# THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1954


## William B. Umstead, Public Servant

WILLIAM Bradley Umstead revered his father, a stern Durham County tobacco farmer who impressed upon his sons that public service is a duty. "He made me mind him," the governor once said, "and he wore me out more than once. I have always been grateful for that."

It was this uncompromising concept of service that exhausted the ailing governor and led to his death yesterday.

As farm boy, teacher, lawyer and elected official, with service in both houses of Congress, earnest William Umstead developed a philosophy of government typical of many of this state's leaders and aptly fitted to this period in the state's history. His calm let's work-and-think-this-out approach to the school segregation decision was typical of the man and the state. And because Gov. Umstead was a deliberate man who preceded major decisions with months of study some of his cherished goals for this state are only now taking shape.

It was his hope that the 1955 General Assembly would separate the Prisons Department from the Highway Commission. He had been spending a great deal of time working out detailed recommendations regarding this long-needed change. Another of his projects for the 1955 legislature was the redrawing of the state's judicial districts. This too received a good deal of the governor's personal attention. He hoped also to reorganize the state government, in line with studies being made at his recommendation.

But the essence of the governor's program was improvement of the state's schools, hospitals and institutions. This portion of the program got under way before his death. His administration will be remembered as the one in which voters agreed to issuance of 50 million dollars worth of bond issues for schools, and 22 million dollars for mental hospitals, and the legislature agreed to issuance of more than 14 million dollars' worth for improvements at other state institutions.

Also, during his administration, the Board of Conservation & Development was invigorated, under the chairmanship of Umstead's appointee from Charlotte, Ben Douglas. The state's ports were utilized more fully. The state's highways were dramatically made safer under the direction of another Umstead appointeee, Ed Scheidt.

The highway safety program illustrates how the full impact of the Umstead program has not yet been fully felt. The governor had brought in an able administrator, in the person of Ed Scheidt. The 1953 General Assembly had markedly improved the auto liability insurance law. But other parts of the program, including a vehicle inspection law, were to be vigorously pushed at the forthcoming legislative session.

William B. Umstead, despite the heart ailment that handicapped him severely during most of his administration, helped North Carolina "Go Forward Toward A Better Tomorrow," as he said he would do. With the able Luther Hodges moving into the governorship a continued forward pace is assured. And North Carolina will long and respectfully remember the studious and painstaking man who planned for its future.

## Minority Rule Cannot Be Tolerated

THE defeat of Amendment Three by Tar Heel citizens last week was a sharp rebuff to the rural politicians who sought to deny urban population centers fair representation in the legislature. The meaning of the vote was clear and unmistakable: The people will not stand for minority rule in North Carolina.

The proposed amendment would have altered section four, Article II, of the state constitution to provide that no county in North Carolina would be entitled to more than one senator.

If voters had fallen for this vicious political booby trap, a nonrepresentative minority of Tar Heel citizens would have been able to control the General Assembly's upper house permanently. This minority would have been able to get a tight hammerlock on statewide policy.

By voting down the amendment, voters served notice to the 1955 legislature that democratic principles and the intentions of the framers of North Carolina's constitution can be ignored no longer.

Under present dictates of the constitution—which directs the General Assembly after each federal census to redistrict the 100 counties and reapportion senate seats on a population basis—Mecklenburg County is entitled to two state senators. In fact, Mecklenburg has had that extra senate seat coming since 1940.

But the 1953 legislature, like other legislatures before it, stubbornly disregarded this mandate.

The 1953 legislature went even further. It drafted the constitutional amendment —voted down last week—which would have permitted rural political elements to remain in power forever.

Approval of the amendment would have given North Carolina something like the Georgia system with no hope of improvement. There, Atlanta has one representative for each 131,000 inhabitants while a neighboring rural county has one representative for 3,000 inhabitants. Rural dominated legislatures throughout the nation have used their power to perpetuate this disproportion of representation. This is what is happening in North Carolina too.

