

Foushee's Bill Provides Balance In Court System

Roger Foushee's bill introduced to the legislature Thursday night provides the final brick in the wall of student judiciary revisions now being considered for the campus.

To help explain his bill and why it is important to the campus we will attempt to explain here the current court system and how that system would be changed if the proposals now pending are effected to revolutionize the judiciary system.

Following is an outline of the existing system, pointing out areas in which the several courts now have jurisdiction:

JURISDICTION

- I. Student Council
 - A. Men's Campus Code Violations
 - B. Case of Constitutionality
 - C. Cases involving elections laws violations
- II. Men's Honor Council
 - A. Men's Honor Code violations
- III. Women's Honor Council
 - A. Women's Honor Code violations
 - B. Women's Campus Code Violations
 - C. House Council case appeals
- IV. Student-Faculty Council
 - A. Appellate court for all the others.

Now we will describe the proposed revised court system if the student body elects to amend the judiciary as it is now constituted:

JURISDICTION

- I. Honor Council
 - A. Both men's and women's Honor Code violations
- II. Women's Council
 - A. Women's Campus Code violations
 - B. Social rule violations passed on from House Councils
- III. Men's Council
 - A. Men's Campus Code violations
- IV. Student-Faculty Council
 - A. Appellate court for all the others.

(Note: Any election on an amendment authorizing revision of the courts system would not affect the Student-Faculty Council. It would exist under the proposed system just as it is now drawn.)

We now come to a fourth branch of the judiciary, currently proposed, which would hear cases of constitutionality and those involving elections laws violations. This court would be composed of three members each from the new Men's

Council and the new Women's Council.

Such a court would give to women students an equal voice in student government, of which they are now deprived. Under the current system, the Student Council, with one coed member and the rest men, acts on cases of constitutionality and elections laws violations. Under the proposed plan the court which handled those cases would be constituted equally by men and women.

The importance of Foushee's bill is that it provides a parallel court for men in disposition of cases which, under the proposed system, would come before the Women's Council for women exclusively. Explained differently, the new plan provides for a Women's Council which would hear Women's Campus Code violations. Foushee's bill sets up a court to provide for men's Campus Code violations, thus giving men a parallel court. Approval of this bill is the only means to provide a systematic judiciary in which equal courts are provided for both men and women alike. Its rejection would throw the proposed judiciary completely out of balance.

As was pointed out at the legislature meeting Thursday night, there can be no revision in the judiciary setup without first amending the constitution. This would demand a majority vote of approval by students participating in a campus-wide election.

Obviously, the amendment cannot be called for until the system for which it provides has been drawn up and agreed upon by the legislature. The amendment would only provide for the change in name and jurisdiction of the new courts, and would not be concerned with whatever machinery the legislature might set up to equip the courts for performance of their jobs once they were established.

GUEST EDITORIAL

They Asked Him

Dr. Bernard Schwartz, ousted as its counsel by the House subcommittee investigating the FCC and other agencies and then subpoenaed to testify under oath, spoke plainly and to the point. If the majority of the subcommittee, which some charge is trying to deliver a whitewash rather than true findings, hoped by putting Dr. Schwartz "on the rack" to cow him into evasions or retractions, their strategy backfired.

Federal Communications Commissioner Richard A. Mack "acknowledged," when pinned down, said Dr. Schwartz, that he received several thousand dollars from an attorney for the firm to which Mack afterward voted to award a Miami TV channel. He identified the attorney as T. A. Whiteside, Miami friend of Mr. Mack. He produced checks.

Dr. Schwartz even appeared at the open hearing against his will. He didn't want to mention too many names, fearing to injure innocent persons; but the committee asked him for the facts and it got them.

What, now, has Mr. Mack to say? What has Mr. Whiteside to say? What has National Airlines, which got the TV channel when the FCC overruled its own field examiner, to say?

And what is the House subcommittee going to do about it? —The Durham Sun.

The Price Of Tags

North Carolina motorists, the papers said today, will have until midnight Monday to put new '58 tags on their automobiles.

Most motorists, that is—there are a lot right here on campus who, for all that, won't need license tags until June. They can buy them then.

But that's the price you have to pay for being a freshman, or just a dumb sophomore!

Symposium Promises Fill Of 'Culture'

Tuesday—7 a.m. The air is filled with suspense. You have just risen and yet even in your present condition, you will know that this is no ordinary day.

There is a buzz from the shower and you hurry down to see what has happened. What do you find? You find a cluster of Students gathered around the morning edition of the Daily Tar Heel.

There on the front page is what you have been looking for in high expectation. In the upper right hand corner you see it—Tuesday's lead story. It is not written as you normally see a lead, but is enclosed in a box. Fifteen names are in this box and you eagerly pick up your copy and scan the list.

