THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

Thomas L. Robinson ..... President and Publisher
Brodie S. Griffith ..... General Manager
Cecil Prince ..... Associate Editor
Thomas G. Fesperman ..... Managing Editor
W. W. Sirmon ..... Circulation Manager

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1956

State Parking Ban: A Shining Virtue

HIGHWAY Commissioner James Hardison has made what will come to be known, we suppose, as a "controversial proposal." We certainly hope so. His call for a state-imposed ban on state-financed city streets and urban highways has too much merit to be allowed to die from disinterest.

There is a shining virtue in the Hardison plan. It recognizes that the primary purpose of streets and highways is to move vehicles and the people in them. The dilution of this principle by allowing on-street parking is one of the main sources of the wallowing confusion generally called the traffic problem. Streets built at great expense to move vehicles have become pinched and blockaded pig paths by reason of cars parked in one or more lanes and of cars stopped in order to park.

It is neither economical nor efficient to make multi-million dollar thoroughfares into parking lots. It is a country-town practice that eventually must yield to metropolitan facts of life.

The practice has hung on because there are so many good reasons for keeping on-street parking once it is permitted. Merchants justifiably complain that a parking ban would hurt a business established to serve on-street parking. Moreover, motorists have to park somewhere, and if a city has been derelict in providing sufficient off-street parking the case for insisting that a highway should be used only for its original purpose becomes doubly difficult.

But Mr. Hardison is making a before-the-fact proposal. He would stop on-street parking before it began on thoroughfares the state finances. Merchants would be forewarned to provide off-street parking. So would cities. It is a simple, common sense approach.

If it would impose a state dictate, it also would relieve cities of a responsibility that some are unwilling to properly discharge, that of demanding that urban thoroughfares be utilized fully for the movement of traffic.

The State Highway Commission should consider carefully the Hardison proposal. It makes too much sense to be put in a cubby-hole.

Ike Sets A Reasonable Fiscal Pace

UNCLE SAM'S fiscal dilemma is no different from the plight of many a hard-put citizen in 1956.

His cuff runneth over.

The federal budget submitted to Congress yesterday by President Eisenhower is designed not only to balance the nation's books this year and next but, at the same time, take a little off the cuff.

In objective, it is an admirable document.

It expresses in terms of hard cash the broad philosophy Mr. Eisenhower laid before Congress Jan. 5.

It reflects, too, reductions in certain governmental expenditures and anticipated increases in federal revenues.

It recognizes the need for a more enlightened program of foreign aid and the fact that "defense needs are still overriding and must continue to be met in full measure." (There was no illusory nonsense about "a bigger bang for a buck.")

Finally, it provides for new and expanded programs for "enhancing opportunities for human well-being and economic growth" — programs which are frankly New Dealish in substance and intent.

But the President tied up his fiscal package with a word of warning:

> Although balanced, the margin of estimated surplus in each of these budgets is slim. This calls for the utmost co-operation between the executive and legislative branches to prevent increases in expenditures or reductions in receipts that would create a deficit.

It was an augury of sorts.

For however admirable in intent the proposed budget is, it must stand the acid test of political expediency.

This is an election year. A small tax cut is probable. Such a reduction is indeed justified if it can be fashioned to offer a measure of relief to low income groups and small businesses.

At the same time, many members of Congress from both parties have declared that Mr. Eisenhower's foreign aid requests will be sharply cut. In view of the great delicacy of global problems at this time it is regrettable. But the prospects for the President's proposal—an appropriation for fiscal 1957 almost double the $2,700,000,000 approved last year—are indeed dim.

Furthermore, there will undoubtedly be sharp controversies over the President's school construction and housing plans—with a resulting alteration of budgetary entries.

In addition to purely political consideration there are certain historic compulsions of the time that affect even congressmen—for instance, the familiar feeling that safety in a world of struggle comes only with great exertion and high cost. There is justification for this sentiment. Indeed all of President Eisenhower's budgets have reflected a determination to hold steady over the long haul in the face of massive global problems.

The reaction of Congress has, like the budgets themselves, been moderate. All things considered, Congress has been remarkably cooperative.

