

WILL THIS 'STUDY' GO DEEP ENOUGH?

WHEN the Charlotte Civil Service Commission is unable, despite intensive advertising, to interest qualified applicants in becoming policemen, and when frequent recruiting keeps in those lines well below full strength, a study of working conditions and compensation is certainly in order.

Councilman Jim Smith said he wasn't talking about a complete "investigation" of the Police Department when he called the meeting Wednesday afternoon. And he noted it down at a subsequent meeting that night to substitute the word "study," and to include City Manager Henry Yancey in the Civil Service study.

We don't seriously, however, that this particular study is going to turn up very much. In the first place, Mr. Yancey, as chief administrative officer of the City Government, has been in the line of the study for a long time. If he knew of needed changes, presumably he would have spoken up about them earlier.

And the Civil Service Commission has

also been very close to the Police Department—so close that its members will be unlikely to see the problem with much perspective.

Compensation may be an important factor in getting and holding good men, yet the County Police Department's pay scale and fringe benefits are pretty much in line with those of the City Police. The County force has little trouble filling its ranks.

We suspect, however, that a thorough investigation—and we use the word deliberately—would turn up other reasons for the poor morale, the turnover, the jealousies and the general dissatisfaction that have plagued the City Department for years, and about which many members of the force will talk freely when they know they won't be quoted.

But such an investigation, to be worth the time and effort, should be conducted by outsiders who have better perspective, and who are not tied to the department by close associations and close friendships.

\$1.55 MINUS 7c EQUALS \$1.48

THE City Council has served Charlotte taxpayers well by whacking the tax rate by seven cents, from \$1.55 per \$100 valuation to \$1.48.

The Council did even better than that within its own sphere of operations. It knocked off 11.9 cents. But an extra two cents on the Park & Recreation special tax, and a boost of 2.9 cents in the special school tax, cut the net rate reduction to seven cents.

That's a help. Not only will it save the average taxpayer a tidy little sum, but it shows an encouraging attitude to municipal finances by a majority of the Council.

When the Council was in session, several members complained about the tax. One, Councilman Boyd, Baxter and Albee, on several occasions moved for salary increases of one kind or another for

city employees, but none of the motions got a majority vote.

It may be that some readjustment in pay scales will be necessary, especially in the lower brackets. But the City Manager had already been instructed to work out a job classification plan for all municipal employees, and it wouldn't have made much sense to go ahead now with pay raises at figures plucked out of the air.

The better plan is to aside a reserve of \$220,000 to pay for salary increases if the job classification study shows they are merited, was adopted.

All in all, the first budget-making session of the new Council was a big success with the three freshmen, Everett Wilkinson, Jim Smith, and Herman Brown deserving a big cut of the praise.

WHEN LAWYERS LOOK IN THE MIRROR

SOMEWHAT belatedly, but with exacting thoroughness, the members of the North Carolina Bar Association subjected themselves and their profession to a searching analysis at Wrightsville Beach last week. What they heard from their president and from other speakers was not flattering at all, and it brought quick results.

By the end of the four-day convention, the Bar Association had snapped out of its lethargy, upped its dues, decided to employ a full-time executive secretary, and set about adopting a realistic program of real and worthwhile public service.

Much of the new enthusiasm was fired by J. Spencer Bell who, in his year as president, set in motion the machinery for revitalizing the Bar Association. Elsewhere on this page are some excerpts from Mr. Bell's presidential address, a frank and honest appraisal of the profession. He gave them strong medicine. That they valued his criticism in good spirit was evidenced by a strong movement to draft him to serve a second term—a movement he finally stopped by a flat refusal to serve.

And when they looked at others in the mirror, the lawyers found that themselves were looking over their shoulders. The *Greensboro Daily News*, applauding the new

emphasis on public service, said:

"The Bar serves in a quasi-public capacity, and is a part of the courts themselves and their profession to a searching analysis at Wrightsville Beach last week. What they heard from their president and from other speakers was not flattering at all, and it brought quick results.

By the end of the four-day convention, the Bar Association had snapped out of its lethargy, upped its dues, decided to employ a full-time executive secretary, and set about adopting a realistic program of real and worthwhile public service.

