

The Star-Telegram is an independent Democratic newspaper, supporting what it believes to be right and opposing what it believes to be wrong, regardless of party politics, publishing the news fairly and impartially at all times.

HOW HIGH DOES IT GO?

by Hal Coffman



Hal Coffman's cartoons appear exclusively in the Star-Telegram.

President Is Urged to Approve Tidelands Bill

(The following letter, setting forth reasons why the so-called tidelands bill soon to emerge from Congress should be signed into law, has been sent to President Truman by Amon Carter.)

Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

Both Houses of Congress, by a decisive majority in each, have approved legislation confirming to the states the title to submerged lands within their borders. House and Senate conferees now are engaged in reconciling differences in the legislation as it was passed by the two houses, and final congressional action is in the offing. This is to urge you, respectfully but strongly, to affix your signature of approval to the measure when it comes to your desk.

This urgent request is made not only in the earnest belief that enactment of the measure into law would serve the purposes of justice and equity, and that restoration of state ownership would be in accord with the facts of history and settled principles of constitutional government, but also in the belief that it would soundly serve the interests of the nation and its security. The reasons for this may be set forth briefly as follows:

Provided Orderly Development. For more than 100 years, in decision after decision, it has been held by the United States Supreme Court that ownership and title to the submerged lands within their borders in the states. During that time the states have exercised their rights over these areas in good faith and without interference with the recognized powers of the Federal Government to regulate commerce and navigation therein. They have provided for the orderly development of the resources of these lands so as to make them an asset to the economy of the whole nation.

Until the decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years in the cases involving California, Louisiana and Texas discarded the long-settled rule of state ownership, the claim of the states to the submerged lands was unchallenged and undisputed. But with enunciation of the doctrine that the Federal Government possesses "paramount rights" in these areas and to the minerals and other resources contained in them, a cloud was cast over the property rights of the states. In the case of the three states most directly involved, the effect has been to bring to a standstill all new activities aimed at developing the oil resources of the offshore area.

Cloud of Uncertainty. This result is one that could be of dire import if the nation should be plunged into a major war in the next few years. For oil—and oil in great quantities—is essential to the modern conduct of war, and oil from one of the nation's potentially most productive sources would be unavailable. The production of oil is the result of patient individual search and costly development, and in the event of war the required time, manpower and materials might be lacking. The cost of finding and producing oil in the submerged areas is so great that no one can be expected to undertake it while the present cloud of uncertainty remains.

Restoration of the submerged

lands to the states would revive the orderly development of their petroleum resources, thus assuring the greater production of oil that would be vital in case of national emergency. Instead of lessened availability of oil, there would be greater availability of it to meet the nation's essential requirements, for oil produced in the tidelands would be just as available to meet national needs as are all other resources of men, materials and production in time of war. Moreover, it would be oil on this side of the ocean, where it could not be cut off by enemy action as might be the case with supplies from foreign shores.

Owned Marginal Seals. As you are well aware, having once made special mention of it, Texas has a unique claim to its submerged lands. As an independent republic, Texas owned the marginal seals out to a distance of 10 1/2 miles from shore—a point acknowledged by the Supreme Court in its opinion in the Texas case. By terms of its voluntary admission to the Union, Texas retained the public domain which had belonged to it as an independent nation. The terms of that agreement were fixed by a joint resolution of Congress and accepted and ratified by the people of Texas. It thus formed a solemn and binding contract.

The lands in question are dedicated to public school purposes in Texas. The revenues from them form the basic endowment of the state's system of public education. The lands included in the offshore portion of the public domain are a valuable part of the heritage of the school children of Texas.

These facts of history make the tidelands matter, insofar as Texas is concerned, a moral as well as a legal matter. Whatever view may be taken as to the legal aspects of the case, to dispossess Texas of the offshore lands within its historical boundaries would be to breach a good faith agreement and to cast a blight upon the honor and integrity of the United States of America.

We strongly believe that your signing of the measure confirming title of the states to their submerged lands would be an act to preserve the traditional relationship between the federal and state governments, to uphold the honor of the United States, and to safeguard the welfare and security of the nation. It is for these reasons that you are urged respectfully to give presidential sanction to the legislation when it is presented to you.