Defeat of the senatorial amendment did not erase the problem but it helped. It reflected the stern disapproval of the voters.

It is now up to the 1955 General Assembly to yield to the will of the people, follow the dictates of the constitution and redistrict the state for legislative purposes at the earliest possible time.

## Farm Belt Did Not Desert Benson

REP. HAROLD D. COOLEY is a keen student of American politics but we suspect that he has been neglecting his homework lately.

Before the Tar Heel Democrat promised to resume the battle for 90 per cent of parity support prices on basic crops, he should have taken another long, hard look at farm belt election returns.

In numerous areas where the price support program became a serious campaign issue, rural America backed candidates who favored flexible supports.

Results in these areas did not show, as Mr. Cooley said, that farmers were "very much disappointed in the leadership" of the Eisenhower administration and "disturbed over the fact that the chief agricultural officer, Mr. Benson, (secretary of agriculture) has been waging war on them constantly ever since he has been in office."

Actually, the biggest GOP victor in last Tuesday's election was Ezra Taft Benson.

He had been warned that a flexible price support program was "political suicide."

It wasn't.

Look at the record in the agricultural Midwest where Mr. Benson had to defend his program against a vigorous Democratic attack.

In Iowa, veteran Sen. Guy Gillette, one of Secretary Benson's most outspoken critics, was defeated by Republican Thomas E. Martin who stoutly defended the Benson farm policy.

Utah sent back two GOP congressmen. Kansas voters re-elected Sen. Schoeppel who backed flexible supports despite a barrage of criticism from the Democrats.

Even where Democrats triumphed in the Midwest—as Sen. Douglas did in Illinois—farm precincts generally remained in the Republican column.

Democrats had hoped to make big gains in midwestern agricultural districts by plugging away at the price support issue. The strategy just didn't work. In fact, some of the GOP's biggest upset victories in the Midwest—as in Iowa—were fashioned by candidates who openly supported the Benson program.

As the man who will head the House Agriculture Committee next January, Mr. Cooley is in a position to wield much influence on U.S. farm policy. But he is mistaken if he thinks that the Democratic midterm victory is a mandate to revive the old rigid price support program.

From The Gastonia Gazette

## TURN IT DOWN, KIDS

YOUNG people and noise are practically synonymous, and we have no real thought of altering that basic order of things. But we do think some progress might be made toward muffling slightly today's swelling volume of youthful sound.

In other words, we think the kids of this age are abusing their established privilege of conducting their affairs noisily. The worst offenders are not the youngest ones, whom you'd expect to exercise the least self-control. It's the teen-agers who are setting new records on the decibel machines.

In city or suburb, during the playing day the streets resound with shrill cries. Later, when the sandpile-and-dungaree set adjourns to the indoors, the TV screen becomes a new focus of noise.

The youngsters don't tone it down when they move into more public settings. They travel about town in bicycle packs. The chief rule is not to converse with another member of the convoy at a distance of less than 20 feet.

Well, kids, let's turn the volume down a little before the whole country becomes your captive audience.

Opposition Expected

## A Rebellious House For Ike?

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

WASHINGTON

THE NEW Democratic bosses of the House can be expected to oppose President Eisenhower more often than did their Republican predecessors.

On all roll calls which tested the Eisenhower program, only one of the prospective "new" chairmen of the 19 House standing committees supported the President more frequently than did his Republican predecessor. In addition, some Democrats taking over committee gavels have bucked the President on specific phases of his program.

Eleven Democratic representatives are scheduled to return to the chairmanships they held just two years ago, before the Republicans swept them from control of Congress. Eight in line to become chairmen in the 84th Congress have not held the top post before.

**DIXIE'S BIG SHARE**

With return of House control to the Democrats, the South will reclaim the big share of the chairmanships. Nine southerners are in line. Four chairmanships will go to the Border states on the South's fringes, three to the East, two to the Midwest and one to the Pacific Coast. In the 83rd Congress, GOP chairmanships were divided between 14 midwestern and five eastern representatives.