"The legal profession has been entrusted the enforcement of these laws through which we endeavor to maintain in this country an orderly, free society based upon justice, equity and the safeguarding of individual rights. Few if any professional groups therefore, carry a greater burden of duty and responsibility than the bar. A broad awareness of that responsibility might contribute as much to the development of a stronger spirit of good will between the bar and the public as the employment of a full-time executive secretary for the state association."

Thus the idea spreads. We are quite confident that the legal profession will find friendly cooperation and interest from the private estate as it turns to its new assignment.

IN DEFENSE OF THE 'COMMON MAN'

THE other day we noted that the fine old word "progressive" has fallen into disfavor in some quarters since Henry Wallace capitalized the P and led the Progressive Party in 1948. It appears that another of Henry's phrases is going by the boards, too.

We spoke eloquently, you will recall, of the spoke of the "common man." While Australians don't care for the term, preferring "working man" or "blue collar," it has been a favorite and altogether acceptable phrase of American politicians, particularly Democrats, and Britishers for many years.

If the phrase has been used recently by orators of either party, it has escaped us. And rather surprising is the new and similar term that a well-known New York columnist used recently in congratulating ADA, Harry Truman said the "everyday man should put

forth greater effort to see that his interests are protected."

An "everyday" man is not much of a fellow. He is one who is used to fit or coming, every day, usual, routine. Of course the word "common" by itself can be most derogatory. It may mean "notorious" (as a thief), or "unclean," "vulgar," "cheap," "inferior," "without refinement."

But when the noun "man" is added after the phrase rises to greatness. It then makes literature out of plain grammar, as happened when British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin reminded Parliament shortly before his death, that "the common man is the greatest protection against war." The late and great editor of the *Monroe Journal*, R. F. Beasley, used the phrase compellingly, and with a certain refinement, in his "Common man" is as good a phrase as ever graced a sermon or oration.

From The Louisville Courier-Journal

NO SHORT CUT TO THE MINT JULEP

ACCORDING TO The New York Times a leading distiller has come up with a concoction with which he has the gall to refer as a "short-cut mint julep." In mixing this concoction, one is supposed to omit the whisking of a stick of peppermint candy, substituted for "the mint leaves and sugar customarily used," until the candy melts, imparting "sweetness, savor and a green hue. This, says the usually sane man, is "easier and quicker than crushing the mint leaves with sugar."

As soon as the old colonel recovers from his faint, and Man O' War stops turning over in his grave, we would like to point out to the Times a few fallacies in its spin glass hallucination. First, the concoction is not a gentleman would dream, sir, of "crushing the

mint leaves," with or without sugar. Occasionally, some younger, more radical host may bruise the mint ever so slightly. But the true connoisseur of the julep, the true aficionado of mingling in untroubled, unharmed association, the flavor of mint and whiskey. As for green hue (and), we can only trust that the next time the writer visits Louisville in the Springtime, he will remove his undisciplined fingers from the mint leaves.

Should he do so, he will find a nectar of gentle amber hue, mellowed by time and hallowed by custom. To propose that such a drink is susceptible to short-cuts, as scurrilous as suggesting that the mint julep, like Greenwich Village or the Polaris Berge, is something palmed off on the greenhorn visitor, but never touched by the homelicks.



A Frank Appraisal

Lawyer Looks At The Bar

(Following are excerpts from the President's Address, delivered by J. Spencer Bell of Charlotte, at the recent North Carolina Bar Association meeting at Wrightsville Beach, Eds. The News.)

TONIGHT I wish to point out some of the threats (to our profession), even as I shall point out to you what I believe to be an effective way of overcoming them.

It is to you—the lawyers of North Carolina—to decide whether you will continue to drift with the dangerous currents of lethargy and smug satisfaction, or the challenge and move forward with the more progressive elements of our profession into a new era of public service and professional achievement.

As a Bar Association, we must frankly face this trend of specialization. We must somehow allow the expert to tell the public of his specialty and we must help the client choose the right lawyer for his problem.

Another criticism thrown at us (and this is the Communist's favorite) is that the lawyer is for the favored few—unavailable to the poor man and too expensive for the salaried classes, except when dire necessity compels his employment. A recent survey shows that less than 20 percent of our population has ever used the services of a lawyer. Less than 30 percent knew any lawyer by name. What a blow those figures are to the vanity of some of our more eminent brethren.