Sincerely,
AMON G. CARTER.
Publisher, Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

landed to public school purposes in Texas. The revenues from them form the basic endowment of the state's system of public education. The lands included in the offshore portion of the public domain are a valuable part of the heritage of the school children of Texas.

These facts of history make the tidelands matter, insofar as Texas is concerned, a moral as well as a legal matter. Whatever view may be taken as to the legal aspects of the case, to dispossess Texas of the offshore lands within its historical boundaries would be to breach a good faith agreement and to cast a blight upon the honor and integrity of the United States of America.

We strongly believe that your signing of the measure confirming title of the states to their submerged lands would be an act to preserve the traditional relationship between the federal and state governments, to uphold the honor of the United States, and to safeguard the welfare and security of the nation. It is for these reasons that you are urged respectfully to give presidential sanction to the legislation when it is presented to you.

Sincerely,
AMON G. CARTER.
Publisher, Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Letters From the People

Editor's Note—Contributions to this column should be kept as short as possible. The Star-Telegram reserves the right to edit all letters to fit space requirements or to return them for condensation. Each letter must bear the author's name and address, but upon request for valid reason name and address will not be published.

LIKES SHIVERS' STAND.

I like Governor Shivers' position on an unstructured delegation to the National Democratic convention because he stands for something fundamental, the dignity and rights of Texans. He stands for the right to control and develop our natural resources; faith in the honor and judgment of fellow Texans; and trust in the choice of these delegates by the voters.

Precinct conventions on May 3 provide the only means for the voters to attend, organize, and express their views. At this meeting the voters first register their wishes on a party platform and a candidate to carry out that mandate. The county convention on May 6 will reflect all precinct preferences.

Let us be for something and be courageous enough to live and vote our beliefs. Our precinct conventions provide the time and the place.

H. V. BURRUS.
3713 Ave K.

LET'S ALL VOTE.

Some years ago a writer, Gibbons, in his narrative, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," very intelligently wrote the following expression:

"Civil governments, in their first institution, are voluntary associations for mutual defense. To obtain the desired end it is absolutely necessary that each individual should conceive himself obliged to submit his private

opinion and actions to the judgment of the greater number of his associates."

If we the people consider, ponder and are then adequately impressed with the above statement, why shouldn't we, during this all important election year, for our mutual defense manifest our private opinions at the ballot box?

A true return of the number of votes would certainly be an authentic expression of the voters' associates.

A. E. CROUCH.
2018 Lipscomb.

WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE?

A few days ago I got a letter from a Star-Telegram reader. He didn't like my glamour boy letter at all. He said if Taft was elected president, we would have another Hoover depression. According to his reasoning, Hoover, being President at the time, was responsible. Now if that is good reasoning, then Woodrow Wilson was responsible for getting us into World War I, Roosevelt World War II, and Truman the Korean war. Going a little farther, during Roosevelt and Truman's administrations the federal debt climbed to a staggering figure. Therefore, they are responsible.

This reader bragged about the present prosperity. If I were he, I never would mention it. It is blood-bought prosperity.

Back to the Hoover depression. Hoover started the RFC, wanted to plow up some cotton and go off the gold standard. Roosevelt used all three to get us back on our feet. That's not all—the Federal Reserve Act was a Democratic baby. The Democrats said we would never have a depression. Let's keep the record straight.

H. L. HARELL.
Argyle.

New Code Plus Special Law Mixing Up GOP Politics

Republicans Have More Trouble Than Democrats; They Use Two Bases in Picking Their Delegates

BY SAM KINCH, Austin Correspondent.

AUSTIN.—If Texas Democrats think the new election code got their presidential politics in a mess, they should take a look at the Republicans.

GOP members have most of the headaches of the new laws—plus a law of their own.

And that private law has compounded the confusion of the re-codification.

It creates situations where some counties will send delegations to the state convention that are bigger than the entire attendance permissible for the county conventions.

And many a one-man precinct convention next Saturday will select a one-man delegation to the county convention.

Actually, most of the one-man precinct conventions will be in voting boxes where there aren't enough Republican votes to justify one man—the lone vote is given each precinct in accordance with party custom.

No Votes in 1950.

Nine of the counties will get lone votes in the state convention where their voting records do not entitle them to such consideration. They are the ones in which no Republican votes were recorded in 1950.

Thirty-two counties in all will send single delegates to the state convention.