Despite the political climate, we hope that Congress will again react with reasonable restraint, preserving the general characteristics of the President's fiscal policy. With some cautious tinkering along the line, he has finally gotten "control" of the budget, without disrupting the national economy, as he moved toward the goal of balanced books.

But the nation's goal is not simply a balanced budget. It is more properly a balanced economy—in which both tax reductions and an end of deficit spending can be achieved.

Porgy & Bess Vs. Gilels & Oistrakh

WHEN the Russians invited America's touring production of PORGY AND BESS to appear in the Soviet Union, State Department officials called the project politically inept and flatly refused to support it.

Disregarding the bureaucratic frown, the company decided to go on its own. The USSR, meanwhile, announced that it would be happy to underwrite the tour.

What happened? PORGY AND BESS has been a success behind the Curtain—and the Soviets have fashioned Washington's attitude into a propaganda boomerang, turning the entire incident to their own account.

In addtiion, the Kremlin exported two of its greatest musical artists to the United States—pianist Emil Gilels and violinist David Oistrakh. They were enthusiastically received.

The magazine MUSICAL AMERICA called the episode "a masterful piece of diplomacy by the Soviet Union."

> Not that any Americans left the concert hall converted to Bolshevism, but they did come in personal contact with the clear fact that, however else they pervert social and cultural values, the Russians are just people like ourselves.

When will the United States begin to appreciate the value of cultural diplomacy? If anyone is demonstrating "political ineptitude" in this matter it is the policy-makers of our own State Department.

From The El Paso Herald-Post

EL PASO SHOWS THE WAY

THE majority of those who attended the White House Conference on Education think it is impossible to build new schools without federal financial aid.

They believe that American states, cities and school districts can not take care of their own.

Well, we know of one city that can, and it does it without going into debt, either. That city is our El Paso.

We suggest that other cities profit from El Paso's example.

In 1938, the El Paso Independent School District decided it would issue no more bonds and pay cash for all future buildings. The schools bonded debt then was $600,000, now it is $175,000 plus $173,000 assumed when two small adjoining districts were annexed.

Since 1938 El Paso has built $9,727,262.39 worth of new schools and additions to old ones.

And paid cash.

Before and during World War II, the district spent only $645,161.14. In the 10 years since the war's end more than $9,000,000 has been spent and plans call for about $2,000,000 a year to keep up with the growing school population.

In 1955, there was spent $2,597,218.89. The money has come from its usual sources, local and state taxes, except for $2,500,000 from the government. This was paid the district for providing school facilities for the children of the 25,000 soldiers and airmen stationed here. Deducting that leaves a total of more than $7,000,000 El Pasoans have spent to increase their school plant.

El Paso doesn't want any of the usual federal aid. It has found out what that means through the lunch program, and the School Board should get rid of that bit of paternalistic socialism. In payment for "free" surplus foods, the schools must serve a menu composed by a spinster in Washington who denies the young Texans the privilege of eating a piece of candy or drinking a bottle of pop during school hours.

El Pasoans would rather design their own buildings and have no strings attached to them.

Any American city can do what El Paso has done, we believe. We hope many will. Government aid makes the government boss. Besides, the government has no money; it has a deficit and a debt.

To keep apples from spoiling, place in a cool room occupied by several boys. —CARLSBAD CURRENT-ARGUS.

People's Platform

Presidential Possibilities: A Reader's Analysis

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

FOR WHAT it is worth here is a view of current public affairs, political and national, as it appears to me.

The present political situation in the United States presents its imperatives and its potentialities. Imperatively we will have a newly elected president after November. That is in our laws, constitution and historical record. Elementary in this imperative is the fact that every citizen from the Great Lakes to the Rio Grande and from Cape Hatteras to San Francisco will, or can, deposit his or her unit of sovereignty directed to national control and policy. No politician nor individual controls or directs the course of the nation; it is the people.

ILL HEALTH

Prevalent are reports that we have a person of ill health in the president's office. Faced with such a situation and an Eisenhower candidacy the voter would have to decide whether he could responsibly discharge his duty to his fellowmen and to his country by voting for a man for the hardest job in the world who is, in degree, in fact or in doubt, incapacitated. This has nothing to do with Eisenhower's credit for patriotic service to his country, past or present.