What are these dangers?

In our society today, every segment of the business world, every money-grubbing trade is seeking to elevate itself to the dignity of a profession and is using every facility of mass media communication to sell its "professional virtue" to the public, we are becoming lost in the shuffle.

I want it distinctly understood that I have no quarrel with the efforts of any of the public to make itself a profession. I simply point out that the basic fundamental characteristics of a profession are not in the group, but in the individual. It is not organizations of men possessing a specialized knowledge and devoted primarily to service to the public and only secondarily to making money.

If we are to regain the position of respect which we once occupied in the eyes of the public, we must through the public relations activities of our organized bar get this distinction across to the public.

Anyone thinks we can contribute \$10 or \$25 or \$50 or even \$100 per lawyer to some high-priced smooth-tongued publicist expert and expect the public to turn to us for help? We must do our own work, but we must do it with a sense of purpose. We must do it with a sense of purpose. We must do it with a sense of purpose.

WE can and we must answer this criticism by broadening the basis of our services to the public. The bar is ready to hand two simple and efficient devices by which we can reach all the people who need our services.

The first of these is legal aid which has been in existence for 75 years in America. In Atlanta, legal aid is supported by the Community Chest because its value to the community has been recognized. The lawyers have changed from indifference or even hostility to enthusiastic support.

The second device, which I speak is Lawyer Referral. This is not charity. It is a plan by which we as attorneys can tell the story of our profession to the thousands of people in the community who do not know a lawyer and are afraid to go to one. This plan is now working in more than 80 cities in America, making thousands of new clients and relieving the charge that men of modest means cannot afford a lawyer.

PERHAPS the most serious defect in our profession today is that lawyers are not adequately prepared when they begin to practice and they do not keep abreast of the changes in the law.

The first point is too obvious to belabor. We all live to learn. We are thrown out of court because of our ignorance of some fundamental point of law. That may be the way to make the law a profession. We must keep abreast of the changes in the law. We must keep abreast of the changes in the law.

Here's the blunt one on both fronts: If we refuse to keep abreast, have explained the door and invited the public to come in, we have caused our invitation was accepted.

We have begun to tackle this problem with our Continuing Legal Education Program. But it is only a first step.

These are the major and fundamental weaknesses of our profession. I am not going to argue these criticisms with you. I expect minor variations of opinion but I state categorically if you do not agree in the main with this diagnosis then you are so blind that no argument I could make here would ever change you. Further, most of you are opposed by the vast majority of the leaders of your profession. The time has come to accept the diagnosis and set about the cure.

LET us look frankly at the organization we have. We meet once a year—about one-tenth of the practicing lawyers of the State—we pass high sounding resolutions—we appoint committees to correct this situation, but the implementation of that program requires a strong state-wide organization. If you do not want to carry out the resolutions, then let us stop talking and cease to sail under false colors, to pretend to do what we are not doing and thereby fill the profession with a cloud of confusion. Let us stop pretending to be doing what we are not doing and let us get on with the job.

ANOTHER side of this problem of inadequate preparation and failure to keep abreast of the changing laws is our insistence upon holding out to the public the notion that all lawyers are equal in the fields of the law. That was true when North Carolina was predominantly an agricultural state. Today, however, the situation is different. The situation is different.

Throughout the remainder of this meeting you will have outlined to you a definite concrete program to correct this situation. But the implementation of that program requires a strong state-wide organization. If you do not want to carry out the resolutions, then let us stop talking and cease to sail under false colors, to pretend to do what we are not doing and thereby fill the profession with a cloud of confusion. Let us stop pretending to be doing what we are not doing and let us get on with the job.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

THE two biggest stories in the world today are (1) riots behind the Iron Curtain, and (2) depression clouds in the U.S.A.

Most Of Eisenhower Program Put On Shelf By Congress

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON

AS THE WOLVES of opposition howl louder, and louder, the Republican leadership in Congress is throwing overboard more and more of the Eisenhower program.

As though it were finally getting down to the irreducible minimum of the appropriation bills necessary to run the Government, the House and Senate are now talking of taking up the Eisenhower program.

The latest casualty is the Hawaiian Statehood Bill. This has been a promise long due. The Republicans have had a special interest in Hawaii, where theirs is the worst record of the administration while at the same time the Senate leadership talks of taking up the Eisenhower program.