What is confusing to some Republicans is that they are fighting among themselves to organize precincts that may have historically strong Republican votes but will get only wee small voices in county conventions this year.

That is where the new Republican law comes in.

It was pushed through the last Legislature by the lone Republican—Rep. Edward Dicker of Dallas—and was given little thought by Democrats who passed it ahead of the election law re-codification.

The Legislature put it in a section of the code, providing that it would not change any other laws passed at that session.

Presidential Vote Basis.

The special law provided, among other things, that delegates to the GOP state convention should be picked on the basis of one for each 300 votes, or major fraction thereof, cast by a county for the party nominee in the preceding presidential race.

It left unchanged the method of picking delegates to county conventions—one for each 25 votes, or major fraction thereof, cast in the various precincts for the party nominee in the preceding governor's race.

Apparently party workers forgot that the gubernatorial vote never is strong except in presidential years, or that the small-voting precinct, with its one gratuitous delegate, would have a big voice in organizing the county conventions which sent the presidential-vote delegations to the state convention.

Naturally, Texas recorded far more Republican votes in the hot Dewey-Truman race of 1948 than in the Shivers-Curry race for governor two years ago.

Actually, if the Republican leadership wanted to force strict construction of the law, there would be innumerable precincts and the nine counties which would be entitled to no representation at all. It is by custom of the state committee that one delegate is allowed, regardless of the vote cast.

An Extreme Case.

One of the extreme cases is that of Travis County, where Republicans registered only 285 votes in the governor's race of 1950.

That would entitle the county to 11 delegates in its county convention—under strict interpretation of the law—while the county will be allowed to send 20 delegates to the state convention because of 5,994 votes for Dewey in 1948.

Tarrant County would have 100 delegates at the county convention and will be able to send 57 to the state meeting, while Harris County would have 161 at a

county meeting and can send 143 to the state convention.

Other Big Delegations.

Bexar County, with 112 allowed at the county convention, will be entitled to send 87 to the state convention, and Dallas County, entitled to 289 at the county meeting, will be entitled to 118 at the state convention.

Those will be the delegations to be reckoned with in the fight over whether to send Taft or Eisenhower delegates to the national nominating convention—and whether to recommend Jack Porter of Houston (Eisenhower leader) or Henry Zweifel of Fort Worth (national committeeman now and state campaign manager for Taft) to represent Texas on the national committee.

GUEST EDITORIAL

'OLD TAWM' WILL BE MISSED.

The United States Senate is going to lose in color, as well as talent, with the absence next session of Thomas Terry Connally.

The tall Texan, familiarly known as "Old Tawm," has long been the showpiece of the Senate. He was of the vanishing age of "old statesmen," almost Bryan-esque in dark suit, flowing black string bow tie, boiled shirt and glistening gold studs.

His oratory, too, was of the old school. Barbed wit, mimicry and repartee were his weapons. It was part of his stagecraft. He could storm and rant in a way awesome to behold and in the next moment be the courtly southern gentleman. He was the delight of the galleries, the joy of fellow senators (except when he cracked his whiplike tongue at them) and the pride of the Lone Star State.

Yet Tom Connally was no Claghorn. He was a hard working and able senator, for all his flamboyance. Occasionally, he put Texas and its interests ahead of the national welfare, as in his battle against the St. Lawrence waterway. Sometimes he talked too much, and too fast, as when he announced a peace settlement (it turned out to be a surmise) with Germany two weeks before the fact in 1945. Now and then his irascibility resulted in injustice to witnesses before his committee. But his over-all record of national service overshadowed all these.

During all of World War II, Connally was chairman of the important foreign relations committee. He guided wartime legislation through the Congress. He participated in many international conferences. He was active in working out the legislation for all postwar agreements.

When the Republicans won Congress in 1946, and the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan took over the foreign relations committee, Connally and Vandenberg worked as a team in developing a bipartisan approach to foreign policy. Connally struggled to maintain this bipartisanship in 1949 and after Vandenberg's death in April 1951.

If for no other reason than this, Connally is deserving of the gratitude of the American people.—Milwaukee Journal.

When the Republicans won Congress in 1946, and the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan took over the foreign relations committee, Connally and Vandenberg worked as a team in developing a bipartisan approach to foreign policy. Connally struggled to maintain this bipartisanship in 1949 and after Vandenberg's death in April 1951.