BASIC ERROR

If he runs the Republican Party will be overwhelmingly defeated and the basic error of his candidacy will weigh heavily upon that party for a long time as it goes into eclipse. If he runs and should be elected it will continue for four years his appointees who are by tradition and practice in position to control the next Republican national nominating convention. (And here is the basis for the argument that our presidents should have one term of six years and not two or four with the second nomination dominated by federal office holders). However, the present situation indicates on its face that Eisenhower's decision will be delayed until other aspirants will be at a disadvantage in furthering their claims and when candidates are eliminated by indirection, whether planned or not, the nomination of the Republican candidate could fall by mere political gravity to administration choice. In American political history there has never been an occasion when national party politics were played over the heads of the people in this way, planned or not.

As for Knowland and Nixon both are weak, very much unknown by the people, neither of presidential calibre, and that makes delay and domination of the Republican party by the Eisenhower regency easy. Nixon has nothing to his credit except that he appeared as an attorney against Hiss. Thousands of attorneys appear in cases every day. He appears to be waiting to be named by the regency in case Eisenhower fails to make the try. If a miracle should happen and he should be nominated and elected he would have attained the presidency upon the most insignificant background and least show of fitness of any man who ever held that office.

TAFT MACHINE

The nomination of Knowland would, in my opinion, bring to life the Taft machine which would mean division and retrogression in the Republican party. With the lesser lights eliminated and withdrawal from the race of the aged and infirm Eisenhower there is yet one man who stands out.

Warren is not seeking the nomination for president.

As the Republican candidate he would sweep the country; place the Republican party in power for a generation; eliminate doubt and obscurity in our foreign policy; establish the deserved prestige of this country among the nations; remove, in the national administration at Washington, the danger of Republican regency rule potential in the election of Eisenhower. In my opinion, judged upon the highest plane upon which politics can be judged, it should be Warren or Stevenson. I would like to see it that way. Both are good.

As to the farm question, schools, home building, and pensions, those questions are domestic and will inevitably be settled by a vote in Congress or by the people at the polls by convergence of sentiment in the coming election.

—HOYT EAVES

EARL WARREN
A Winner?

passed on account of our worthiest councilman had to be absent when the smoke screen exploded in the Council Chamber. We had three which were opposed to the smoke chaser that will cost the taxpayers somewhere between $25,000 and $50,000 when all the frills are added. As we see it now, we will need another City Hall so we can elect a he-man Council to protect the taxpayers. We thought we had at least five he-men on the Council, but two of them fooled us. If the women are going to take over or cause so much expense, then we shall move to establish a hut so the he-men can carry on as heretofore.

We were in hopes that the Council would give the smoke, smog and fog claim the same treatment as they did the request for money to explore Europe in 1955. But we may be able to carry on until we can get rid of this excess that has been plastered on us for the time being. All of this is a publicity pull and we shall keep an eye on the future which will bring all to the surface.

We do have this much to look to; there is another time that we can and will vote. I am very sorry that three of our councilmen had to take a beating on account of the absence of Mr. Brown, one of our outstanding councilmen. We look forward to seeing him well and able to be on the battle line again.

We hope to blow the smoke out of the City Hall with less than $25,000 to $50,000.

—S. C. VAUGHN

down the road of sanity and logic, and brought into true focus the function of the Supreme Court in our federal republic; namely, to interpret the constitution — not to rewrite it nor legislate.

FLIMSINESS

In view of the incredible flimsiness of your argument for urging unbending compliance with the court's anti-segregation decision, one can but assume that you regard the court as having virtually unlimited power, as well as infallible judgment as to what's best for the people. Nothing must do but the people "drink the hemlock" as the court commands—right, Mr. Editor? Then you and the eggheads drink it! A battle scarred old patriot once whispered in my ear that the stuff would "kill you dead" — and I believe him!

DEFY THE CHILD

You appear to abhor the thought of the people defying a child of their creation (the Supreme Court) because to do so is to defy constitutional government. All right, but why do you not come down to earth, study this abominable situation closely, and admit candidly that you equally abhor the colossal usurpation of power by a branch of government? You cannot justify by inference the present Court's usurpation of power by quoting Justice Marshall in the 1891 case of McCulloch vs. Maryland. Clearly, that case did not involve fundamentally the same situation as we have in the segregation decision, because in McCulloch vs. Maryland it was a legislative act of Congress (not a purely prejudiced judicial opinion) which Maryland attempted to nullify.

You write prettily about honoring the Constitution and the Court's segregation decision to the Southern people whose cause on this issue you have never championed. But you have, in effect, given license to the present court to re-mould the character of our section and republic in its own morbid and thoughtless image. If it be said there are those who would defy the court's anti-segregation decision, let it be said at the same time that the Court taught all of us how by first defying the constitution and legal precedent.

PALPABLE CONTEMPT

In the spirit of one who has devoted his life to the study and enforcement of the law, John W. Hester ended his superb letter with the observation that he was "not a candidate for any contempt citation," although he could have no respect for the usurpation of power perpetrated by the Court. Neither will I "seek" the candidacy of contempt. However, if it is thrust upon me by those who would consciously or unconsciously tear this republic asunder, then let me make it perfectly clear that I am prepared to bear a contempt citation as unashamedly as did the court when it demonstrated palpable contempt and disregard for the constitution of my country.

— J. R. CHERRY JR.

HERMAN HOOSE
Bad Treatment?

Providence Road: Are Memories Long?

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

OF COURSE it's too late now, but it is certainly a pity that a group of drivers who use Providence Road traveling to and from town each day didn't get together and stand on the side of that road and get the names on a petition of those persons who favored imposing a parking ban on Providence Road.

The City Council in session listened to the gripes of three merchants who stood to lose their parking spaces for a couple hours a day, and in a sense told the 10,000 drivers and their passengers who use the road every day to "go jump in the lake." I hope that the voters of Myers Park have long enough memories to remember this when election time comes.

I don't know which I ought to be ashamed of the most. The city Council and the manner in which they treated Mr. Hoose, or the citizens of Myers Park for the way in which they remained silent.

Name withheld by request.

Natural Gas Rhubarb: 'A Principle In Peril'

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

IT SEEMS to me that the implications of government control and price-fixing in peacetime go far beyond the natural gas producers. I think there is a principle in peril — the basic American freedom of competition. If peacetime price controls are fixed on natural gas producers, it will mark the beginning of the end of "free" competition as we know it. . .

Natural gas, the focal point of the present effort, is a commodity. If the government can control it, then it can control any commodity, and any producer. . .

Another point too often overlooked is that the natural gas producing business is one of the most competitive in the country. Naturally, pipeline companies and utility companies long have been regulated, because usually they are the only suppliers in a particular area. In other words, they have a franchise and, in view of their more or less exclusive outlets, there's a basis for this kind of control.

COMPETITION

Until recently, however, no such regulation ever was placed on producers of natural gas — and for very good reason. The man who drills for gas faces tough competition. There are more than 8,000 competing producers today — and that spells competition in any language. These producers must compete for pipeline patronage and, not infrequently, one pipeline bargains with hundreds of producers and finally ends up buying the gas of as many as 100 in a given area. That's a far cry from monopoly, which is the basic reason for regulation of utilities.

Moreover, gas production involves a lot of risk. It's not generally known, but the average exploratory well costs at least $100,000, and some cost a lot more than that. Also, among such wells, eight out of nine turn out to be dry holes; in other words, producers exploring for gas face 8-1 odds against finding it.

Yet, with all of these risks and difficulties, the producer of natural gas gets only about 10 cents, on a national average, out of every dollar the householder pays for the gas he burns. The rest of it goes to the pipeline, for transporting it, and to the local gas utility, for distributing it.

CONSUMER SPOKESMEN

The current demand for federal regulation of gas producers clearly does not come from consumers. The so-called "consumer spokesmen" are mostly from municipal governments and big northern distributing utilities. The case they make is for the utilities' iterest, not for the public interest.

Indeed, through all the controversy, it's notable that there have been no petitions from consumers for relief from high gas prices. There is no showing that "gouging" takes place.

One other point deserves emphasis. Agitators for federal regulation assert that if controls are lifted from producers, America's household gas bill will go up $400—$800 million annually. Yet, in the 16 years before controls were imposed, cost of gas for household use went up only seven per cent, while the over-all cost of living soared 90 per cent. With oil, coal, manufactured gas and electricity as competition, it's hardly likely that natural gas producers will price themselves into bankruptcy.