Here are comparisons of the Democrats expected to take over with the Republicans they will replace. Included are ages of the lawmakers, their Eisenhower support percentages, (showing how frequently they backed the President on roll calls during the 83rd Congress which involved decisions on his program and leadership), and their views on legislation their committees handle.

**COOLEY WINS CHAIR**

Agriculture—Harold D. Cooley (N. C.), 57, 46 per cent active Eisenhower support, to replace Clifford R. Hope (Kan.), 61, 78 percent Eisenhower support. Cooley was chairman during 81st and 82nd Congresses, both men were for rigid farm price supports.

Appropriations—Clarence Cannon (Mo.), 73, 51 percent, to replace John Taber (N. Y.), 74, 76 percent. Cannon first became chairman in September, 1941. He's generally considered more generous than Taber with appropriations.

Armed Services—Carl Vinson (Ga.), 70, 46 percent, to replace Dewey Short (Mo.), 56, 43 percent. Vinson was chairman of Armed Services in the 81st and 82nd Congresses. He has been for a big Navy, big Air Force and Universal Military Training. Short fought UMT.

Banking and Currency—Brent Spence (Ky.), 79, 47 percent, to replace Jesse P. Wolcott (Mich.), 61, 67 percent. Spence, who first became chairman in 1943, has favored public housing, while Wolcott has opposed it.

District of Columbia—John L. McMillan (S. C.), 56, 47 percent, to replace Sid Simpson (Ill.), 60, 60 percent. McMillan, chairman in the 79th, 81st and 82nd Congresses, has opposed home rule for the District.

**BARDEN BLOCKED BILL**

Education and Labor—Graham A. Barden (N. C.), 58, 29 percent, to replace Samuel K. McConnell Jr., (Pa.), 53, 75 percent. Barden first took the chair in June, 1950. That year he helped block a federal aid to education bill by his stand against granting funds to private and parochial schools.

Foreign Affairs — James P. Richards (S. C.), 60, 37 percent, to replace Robert B. Chiperfield (Ill.), 54, 69 percent. Richards first became chairman in May, 1951. A former UN delegate, he supported Truman administration foreign policy by and large, but worked for cuts in foreign aid money.

Government Operations — William L. Dawson (Ill.), 68, 36 percent, to replace Clare E. Hoffman (Mich.), 79, 44 percent. Dawson became the first Negro chairman of the 81st Congress. He is for civil rights legislation and favored giving President Eisenhower government reorganization powers.

**TEXAN IN CHARGE**

House Administration — Omar Burleson (Tex.), 45, 44 percent, to replace Karl M. LeCompte (Iowa), 67, 83 percent. This committee handles matters relating to House employes and office buildings, election credentials and qualifications.

Interior and Insular Affairs—Clair Engle (Calif.), 43, 60 percent active Eisenhower support, to replace A. L. Miller (Neb.), 62, 76 percent. Engle has favored statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, is former chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee. He is one of few Californians who has not indicated opposition to the administration's Colorado River storage project.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce — J. Percy Priest (Tenn.), 54, 53 percent, to replace Charles A. Wolverton (N. J.), 64, 85 percent. Priest, Democratic whip or floor leader, has tried to limit Atomic Energy Commission authority to contract for electric power. He voted against recommittal of the Eisenhower health reinsurance plan, reported by his committee.

Judiciary — Emanuel Celler (N. Y.), 66, 42 percent, to replace Chauncey W. Reed (Ill.), 64, 81 percent. Celler headed Judiciary during the 81st and 82nd Congresses. He has supported civil rights measures, admission of displaced persons. He voted to outlaw the Communist Party though he said the provision was "palpably unconstitutional." He is against giving the vote to 18-year-olds.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries —Herbert C. Bonner (N. C.), 63, 29 percent, to replace Alvin F. Weichel (Ohio), 53, 40 percent. Bonner was against putting U. S. tankers in a reserve fleet to be resold to the government in emergency and has been concerned with proposals for requiring half of agricultural surpluses to be shipped to participating countries in U. S. vessels.

Post Office and Civil Service—Tom Murray (Tenn.), 60, 47 percent, to replace Edward H. Rees (Kan.), 68, 78 per cent. Both Murray and Rees opposed the 1954 proposed postal pay raise. They said salary increases should be accompanied by provisions for a general salary reclassification.

Public Works — Charles A. Buckley (N. Y.), 64, 6 percent active Eisenhower support, to replace George A. Dondero (Mich.), 70, 65 percent. Buckley, Chairman during the 82nd Congress, has favored most New Deal-Fair Deal legislation. He has offered legislation to provide federal aid to build city streets. Buckley actually voted against the President's program on only 21 percent of the Eisenhower roll calls, so his low support percentage resulted largely from failures to vote.

**SMITH FOR ALLEN**

Rules—Howard W. Smith (Va.), 71, 46 percent, to replace Leo E. Allen (Ill.), 56, 82 percent. Smith, a bitter opponent of Roosevelt-Truman policies, has called public housing "evil" and "socialistic," opposed statehood for Hawaii and extension of the excess-profits tax on corporations.

Un-American Activities—Francis E. Walter (Pa.), 60, 63 percent, to replace Harold H. Velde (Ill.), 44, 64 percent. Co-author of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, Walter has favored outlawing the Communist Party. He introduced a measure to permit wiretapping in national security cases.

Veterans Affairs — Olin E. Teague (Texas) 44, 37 per cent, to replace Edith Nourse Rogers (Mass.), 73, 66 percent. An 11-times decorated veteran of World War II, Teague has introduced bills to extend time for vocational training of disabled veterans, veterans housing loans and has sought to increase Veterans Administration funds.

Ways and Means (taxes) — Jere Cooper (Tenn.), 61, 60 percent, to replace Daniel A. Reed (N. Y.), 79, 63 percent active Eisenhower support. Cooper fought to increase individual income tax exemptions and criticized allowing deductions on stockholders' income from corporate dividends. He has supported reciprocal trade agreements.

## The Dowdy Male Is Again The Target Of Fashioneers

By ROBERT C. RUARK

NEW YORK

FROM TIME to time I have indulged in genteel warfare with Mrs. Edna Woolman Chase, who started out as editor of Vogue magazine just prior to my emergence into this troubled world. Shortly after I emerged I was attired tastefully in a tricornered napkin, held together with a safety pin, and even then Mrs. Chase was knocking diapers as dowdy for boys.

Wars came and went, and Ilka grew up and got married a few times, but the grand old battler ain't changed any with the years. She is still trying her level-best-est to cause the gentlemen acute pain and discomfort, fashionwise, and as long as they make paper I refuse to let her get away with it.

**NO MOULTING**

Mama Chase appeared at a celebration the other day, and immediately took off after the gents' suiting trade. She claims we haven't radically moulted our fine feathers in 60 years, despite the recent trend towards Bermuda shorts and fancy weskits. She says that a gent dolled up a la 1910 could still go the races without exciting comment, while a lady of the same epoch would likely be stoned from the two-dollar window.

I couldn't agree more heartily. Ladies then dressed about as stupidly as they dress now, and the only thing that saved them from witch-burning was the fact that all the girls copied one another, even as now. It is well known that if the wearing of old applejack kegs was advocated by Vogue, the uptrend in applejack would wreck the Scotch market.

**STILL GOOD**

It is a compliment to the gentlemen that we have not been unduly swayed by the likes of Mrs. Chase and her co-conspirators, such as Dior and Balmain and the rest. We have maintained some semblance of dignified conformation to the norm, so that a good tweed bought before de war is still a good tweed and can be worn without exciting sarcasm.

I really do not understand the fanaticism of the female fashioneers, this burning urge to upset male fashions that seems to obsess them all—unless they wish to create an entirely new market of compulsive suckers, so that the budget will be further wrecked when Pa discovers he really hasn't a single decent thing to wear. We get enough male fripperies out of Esquire, which is a kind of hair-chested Vogue, to keep the merchandisers moving stock, but even Esquire has never dared tamper too audaciously with the established format of pants and coat and shirt and tie.

**MANY DELIGHTS**

One of the delights of being a man—and there are many—is the knowledge that a white shirt and a blue suit and a more or less non-nauseating tie will get you into those Belmont races that Mrs. Chase mentions, yesterday today, and tomorrow. We do not have to fret our already-aching heads with short skirts, long skirts, boned bras, big bosoms, little bosoms, flat-looks or the whimsical headpieces of Mr. John. We do not walk into a saloon and find our day ruined because somebody else is wearing the same suit. A good suit lasts 10 years and when it's shiny-seated you buy another one just like it—blue, brown, or gray. Plain, checkered or striped. Single or double-breasted.

Mrs. Chase has leveled her guns also at our shapes. She reckons she can squeeze us into girdles if she makes us more style-conscious. Having been a married man for some years, I am an authority on girdles — the getting into and, out of, the scratching where they itch and the pulling down where they ride up. Mrs. Chase, genius though she be, is not likely to peddle girdles to the menfolk.

**A FIBBER**

I love the old girl, but in her recent pronunciaments she was guilty of what I shall have to call a fib. "You never hear a woman objecting to a new fashion on grounds it's uncomfortable," she says. "Is it flattering, is the only question a woman ever asks."

Oho, Edna Please. I have been the female armor of the Nineties, and the cloche hats and hip-line waists and short skirts and below-the-knee-rolled-stockings of the '20s. I have been through the New Look and the Old Look and the current caricatures of M. Dior. Let us face a fact; any woman will wear anything another woman wears, including tar, feathers, and Army shoes, if you say it's chic.

## You Don't Dig Shakespeare? Well, Try Our Mr. Marlowe

By LARRY HIRSCH

In The Florida Times-Union

IT WAS HARDLY news when Howard Mitchell, conductor of the National Symphony Orchestra, recently said that the nation's major orchestras are facing bankruptcy. All the arts have been in financial trouble ever since the old European patronage system pettered out.

Rare indeed are the painters, musicians and writers of serious intent who can earn their way solely on the practice of their art in the free market of today. Most of them have to commercialize part of their talent for mass consumption or get a part-time job in the business world.

And most of them seem resigned to the situation. There just doesn't appear to be any other way.

**BOOK OFFER**

It thus was somewhat startling to notice the other day that at least one associate of the arts—a book publishing firm—thinks it has found another way. G. P. Putnam's Sons of New York, whose reputation is as good as anybody's, printed an advertisement for "Prisoner in Paradise," a new novel by Garet Rogers, and made the following offer:

"GUARANTEED to chill and fascinate any adult reader, or we'll replace it with any current book of equivalent price."

This IS news.

Never before in the history of the arts has anybody, to this observer's knowledge, dared to guarantee anything — in writing, anyway. Legions of artists have boasted of their creations, but none has ventured into the realm of satisfaction or your money back.

**ARTIST'S INCENTIVE**

The reason, of course, is that the real artist creates for his own satisfaction, and all he can do beyond that is hope that others will pay money to share the same feeling.

It would have been ridiculous, for example, for Shakespeare to have offered a free ticket to a play by Marlowe to anyone who didn't enjoy "Hamlet."

Or imagine if you can, the Jacksonville Symphony guaranteeing to thrill its audience and promising it another concert if the thrill failed to come through.

It is no secret that the book publishing business is having hard times in the hardback field. Production costs are up and readership is down. The publishers have statistics to prove it.

**HUCKSTER'S TECHNIQUE**

But is the guarantee the way to lick the problem? Today's average man has come to expect the written pledge of quality on most of the material things he buys—automobiles, appliances, drugs. The guarantee is a statement of faith by the manufacturer, and the buyer accepts it as such, and it has done a great deal to raise the standard of living.

A book, however, is not truly a material thing, nor is a poem or a painting or a piece of music. You do things to a material object, and its maker is pretty well able to predict how it will react, because the object was specified to react that way. But a work of art does things to you, and its creator cannot predict what that will be because you are that most unpredictable of objects—the human being — for which there are no hard and fast specifications.

It would be interesting to know exactly how G. P. Putnam's Sons plan to gauge the chill and fascination which "Prisoner in Paradise" will have on its readers —and what proof the unchilled and unfascinated reader will be required to submit in order to get another current book of equivalent price.

The arts today are, forsooth, prisoners in a paradise of paradox, where many great talents go unrewarded, but the written guarantee is scarcely the open sesame to something better.

## Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

## Harvey Matusow Turns On McCarthy

WASHINGTON

On the eve of the McCarthy censure debate, a former associate of McCarthy's has given highly revealing information regarding his operations. They include:

1. An attempt by McCarthy to thwart the Senate committee probing his finances in 1951.

2. McCarthy's efforts to defeat Democratic candidates in Utah, Montana and Washington by smearing them as pro-Communist.

The ex-McCarthy associate, Harvey Matusow, is a former member of the Communist Party who became disillusioned, gave information to the FBI and later joined McCarthy's long list of friends, informers and paid employes. Interviewed, by this writer, Matusow told in detail how McCarthy had sent him to Utah to re-elect—of all people—Sen. Arthur Watkins, now chairman of the Senate committee which recommended the censure of McCarthy.

Matusow did this, he said, first by testifying before a Senate committee in Salt Lake City about Communists in the government and later by smearing Congressman Granger, Democratic opponent of Sen. Watkins, as soft toward Communists.

"I used McCarthy logic," Matusow explained. "I said Granger was for pro-administration policy on China . . . China fell to the Reds and your boys are fighting in Korea.

"I also campaigned in Montana against Sen. Mansfield and in Washington against Sen. Jackson," Matusow said, "but the smear technique was not successful."

### Lady Witness Exits

Describing his work for McCarthy in thwarting the Senate committee probing McCarthy's finances, Matusow said he had received a call from Mrs. J. B. Matthews, whose husband was then McCarthy's committee counsel, asking him to take Mrs. Arvilla Bentley out of the United States until the probe of McCarthy's finances blew over.

Mrs. Bentley, former wife of Congressman Alvin Bentley, had "loaned" $7,000 to McCarthy, while the Congressman "loaned" $3,000. And the Senate wanted to question her regarding this and other contributions. Mrs. Bentley, Matusow said, had also paid for a Mutual network broadcast which McCarthy made before the 1950 elections.

Matusow said McCarthy knew all about the idea of taking Mrs. Bentley out of the United States away from Senate probers and that he, Matusow, had talked to McCarthy himself about it. He also said that McCarthy's attorney knew about the plan.

Mrs. Bentley remained in the British Bahamas outside the arm of a Senate subpoena for about two weeks, then came back to the United States, Matusow explained.

"Was this $10,000 the money used by McCarthy to speculate on the soy-bean market?" Matusow was asked.

"That's correct."

"Did Mrs. Bentley have any idea that McCarthy was going to use it for speculation?"

"No, she did not."

"Did she express any opinion to you about it?"

"Very definitely," Matusow replied. "She said that if she had known Sen. McCarthy was going to speculate with this money, she never would have loaned it to him."

Matusow also said that McCarthy had asked him to investigate the New York Times, Time magazine and other newspapers with a view to pinning the Communist Party label on them.

"They had been attacking Sen. McCarthy," the ex-McCarthyite explained, "and he was sore about it and wanted to take his revenge."