If for no other reason than this, Connally is deserving of the gratitude of the American people.—Milwaukee Journal.

When the Republicans won Congress in 1946, and the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan took over the foreign relations committee, Connally and Vandenberg worked as a team in developing a bipartisan approach to foreign policy. Connally struggled to maintain this bipartisanship in 1949 and after Vandenberg's death in April 1951.

If for no other reason than this, Connally is deserving of the gratitude of the American people.—Milwaukee Journal.

WADING IN

by H. V. Wade.

A GI in Alaska writes back to say that the first robin of 1951 has just arrived.

For sweet sadness, nothing beats the shattered Hollywood idyll, as when a cutie and her husband part on better terms than 90 per cent of those who go on living together.

Corruption in Washington, it begins to be felt, will be handled like the snow-removal problem in the small town: You kick the stuff around until it gets lost.

Still, there is this about woman: She seems never to become discouraged. She has spent countless generations making man over, and look at the guy.

Among the government's food requirements is one that the hot dog must be "resilient." Few wayside sights are as depressing, in season, as the wiener that doesn't care.

As a postwar period, this seems pretty terrible. On the other hand, there has been no recurrence of the young intellectuals of the mid-1920's.

CLIPPED QUIPS

The young husband brought his boss home for dinner, only to have his wife greet the guest enthusiastically. "Oh, it's so nice to meet you, Mr. Legree. My husband speaks of you so often." Lamar (Mo.) Democrat.

To stop government spending just before we go broke is like stopping drinking just before you get drunk. You don't know you have gone too far until you have gone too far.—Kingsport (Tenn.) Times.

It never occurs to a boy of 18 that some day he will be dumb as his father.—Etowah (Tenn.) Enterprise.

JUST FOLKS

by Edgar A. Guest.

My eyes with happiness grew bright
When first I learned to fly a kite.
As high above the world it flew
Accomplishment's sweet thrill I knew.
To all who watched was being displayed
The first true thing my hands had made.

But this in time I had to learn:
How soon can joy to sorrow turn.
My precious kite I had to see
Entangled in the tallest tree,
A broken and a tattered thing,
Dead to the touch of wind or string.

And so it seems, as time goes by,
Kites made of dreams we mortals fly.
And some in moments rare come true,
And some, in spite of all we do,
For some strange reason, fail to soar
And down they crash, to fly no more.

And so it seems, as time goes by,
Kites made of dreams we mortals fly.
And some in moments rare come true,
And some, in spite of all we do,
For some strange reason, fail to soar
And down they crash, to fly no more.

And so it seems, as time goes by,
Kites made of dreams we mortals fly.
And some in moments rare come true,
And some, in spite of all we do,
For some strange reason, fail to soar
And down they crash, to fly no more.

And so it seems, as time goes by,
Kites made of dreams we mortals fly.
And some in moments rare come true,
And some, in spite of all we do,
For some strange reason, fail to soar
And down they crash, to fly no more.

Spur to Direct Election of President

This year's political developments appear likely to provide the impetus needed to bring about direct voting in presidential elections.

They may help get statewide preferential primaries—or a nationwide elimination contest in each party—which would allow voters to pick the nominees instead of having them selected by whatever factions happen to be in control. And a natural adjunct to that would be direct voting in the general election—as a substitute for the antiquated electoral college system which left its original course so long ago.

The Texas picture is closer at hand, of course, but similar problems are cropping up in other states, and in both of the major parties. There probably are going to be bolts in both parties in several states. That means contesting delegations will appear at the national conventions in Chicago and that recognition will go to the group having the greater influence with the controlling faction in the national setup.

Undoubtedly there will be many cries of "foul," and undoubtedly some of them will be justified.

It is not right for voters of a precinct to go through the legal formalities of the May 3 conventions—when they get their only opportunity to say whom they prefer as a candidate for President—and then have one faction bolt and leave to a county convention committee the matter of which delegation should speak for that precinct.

The same is true of a county delegation being decided at a state convention committee hearing—and of a state delegation being picked by a national convention committee. It is particularly unfair for a body of complete strangers—as often is the case in the national conventions—to reach a decision as to the prevailing sentiment in Texas, for instance, and which group represents that sentiment.