You read down in a rapid manner, trying to consume as much as you can in as quick a time as possible. You can hardly believe the array of names. There are two senators, a Nobel Prize winning scientist, a famous college president, two great newspapermen, several renowned professors, several leading labor figures, a few clergymen and a diplomat or two.

Yes, student of Carolina, this is it. It is the official list of speakers who will appear during the week of March 16-23, under the auspices of the Carolina Symposium on Public Affairs.

But, this is only the start. There will be others not already referred to. You will not only be exposed to their ideas and philosophies at the regularly scheduled lectures, but will also have an opportunity to hear them and others in classroom seminars and lectures. It doesn't stop here either. Fraternities, sororities, dorms and other campus organizations will be sponsoring receptions and banquets. State and local papers will be carrying the main parts of the speeches for you, if you miss a lecture.

Every effort will and already has been made to insure you of the most educational week of your stay here at Carolina. You will be exposed to more "raw culture" during this seven day period than ever before.

These men who have been selected to come to Carolina are well fitted for the task confronting them in discussing a problem of the broadness of "survival." They are leaders in their respective fields and will rank highly, when the historians dissect our present civilization.

With active participation and regular attendance at Symposium affairs, you should profit greatly. With normal interest, you will consider this week, just another seven days.

Keep in mind the purpose of the Symposium; "to bring together outstanding minds speaking in open forum on critical problems of our times." Watch for the Tuesday edition and you won't be disappointed.

"Rest Assured We'll Proceed Full Speed Ahead"



VIEW FROM THE HILL

Judicial Revision — The Good

By CURTIS GANS

The Student Legislature left the student body a salvage job with regard to the current bill for reorganizing the present campus court system.

Acting wisely, against inane objection from the members of the two Honor Councils, the Legislature passed article two of the current bill calling for a mixed Honor Council.

However, many people lost their heads on Thursday night and ended up with a bill that because article two calls for a constitutional amendment, is at the present time unconstitutional. What is left to do is to reconsider the current bill and hold it under consideration until the campus votes on the amendment unifying the two councils and setting up a new foundation for the Student Council, as well as setting up a court to reconcile legislation with the constitution. There is another alternative. This is to throw the current away, and make a new one while the council amendment is being passed by the Student Body.

The second choice would be unwise, for there are two great gains made by the present bill. The trial-by-jury provision, whatever its current legal encumbrances, is still a step in the direction of having a court that will perform its true function—

that of protecting the innocent.

The second great gain that is made by the current bill is the setting up of a unified honor council, thus insuring that in any one year, there will be but one interpretation of the law as it stands. This goes a long way to protecting the right to a fair trial.

To those who are still opposed to the single court, it should be noted that the Honor Code reads that any individual regardless of sex pledges not to lie, cheat or steal. Honor is an individual matter, not a matter that is divided between the sexes.

Perhaps the most absurd argument offered against the mixed court is that someone "might be unwilling to talk before it" or that someone, would lie to it. The latter objection seems absurd since the law would be committing perjury and should be in line for the next Honor Court. In the case of those who might be "unwilling to talk," it stands to reason that this argument is absurd. Anything that would benefit the accused would surely be brought out. Anything that would act to the detriment of the accused would either be covered by the Fifth Amendment or by a legal term called contempt of court.

To those who are still reluctant to change, it should be

pointed out that in many of the most respected coed colleges in the United States, the system of a single court to cover both sexes obtains and is deemed a success. Just as is the case with the system now at UNC there are some complaints, but these are in the minority.

There are some who argue that there may be some exception to the efficiency of the proposed system, but there are more exceptions to the efficacy of the present system. A judicial system is not built for the exceptions. It is built to provide the maximum justice, and works out within its framework a way of handling the exceptions. This amendment which shall shortly be proposed to the student body will, in the words of Gary Greer, a legislature representative, provide for "the greatest degree of justice." This is what is sought.

Thus, for reasons of providing a monolithic standard of justice, of getting the maximum justice possible, of making honor a matter of individual concern rather than a sexual concern, of having been tried and proven good in other universities around the country, while the system here has been proved weak, and for reasons that the objections to it are asinine, this amendment must be adopted.

ONE WAY

By BARRY WINSTON

Graham Memorial has a problem, of sorts. It's not really a very important problem, and there's a simple solution to it. All it takes to solve this problem is to post a little notice on the bulletin board in the front hall of the building. But the Director, and several other people whose opinions bear on the situation, are a little reluctant to post that notice. It may have to be posted, nonetheless.

If it is put up, it will probably read something like this: Since Graham Memorial is run for the benefit of the Student Body of this University and is supported by student fees and the State Legislature for that sole purpose, it must be the policy of this building that no one except students, their guests, and visitors to the University may avail themselves of the facilities of Graham Memorial.