The House and Senate are now talking of taking up the Eisenhower program.

as did three Democrats, Senators Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, Tammie H. Hennings of Missouri and Willis Smith of North Carolina.

Republicans who worked for the measure are particularly bitter about the votes of Hennings and Kefauver, who have publicly vowed to support liberalizing immigration laws. They accuse them of taking part in what they say is a traitorous vote to pull out support from the Eisenhower program and thereby make the 83rd Congress the worst in the history of the House and Senate.

Hennings and Kefauver say they did not realize their votes would result in shutting up the immigration measure. Hennings has asked Chairman William Langer to call the full committee together again. The vote against the measure was four Republicans, Langer of New Dakota, William Jenner of Indiana, Robert C. Hendrickson of New Jersey, and Arthur Watkins of Utah who, as chairman of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, has worked earnestly to get the Eisenhower bill passed.

There are many reasons why this should be so in the Republican camp. One of them is the loss of the first hand of Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio who always has been regarded as his own views, what he could and could not do.

The handicap put on the President's attempt to steer a constructive course in foreign policy at the moment when there is a crisis within a crisis could hardly be more complete than what has happened to the Eisenhower program to admit 240,000 immigrants beyond the regular quota.

Eisenhower sent that request to the Capitol marked urgent two months ago. He hoped it would be passed by the House and Senate and encourage freedom-loving individuals behind the Iron Curtain.

But the bill is bottled up in a Senate Judiciary sub-committee. Sen. Pat McCarran (D-Nev.), former chairman of the committee, has indicated the blockade added by two committee Republicans, Senators Frank J. La Follette of Idaho and John H. Butler of Maryland.

The final McCarran tactic was a resolution that in effect would require the committee to meet out of business for two weeks by suspending all committee hearings. The measure has four votes for the McCarran maneuver is most revealing. Welker and Butler voted with McCarran.

While this quarrel was going on behind closed doors, Senators sponsoring the measure were getting behind the curtain. The measure was in opposition to it. A considerable part of this has come from California. The California State Assembly has been inspired by a racist hate sheet put out by Robert H. Williams, a Communist sub-committee member, to spread hate propaganda against Eisenhower in the pre-convention campaign.

There are valid differences on immigration policy. It may be argued that this country has a right to control its own immigration. However, this country might be politically to do so. The fact is that the measure has been so badly handled that it has been a disaster for the McCarran maneuver is most revealing. Welker and Butler voted with McCarran.

Excess Profits Tax Battle Has Capitol Tempers Ragged

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON

PRESIDENT Eisenhower's request to Congress to extend the excess profits tax another six months is now hip-deep in a quagmire of Capitol tempers and Congressional practice.

Some congressional tempers are red hot in the struggle between the House and the Senate. The House is in a fight with the Senate over the excess profits tax. The House is in a fight with the Senate over the excess profits tax.

the whole House from voting on it? The House is in a fight with the Senate over the excess profits tax. The House is in a fight with the Senate over the excess profits tax.

Yesterday Rep. Charles Halleck of Indiana, leader of the House Republicans, asked the House Rules Committee to speed the extension legislation out of the hands of the ways and means committee and let the House vote on it.

This was extraordinarily rough action, according to the rules of the House. It is considered necessary to have the committee report first. But the Rules Committee has been properly assigned.

The tax automatically expires on Tuesday. Congress votes to continue it, although it can do so retroactively. Eisenhower says the government needs the money from this tax on corporations. Weeks ago he asked Congress to continue it.

He ran head-on into the fiery and stubborn Reed who is chairman of the House Ways and Means committee, which handles tax matters, is one of the most powerful in Congress.

Since the tax was to expire June 30, Mr. Reed had to let his committee from voting before that date. The tax would then expire on Tuesday.

This raises an obvious question: Is it democratic that one man, like Reed, can bottle up a piece of legislation by preventing a majority of his committee or, eventually,

After a stormy session in which Reed was considered necessary progress if he and his ways and means committee were bypassed by the rules committee, the latter voted 21 to 19 to let the House vote on the issue.

In all these committees Republican and Democratic members are in a party fight. Needless to say, Democrats in general enjoy seeing the squiff.

Red Riots, U.S. Recession on Stories

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON