

Industrial Waste: Specific Data Needed

WHY go stick your head in the lion's mouth? asked Mayor Phil Van Every last week when warring city councilmen suggested private talks with commercial laundry operators on the subject of industrial waste.

It was a rhetorical question. The conference was held anyway. But the Council found the lion's roar worse than its bite. Despite the fact that objections to certain provisions of the industrial waste ordinance reached no measure of insistence, little new evidence was introduced.

The laundries still feel that, under the waste law, they are being compelled unreasonably to construct costly and perhaps unnecessary testing stations and in some cases, holding tanks. Laundry waste, they stoutly argue, is no different from household waste and should be so classified.

The city maintains that laundry waste should continue to be classified as industrial waste—thus, the necessity for testing stations to analyze its strength and holding tanks to regulate its flow into the sewage system.

IN THIS WEEK'S backstage huddle at City Hall, both sides came armed with data. But it was not data that answered one and all of the central question. That question is: Why, in strictly scientific terms, is it necessary for the discharge from Charlotte's domestic laundries to be classified as industrial waste? Laundry operators presented no chemical analyses of their waste to show that it was no different from domestic waste (as they claimed) and therefore would not disrupt sewage disposal operations.

On the other hand, George Bylins, the city's consulting engineer, merely reported some figures indicating that the BOD (biological oxygen demand or strength) of laundry waste, generally, was double that of domestic waste. His statistics were not only old but there was no differentiation whatsoever between domestic laundries and the industrial laundries which handle heavier, dirtier materials like overalls and wiping rags. They were merely averages, lumping all types of laundries together. The protests under consideration at this time come

from domestic laundries only. The city's viewpoint is firmly established. Its experts are confident that, unless regulated and controlled, large quantities of waste from domestic laundries can reduce the efficiency and life of sewage treatment facilities—thus placing an additional tax burden on the average citizen.

Yet the laundries remain unconvinced.

IT SEEMS to us that the question could and should be handled quite simply. The city's engineers ought to put aside their old, disputed BOD counts—figures that are simply averages of analyses of waste from domestic and industrial laundries. New tests should be taken of the waste of each individual laundry affected. These new POD checks should be made at times when fairly representative results can be obtained.

The tests, we believe, would reveal in cold scientific terms why the waste of each Charlotte laundry should or should not be classified as industrial sewage. They should show whether—because of a high BOD—laundry waste actually upsets treatment operations.

THIS is of course an old dog-eared problem. It stems from the community's perfectly righteous demand that industry stop dumping its smelly waste into Sugar Creek. The ordinance which went into effect June 1 is five years old. Laundries have had ample opportunity to treat for it—and much time to air specific complaints. Several laundry operators—by their own admission—attended conferences on the ordinance as early as 1950.

But the Council is wise in cutting forward every possible effort to be reasonable and helpful to businessmen who, understandably, do not wish to spend any more money than is absolutely necessary.

The city can now nail down its case with timely and painstakingly specific scientific data. We believe that it can dispose of the problem one and for all. When the citizen and the government are in conflict over matters such as these, the burden of proof always lies with the government.

A Basic Problem Before Parents

A PROGRAM based on the safety and good training of Charlotte youth will be discussed at Myers Park High School tonight by members of the Parent-Teacher Association and the Parents League.

The subject: Driver training in the schools to teach youngsters safe operation of and proper respect for automobiles. The meeting is set for 8 p.m. The program will continue through permit 10th graders in all city schools to receive 30 hours of driver training in the classroom followed by at least six hours of actual experience behind the wheel. At present, four of the five public high schools have optional, inadequate training systems.

It is difficult and in some cases impossible to change the reckless way in which many adult drivers handle their automobiles, but youth can and should be trained properly. One through advanced driving techniques, instilled in youth through guidance and practice, can we

ever hope to reduce the mounting toll of death and injuries on streets and highways.

There are a hundred things children need to learn in school, such as history, mathematics, literature and science. But what good are any of these things if youngsters go out as untrained or improperly trained drivers and either get killed or kill others?

Driver training should have a secure place in school programs. It can have that place parents are sufficiently interested in. It is not enough to train the one child and leave the other child without instruction. Traffic safety cannot be isolated. It has to be the product of the whole group.

We wish for the parents' meeting tonight an informative discussion and hope that from it will grow positive action to give driver training its proper place in our school system.

Housing Bill Should Be Cut Back

THE House of Representatives has a very clear duty before it as it comes to consideration of the housing legislation passed this week by the Senate. And that is the elimination of the Senate-approved provision for construction of 540,000 units of low rent public housing in the next four years.

The Senate, under prodding by Sens. Sparkman, Lehman and Douglas, took the bit in its teeth on the public housing feature of the catchall housing bill and authorized 470,000 more units than had been recommended by President Eisenhower who had requested authority for construction of 70,000 units in the next two years.

This is no time for further ventures by the federal government in the field of subsidized housing. Past experience has indicated that the government is careless with the tax dollar when it goes

into the realm of normal business. There is no reason to assume a change in policy if it expands the public housing program.

Taking Charlotte as an example, there are no grounds upon which to argue for more public housing to meet any existing or anticipated emergency. Private business is providing the homes needed by Americans and that as it should be. Private business and individuals pay the taxes which would be used by the government in the vast public housing program authorized by the Senate.

With the exception of housing needed for military personnel on government bases, we do not believe Uncle Sam should engage in any additional public housing ventures. We trust that Rep. Jonas and North Carolina's other congressmen will stand forthrightly against any extension of government housing for other than military personnel.

From The Greensboro Daily News

A PLACE TO SIT

EVERY TOWN or city needs at least one park, plaza, village green or common where people can get together in relative peace and quiet when they feel restless, or merely tired. This applies particularly to the South.

But there are less and less of such amenities. We have places to park our cars but not ourselves.

Boston has its common, New York its Washington Square, Paris its numerous squares, and every city in the world has its plaza. The American municipality thinks it can do without such things. It is mistaken.

Walter Gropius, noted architect and author, says in his SCOP OF ARCHITECTURE:

withdraw to a narrow sidewalk, has lost this right of way. It is important that we should re-establish in our communities public centers where people, undisturbed by traffic or the noise of the automobile atmosphere that is not dominated by the influence of the private home and where the spirit of the community can find its public expression.

Trees, grass, benches and a fountain—are those too much for people in a city or town to ask for?

If the Democratic National Committee were half as shrewd as it ought to be, it would build a nice golf course adjacent to the farm of President Eisenhower and present it to him several months prior to the political nominating conventions in 1956—JACKSON (MISS.) STATE TIMES.



'He has a real antagonism for machines... he's so afraid they'll replace humans in industry...'

Democrats' Happy Hope New Fight Against Hooverism

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

WASHINGTON DEMOCRATS who campaigned successfully against "Hooverism" for 20 long years are gaily looking forward to a repeat performance in 1956.

Basic to their optimism is the alleged "business" flavor of the proposals now issuing from the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, which like the first is headed by former GOP President Herbert Hoover.

NOT NEW Proposals of this nature are scarcely new. During the 1952 campaign, Republicans Candidate Eisenhower gathered considerable applause, and possibly votes, with statements extolling the "get government out of business" theme.

As president, however, Mr. Eisenhower has broached nothing so broad as the Hoover Commission's proposal that government "business" be turned into private enterprises. Nevertheless, Democrats hope for big political dividends from a strategy of linking Hoover and the commission's recommendations with Eisenhower and the Republican Party.

Such a strategy has one fact in its favor: President Eisenhower himself named Hoover to head the second Hoover Commission established in 1953. When the first commission was set up in 1947, Hoover was appointed a member by then Speaker of the House Joseph W. Martin Jr., Republican of New York.

However, this point is of dubious political value for one reason. Whereas Congress in 1947 stipulated that the first commission be drawn equally from the

ranks of Democrats and Republicans, this provision was dropped in the 1953 law, which was passed by both houses of Congress without debate or dissent.

Thus, Democrats who charge Mr. Eisenhower with failure to keep the second commission bipartisan may be called on to explain why they registered no objections to the removal of this requirement in 1953.

It's developed that three of the president's four appointees have dissented from several of the commission's more controversial recommendations. None, however, has approached the record of Rep. Chet Holifield (D-Calif.), who entered extensive and vociferous dissents on eight of the 12 commission reports issued as of June 6.

Whether President Eisenhower will lend credence to a Democratic campaign against a "return to Hooverism" by himself endorsing the commission's more controversial proposals remains to be seen.

As of June 6, the outlook for early action, either in Congress or the White House, was poor. The president was still awaiting the recommendations of his own three-man advisory committee on government organization, of which Fleming is a key member.

Infographic showing 'FEDERAL STORAGE' with statistics: OCCUPIES... 1.3 BILLION SQUARE FEET OR... 15,000 CITY BLOCKS OR... 31,000 ACRES COSTS... \$3.5 BILLION PER YEAR POSSIBLE SAVINGS \$253,000,000 PER YEAR

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round Hobby Helper Squirms on Polio Hook

WASHINGTON—The White House has been rocked by a backstage battle over how far it should step into the polio mess. Some advisers, anxious to use the president's prestige to quiet the polio hysteria, urged him to go on television to reassure the public.

Others advised him to keep his hands off the controversy, to let his subordinates handle the TV cameras alone. What worries the politicians is that the voters may blame the administration for the polio deaths caused by contaminated vaccine.

Adlai Will Can Simply It was no accident that a rash of stories came out of Washington and Chicago recently that Adlai Stevenson would definitely run again.

As early as April 20 this column quoted Adlai's son Borden that his father would run. But the recent rash came from Stevenson's law partner and made it clear that whether Eisenhower runs or not, Stevenson will.

People's Platform Arts In Crisis

Charlotte

IT IS heartening to see an editorial such as your recent one on the dilemma of the creative arts in America. The unfortunate fact is that creative artists have little or no place in the American scene. As a consequence, creative talents in the realms of art and music have little opportunity to develop.

Such an important American composer as the late Charles Ives had to spend the major portion of his life making a living in the insurance business, with almost no opportunity to hear the countless works which he had written per se. Even conductors, orchestras, directors of art galleries, and the like who wish to promote music and art are afraid to use more than a token portion because the people who patronize their enterprises are not fond of sponsoring such a modern creative material.

You are quite right to say that a reappraisal of our system of values must be made before we can expect any Beethovens or Michelangelos to appear. It would be well for us to remember that even Beethoven and Michelangelo were eagerly accepted in their day as the greatest artists which they were, and had it not been for people of vision who were willing to accept their works and

give them hearings, their creative efforts might well have lain forgotten on the dusty shelves of time, as did, in fact, the music of Bach for so many years.

It should be a challenge to the American people who have so outstripped the old world on many scores, as such technical fronts to recognize and remedy such a shortsighted condition in their cultural life.

—RICHARD M. PEEK

Safety Patrol Leader Receives A Salute

Charlotte

IN BEHALF of myself and the parents of the School Safety Patrol boys and girls in Charlotte, I would like to thank Sgt. George Livingston for the time, patience, and hard work he has so far put into the training of our young children to be safe, careful, and obedient in their good job. We need more men like him to put forth the effort training young children to be safe, careful, and obedient in their good job. We need more men like him to put forth the effort training young children to be safe, careful, and obedient in their good job.

—MRS. JOHN A. CROSBY

A Patrol Boy's Mother

Tough, Indirect Censorship Spreads Through Washington

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSP

FOR A great many years, American correspondents in Moscow have wisely warned that their own dispatches are slanted, because of the Soviet censorship. In the opinion of these reporters, it is now time for Washington correspondents to send out a similar warning.

This being pacetime, the Eisenhower administration is not yet ready to recommend the use of censored news. But it is still practicing a widespread censorship which is not less effective in slanting the news because it is indirectly imposed.

The censor's pressure is felt by every Washington reporter who still bothers to wear out his shoe leather to do his real job—writing the news. It is a national meaning to the American public.

Facts of really vital meaning are being withheld from the public. As an example of the sort of thing that is now a matter of course, consider the curious episode that led these reporters to write the following article: A censorship warning. It happened very long ago, when one of us had just returned from a six-month trip in Asia.

After this long absence, two of these reporters' best and oldest friends in Washington proposed a happy family reunion. The ladies of the three families had agreed to meet in the city of Washington, although somewhat elaborate, were smoothly completed.

And then, on the very eve of the reunion, there was a somewhat embarrassing telephone call. Messrs. A and B, as we may call them, were both in the city and had high posts in the same government agency. They had been bluntly told that their official positions would be compromised if the party were held as planned.

What is not right, however, is the pathetic, almost psychotic, behavior of the two ladies. This kind of invasion of private life, to carry out reprisals against reporters who are doing what they conceive to be their public duty. What is not right, either, is this indirect censorship by reprisal which has done to the public duty.

What is involved here, in fact, is a radical change in the American political system, and very nearly an amendment to the American Constitution, that is being shoved through behind the backs of the American people. And this is so serious a matter that it will be the subject of several subsequent reports.

It did not matter, of course, that these reporters had had no access whatever to classified information. That point was not even tested. The chief of the agency that employs Messrs. A and B had been at the N.S.C. meeting. Without further ado, he referred to his office and issued the edict that led, in turn, to the embarrassed telephone call already mentioned. The chief of the agency that employs Messrs. A and B had been at the N.S.C. meeting. Without further ado, he referred to his office and issued the edict that led, in turn, to the embarrassed telephone call already mentioned.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed about any "sensitive" matters. This has always been understood between us. In present day Washington, which is more so than metropolitan New York, business and friendship are strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.