

312/45

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.

State Supreme Court Enlargement

Increase of the size of the Texas Supreme Court from three to nine members has long been favored by the legal profession of the state for expediting adjudication of cases long delayed by an overloaded docket and a court too small to handle the volume of business. As an expediency, commissions of appeals with six members were created, and have materially alleviated the work of the three justices.

However, the court proper is still required to produce its own quota of opinions and also to review and approve decisions of the commissions so that the findings may have the weight of law. Even though the caliber of work by the commissions of appeals may be high, the logical procedure would be to eliminate the circuitous route by authorization of six additional justices and discontinuing the commissions of appeal, devised as a temporary makeshift.

The propriety and wisdom of enlarging the Supreme Court to nine members have been recognized by the Senate in approving by a vote of 23 to 4 a resolution for submission of a constitutional amendment to the people that would authorize the increase. The House should sanction the resolution to give the people an opportu-

nity to vote upon an important judicial change of value to the people.

It may not be amiss to remind the Legislature and bar that, even with the approval of the amendment as a desirable improvement, litigation in Texas courts still would continue to be prolonged and to be too costly for the majority of litigants, who can not afford to finance litigation through lower courts, courts of civil appeals and the State Supreme Court. There also should be a limitation of this extended process either by giving the courts of civil appeals final jurisdiction in certain types of cases or by the adoption of the procedure of the United States Supreme Court in extensive denial of writs of error seeking a hearing before that court.

From the standpoint of the people, who seek justice in the courts, those reforms in addition to the increase in the size of the Supreme Court would be beneficial and proper. Both the judiciary and the legal profession should weigh the trend toward quasijudicial commissions that handle disputes with more expedition and less cost than are possible by recourse to the courts. This untoward development has been the consequence of a lack of judicial and legal reform demanded by changed times.

Maj. Gen. Watson

A befitting tribute was paid a gentleman, soldier, friend and diplomat when the President, members of the Supreme Court and Cabinet, other high dignitaries of government and the armed forces attended in Arlington National Cemetery Wednesday the last rites for Maj. Gen. Edwin M. Watson, White House secretary and military aide.

Officially, General Watson, who died en route home from the Crimean conference, handled the President's schedule of appointments, a task performed with capability, tact and geniality. Actually, General Watson filled a more important role as the President's companion, confidante and military adviser. He was well fitted for this place, since at Paris General Watson had been a junior aide to President Wilson after World War I and also was a military aide to General Funston and others previously. A graduate of West Point, General Watson saw service in the Philippines and in France during the last war as a battle commander, who took part in four major campaigns and was decorated for valor at Belleau Wood.

Through his diplomacy, friendliness and ability, General Watson performed an invaluable work in lightening the heavy burdens of the President. His counsel and military experience were of aid to the President in handling military problems, and his personality and charm won him the devotion and respect of the chief executive and others who knew him. General Watson's death, hence, is an irreparable loss to the country and its war leader.

the world and the Air Transport Command operates the "biggest airline in the world." America has the largest air industry for plane production, and it should not be completely demobilized after the war without regard to its future value. Air training of young men should be maintained as a phase of universal military service.

General Arnold also laid proper emphasis upon the importance of air research, a first class air force that is always modernized, and full co-ordination among the Army, Navy and Air Forces. The huge reserve of war planes left on hand at the end of the war may invite the delusion of false security through the failure to realize that such equipment rapidly becomes obsolete. A minimum number of up-to-date aircraft and easily available production facilities will be prerequisite to sound national defense. As to the size of postwar air force, it probably should be compact, highly efficient and directed by highly trained leaders who keep abreast of aviation developments. This regular or permanent organization should be supported by a strong civilian air reserve.

Texas Independence

March 2 as Texas Independence Day is being observed by patriotic Texans through hard work and other support of the war effort. The occasion may suggest a study of histories, presenting the struggle of Texas for its freedom. It was won through tragic sacrifice at Goliad and the Alamo as well as at San Jacinto, and there is an analogy between the Texans of that day and those fighting in Europe and the

NEAR EAST MEETING

by Dorothy Thompson

Every major event in the life we are leading these days is charged with significance, even the place of meeting of the Big Three. Significant that it was again on Russian soil; significant that it was in the Black Sea area—and "not Malta but Yalta," significant that the statement issued covered no questions concerning the very area in which the conference was held—the Balkans—mentioned only as having been mentioned—with Turkey and the Near East completely omitted.

It might be recalled that 90 years ago three powers—Britain and France versus Russia—fought a war over this area. In that war Russia was defeated, was compelled to dissolve her Black Sea fleet, and open ports on the Black Sea for duty-free trade. At that time Russian hopes for a warm water outlet were quelled.

Today the situation is reversed. No power can challenge Russia in the Black Sea. The question now is whether Russia shall have access to the Mediterranean. And this question will not be answered merely by the status eventually given to the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. Two other states and questions are involved: Shall Bulgaria gain an outlet to the Aegean, and, what facilities could the Soviet government get on the Adriatic coast of Yugoslavia—and how much of Italy may that coast include? Marshal Tito is demanding Trieste, which is the sea outlet for Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Austria, and even part of southern Germany. The decade before this war saw a growing competition between Hamburg on the North Sea and Trieste on the Mediterranean. Our troops occupying Austria and southern Germany will have to be supplied through Trieste.

But on all these matters the Crimea agreement is singularly silent.

Now, in all these Mediterranean and Balkans matters, Greece is of great importance. And, although the Crimea statement is silent, actions speak louder than words. Although the statement contained some words that might indicate that the spheres of influence concept has been modified at Yalta, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden hastened from Yalta to Athens.

In the meantime, President Roosevelt flew from the Crimea to the Suez Canal, there to meet a cruiser. The real importance of the Dardanelles is that a power moving from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles could imperil the eastern exit through the Mediterranean—the Suez Canal. This all-important waterway is flanked by three states: Egypt, Ethiopia and Arabia. And the President met these three kings of Orient.

Did he meet them as the emissary of the Big Three, or as the President of the United States?

The Russians were not present. And following the President, Mr. Churchill had his own talks with the three kings, inviting still a fourth ruler, the newly-elected president of Syria. Syria is still, legally, a mandate of France, and has been promised independence by the French. But General de Gaulle has made it clear in a public speech, that he expects French influence to continue predominant there.

Politically Mr. Roosevelt's position is delicate. Ibn Saud is the

N
in
mov
C
A
Mill
fats
sold
T
of
mon
flati