record of the Congress.

Taft has now modified his line, abandoning the rather uphill task of arousing national enthusiasm for the record of the Congress, and seeking instead simply to sell Taft and Taft's views.

DEWEY CHANGES

Dewey has actually changed his line completely, as his remarkable Lincoln Day speech at Boston clearly discloses. There was obvious politics in what Dewey said about the bi-partisan foreign policy. His speech was also the plainest, hardest-hitting, most comprehensive and ablest exposition of the realistic approach to world problems which the country has received from any leader except Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

It is reported that the change in tactics which Dewey completed with this speech was the result of careful and prayerful analysis of polls taken for the Dewey organization by one of the national opinion-testing outfits. Even the polls already published in the newspapers have plainly shown that the voters now want strong, decisive leadership. A coy preoccupation with the problems of state government was inconsistent with national leadership in the grand manner. Dewey has therefore consciously set out to show how much the stuff of leadership is in him.

While Dewey was speaking in Boston, Senator Taft was also voicing his views on his mid-Western campaign trip. The difference between the two men was most clearly disclosed in their approach to the problem of appropriations for the European Recovery Program.

TALKS COMMON SENSE

Dewey was the first important American politician to talk plain common sense on this subject. He said, in effect, that national survival, or at least avoidance of another terrible war, hung upon ERP's success. Therefore he advocated giving ERP the strongest possible administrator, and then putting at the administrator's disposal ample funds to do the job. He pointed out what has been obvious from the start, that the sum needed for ERP could not be determined in advance. And he sensibly suggested that if the administrator could be counted on not to waste money, it was wise to provide him with an adequate operating margin.

Taft, on the other hand, gave grudging lip service to the ERP idea, but made it obvious that he would prefer the risk of too little money for ERP rather than the risk of too much. This implies that he has not grasped the gigantic risk of ERP failure. And herein lines the essential difference between the two men. Taft, with his nostalgia for a pleasanter past, looks backward, and is reluctant to face the grim facts of the present. Dewey, also briskly up-to-date, has faced all the facts, however grim, and has made up his mind that these facts must be dealt with.

Samuel Grafton

Taft And Dewey--II

NEW YORK.

I FIND Mr. Taft's and Mr. Dewey's Lincoln Day speeches almost equally disturbing. Mr. Taft, speaking at St. Paul, attacked the Yalta and Teheran conferences; he lifted the Republican Party's skirts high and clean of these meetings, and he declared that the "bipartisan" phase of our foreign policy applied only to later events. But what was wrong with Teheran and Yalta?

Isn't our moral position all the better because there was a Teheran and a Yalta? Suppose we had adopted the "get tough" line without having had these conferences? How would we have looked then, as pretending peacemakers? Mr. Taft's remarks in past agreements come dangerously close to foreclosing on all possibilities of future ones.

For Mr. Taft professes to find an ambivalance in our foreign policy. He sees a conflict between our past agreements with Russia, and our efforts to "stop Communism" by spending money and building or buying friends. Does this mean that the Marshall Plan (in Mr. Taft's view) rules out any possibility of agreement with Russia? Is the Marshall Plan so entirely anti-Russian, so equalitic and organically hostile, as to make any future agreement with Russia seem an act of incoherence?

That is not the impression Mr. Marshall has sought to convey. He has pushed the Marshall Plan as an approach to peace, not as an act of foreclosure on all possible efforts to reach a compromise. We are going to be in serious trouble if we intend to hold that the Marshall Plan will be outraged in case accord breaks out between the powers.

Mr. Taft does not want war, I am sure; but he comes close to telling us that the reaching of an accord between Mr. Truman and Mr. Stalin (which would necessarily involve some concessions) could be the signal for an end of the bipartisan approach to foreign policy.

* * *

Come to think of it (and it is a fine, fat question) what would happen to the bipartisan approach if the President, suddenly, to announce an understanding with Russia? Could it stand the strain of the end of strife? Is it verging in the direction of becoming an anti-agreement agreement?

* * *

For there was Mr. Dewey's speech, too, at Boston. Mr. Dewey is supposed to be a great opponent of Mr. Taft, yet his speech curiously paralleled the attack. The same scorn was poured out upon our early agreements with Russia. There was the same disavowal of bipartisan responsibility for them. There was the same eager welcoming of the new era of "bulwarks" against the Russian bear.

Mr. Dewey differs from Mr. Taft mainly in that he wants a big, not a small, Marshall Plan, and that he wants to help Western Europe to form an economic and defensive union. But both men speak of walls, not treaties. In neither speech is there the whisper of hope for an accord. Both sneer at past compromises; both set up perspectives which seem to rule out future compromise, though there has never been a peace treaty in the history of the world that was not built on compromise. And though Mr. Dewey is not a war man, any more than is Mr. Taft, he, like the other, offers the world nothing better than a thin hundred years of sentry-go. That he does so with the fine air of giving us a wonderful and glorious gift only makes the proceeding seem all the more strange. We are left wondering where this fear of great talk that the era of compromise with Russia is over could lead us in the future.

It becomes clear that the real quarrel over the Marshall Plan is not over whether it is to be small or large. It is between those who regard it as the first stage of a complex adventure in making peace with a difficult opponent, and those who rather smugly look upon it as the end of the journey, as the miraculous gadget which can stop questions without supplying answers.