There will be many bitter fights this year among Republicans and Democrats. They will leave wounds that only time can heal. But they may serve a good purpose if out of them comes legislation that will let the voters express themselves directly—instead of through the agency of politicians unknown to them.

New Voice for Bipartisanship in Foreign Policy

Republican Senator Wiley of Wisconsin made a notable address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors at its Washington meeting—an address whose reasonableness and avoidance of violent partisanship made it stand out sharply from the utterances of most public figures in an election year. Instead of denouncing everything Democratic, Senator Wiley had words of praise for the worthwhile accomplishments of our foreign policy and words of criticism for politically inspired attacks upon it.

"I oppose," he said, "as a matter of principle, not personality, the efforts of anyone within my own party, or in any other party, who has the mistaken idea that simply because 'the other fellow' recommended a policy it is necessarily wrong. We are first and last of that breed called Americans.

"I oppose the effort of anyone in either party to assume it is 'good politics' or 'good sense' to criticize others unjustifiably. The American people know that there is a time and a place for criticism. But they also know that what is always needed most of all is constructive sug-

gestion, affirmative emphasis, and not merely negativism."

Senator Wiley said the big job in government, and in foreign policy, is not to dwell upon mistakes of the past but to assess our position frankly and decide "where do we go from here."

The attitude evinced by Senator Wiley bodes good for the country, for foreign policy is a thing that must go on regardless of who wins the election this year, and on which the country should be able to speak with a voice of substantial unity regardless of which party is in power. Senator Wiley stamps himself as one who views foreign policy as being above and outside the sphere of party politics.

And this is important. It is important because, if there should be a change in administration after this year and the Republicans are in control of Congress, Senator Wiley will be in position to exert a very great influence upon foreign policy. As ranking Republican member of the Senate foreign relations committee, he will be successor to Texas' Senator Connally as chairman of that powerful and influential committee in the event of such a change.

Banning the Lash

The Youth Development Council is to be congratulated for its decision to ban disciplinary flogging in the state's juvenile schools of correction. Although it is pointed out that the use of the whip already has been abolished by the school superintendents, the council's rule will serve to help prevent the practice of beating inmates from cropping up again.

It was the complaint of fugitives from the Gainesville State School for Girls against whippings and solitary confinement which led to demands for investigation and resulted in the review of disciplinary measures. Whether or not whipping was ever much resorted to, it is a degrading thing to which human beings ought not to be subjected.

The inmates of reformatories presumably are not normal persons, or they would not be where they are, but the objective of reformatories, at least in theory, is to reform. It is doubtful that reform can be achieved by animal-like beatings. Such treatment, we suspect, more likely would engender an abiding hate which would make reform impossible.

The navies of the world once imagined they could not maintain discipline without the penalty of flogging, which

was a brutal experience to inflict upon ignorant seamen, but the navies were wrong. Better discipline nowadays is accomplished by more enlightened means. Flogging in prisons is equally an anachronism.

The recommendation of Harold J. Matthews, director of institutions, and his staff that "the council and the institutions continue to develop as many wholesome and constructive activities, programs and interests as possible, and to create an institutional climate that is as relaxed as possible," makes definite sense.

Bigness Is Costly

The immensity of the federal government is primarily the reason for its cost, but the Internal Revenue Bureau is an exception to that generalization.

The bureau has only 2 1/2 per cent more employes than five years ago, despite the fact that during that period the number of individual income tax returns has doubled and corporation returns have increased by 50 per cent. Reports of extensive income tax evasion justify an adequate staff to enforce the tax laws.

However, the House cut of \$35 million in the bureau's appropriation request would force a reduction of the auditing personnel who are the watchdogs to detect evasion and thereby augment revenues. The protest made by Commissioner Dunlap, therefore, was reasonable objection to an arbitrary slash by the House, and should be heeded by the Senate.

SENATOR SOAPER says:

It is probably no more than an illusion—that Korean truce developments have seemed much clearer since a blackout was clamped on news.

It is Chicago—where the mail order catalogs come from—that announces a finding that there were farmers on this continent as early as 3000 B. C.

Looking over the many new devices of war, a thought is that the hope of the world lies in a new generation that flunks high school physics en masse.

There is something about April—despite the fact that she is pretty much of an emotional mess; mingling girlish laughter with her tears.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram advertisement containing publication information, subscription rates, and contact details for the newspaper's offices and printing plant.