—FRANK J. WHITEHURST
State Chairman,
Natural Gas & Oil Resources Committee

Court Is Instructor In Defiance Of Law

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

AMONG others, the venerable John W. Hester of Pittsboro beat me to the punch in taking issue with your naive, retreating editorial of January 4. ("The Case Against Interposition.") In a masterful presentation, the "Sage of Pittsboro" ushered us

Why Can't We Have Another Video Outlet?

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

ENCLOSED is an article sent to me by a friend in Tucson, Ariz. I might add that Tucson is a city with half the population of Charlotte, and are now securing their third TV station. I, along with numerous other friends, cannot understand why the great and growing city of Charlotte has been held to only one TV station for so many years. The city of Montgomery, Ala., also half the size of Charlotte, now has two stations, with a third on the way. I would also like to add that we in Charlotte had our first station long before Tucson and Montgomery, and we still have our first station, and that's all. There must be a very good reason for our still having only one station, and I think that I ask for thousands, when I ask, "When are we going to get a second, as well as a third station that a city of this caliber is entitled to be proud to have?"

—A. S. ROUSSO

Blow The Smoke From City Hall

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

YOU CANNOT tell what time will bring forth. When we last voted we thought we had elected a City Council that would protect the tax rate, but we changed our opinion after the smoke flood was pulled and

Quote, Unquote

Awkward age: When a girl's too old to count on her fingers but too young to count on her legs. —Gastonia Gazette.

Whatever absence does to the heart, many husbands have learned it does the opposite to the kitchen. — Laurel (Miss.) Leader-Call.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

GOP Appointments Enrage Rayburn

WASHINGTON

PRESIDENT Eisenhower affectionately refers to Speaker Rayburn of Texas as "Mr. Sam," but there was nothing affectionate about Mr. Sam's comment on Ike's administration during a secret caucus of House Democrats the other day. The Texan bluntly declaimed the GOP administration as "100 per cent political."

No Other

"No administration has been as political or as partisan as this one," Rayburn told his fellow Democrats. "When we Democrats controlled the presidency we consulted with the Republicans on everything—domestic as well as international policies."

"But now that they are in power, they don't consult with us on anything," blazed the Texan. "They run a one-party show on everything, even appointments. In past years, under Democratic presidents, we always saw to it that the Republicans had a say in appointing real Republicans to the bipartisan boards and commissions of the government. But Democrats don't get the same consideration today."

Irritation

Rayburn seemed particularly irritated about the ousters of Democrats Jim Mead, ex-senator from New York, from the Federal Trade Commission and Josh Lee, ex-senator from Oklahoma, from the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"Jim Mead and John Lee were trying to represent the people, but they were fired for their pains," protested Rayburn. "What's more, they and others aren't being replaced by real Democrats on these supposedly bipartisan boards. Instead, to take their places, the Republicans are getting men who register as Democrats but who are Republicans at heart."

Democrats who heard him at the closed-door meeting agreed that they haven't seen "Mr. Sam" wrothier since Vice President Nixon and other GOP-ers labeled the Democrats as the "party of treason." He was really steamed up.

'Giveaway' Gas Bill

The president-elect of Brazil, Juscelino Kubitschek, has no idea that he played any part in the hot Senate debate over the regulation of natural gas.

Nevertheless, it was because of him that secret debate inside the Democratic policy committee was abruptly shut off and it was decided to toss the entire question out into the Senate floor for debate — even if it did split the Democratic Party right down the middle.

What happened was that the policy committee was meeting behind closed doors to decide whether to vote the gas bill out for general discussion. Both sides had put out some eloquent pleas, one of the most eloquent coming from Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois.

Hasty Decision

The closed-door debate had now lasted some time. Suddenly word came that the president-elect of Brazil was in the vice president's anteroom waiting to address the Senate. Hastily, in order not to keep him waiting, the Policy Committee voted to bring out the natural gas bill as the first item of debate in the new session of Congress. Probably the result would have been the same anyway, but the arrival of President Kubitschek speeded up the decision.