The problem that would prompt such an ultimatum? High-school students. But, you ask in all innocence, what have high school students got to do with Graham Memorial? How do they constitute a problem? (You ask this question only because at least half of you don't even have the foggiest notion where Graham Memorial is, let alone what goes on inside the building.) Well, it's this way. High school students are getting into the habit of coming to GM after they get out of school, and playing cards, watching TV, yakking it up, and what have you. Several college students have lodged complaints with the information office, to the effect that they can't watch TV in peace, that all the card tables are taken up by kids, etc., etc. You get the general idea.

There has been similar difficulty in the past. In fact, it finally got so bad that Graham Memorial had to restrict the activity of the high-school crowd to the ground floor of the building. Now it appears that further steps may have to be taken, since they're starting to interfere with the leisure-time activities of the college students for whom the building exists.

Now don't you all go running down to GM, expecting to see the place bursting at the seams with high school kids, or teen age hoods terrorizing the college students. That's not quite the situation.

But there is a situation. It's a situation that requires that something be done about it. What's the answer? Throw all the high school students out of GM? That will solve the problem for Graham Memorial, and that's the important thing for the policy-makers of the Student Union to consider.

So, I guess, maybe that's the thing that will have to happen. But where does that leave the kids? In the street, dear reader, in the street. And what does a young'un do when all other sources of entertainment are closed to him? He turns to what might, in this day and age, be called do-it-yourself-recreation. Wanna know more about some of the types of do-it-yourself-recreation? Pick up any newspaper, and look at the front page. Look for the words New York City, and then read the story in which they appear. Stealing, vandalism, gang fights, muggings, rape, and murder? You name it, they got it.

And you know what? If this sleepy little town doesn't wake up pronto, it's going to get jarred out of its peaceful, deceptive slumber to find out that Chapel Hill has got it, too! Contrary to popular opinion, our little village is not a germ-free culture, sterilized against all the social diseases that infect the outside world. Everybody thinking that's the case still won't make it so. There is a problem, and it must be answered.

So, what's the answer? Unfortunately, the first answer is to convince anybody that an answer is even needed. Of the six people who read this far in the column, at least three will dismiss the whole thing as a pipe dream. The first answer, then, is to face up to reality.

I have heard it suggested that a solution to the possibility of delinquency by our youngsters would be a curfew. The proposed hours of this curfew vary, but the idea is basic: after a certain hour at night, anyone under a certain age who was still on the streets would be picked up by the police and required to give reason for being out after the curfew. Some people say the deadline should be midnight. Others say eleven o'clock, or ten o'clock, or even nine o'clock. Why not just pass a law requiring a high school student to go directly home after school? I don't think a curfew is the answer. It doesn't get at the source of the problem.

The proposed Recreation Center is a little more like it. At least it will give the kids somewhere to go and work off some supervised steam. But Recreation Centers cost money. And trying to separate people from their money is not exactly the easiest task in the world. To get anything like a good center, the people building it need at least \$50,000. So far the residents of Chapel Hill and environs have pledged \$30,000. Ground is going to be broken in the spring on the basis of these pledges, and building is going to start, but they're still shy at least \$20,000.

They're still shy at least \$20,000 because, apparently, not enough people realize what an investment now will mean in the future, in terms of prevention.

So, just sit there, Chapel Hill. Sit there smug and content in the knowledge that we don't have to worry about our kids. Just keep telling yourself that Chapel Hill doesn't even know the meaning of juvenile delinquency. And you'll be right, too. Chapel Hill doesn't know the meaning of juvenile delinquency. But Chapel Hill is apt to find out, regardless of the rather inane yammerings of a recent author.

When you ask a teen ager where he went, and he says, "out," it might not be a bad idea to find out where "out" is. And when you ask him what he did, and he says, "nothing," you might ask him what he means by "nothing." The answers might just shake you up. But I doubt it.



by Charles Schulz

by Al Capp

by Walt Kelly

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Sunday, Monday and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year; \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year; \$3.50 a semester.

- Editor — DOUG EISELE
- Associate Editor — FRANK CROWTHER
- Managing Editor — ALYS VOORHEES
- News Editor — PAUL RULE
- Asst. News Editor — ANN FRYE
- Coed Editor — JOAN BROCK
- Feature Editor — MARY M. MASON
- Sports Editor — BILL KING
- Asst. Sports Editor — DAVE WIBLE
- Business Manager — JOHN WHITAKER
- Advertising Manager — FRED KATZIN
- Subscription Mgr. — AVERY THOMAS
- Librarian — GLENDA FOWLER

EDIT STAFF—Whit Whiffield, Curtis Gans, Jonathan Yardley, Barry Winston, Gail Godwin.

NEWS STAFF—Davis Young, Pringle Pipkin, Sarah Adams, Marion Hays, Parker Maddrey, Charlie Sloan, Ed Rowland, Eddie Goodman, Westbrook Fowler, Stan Black, Virginia Sandridge, Ruth Whitley, Ben Taylor.

SPORTS STAFF—Rusty Hammond, Elliott Cooper, Mac Mahaffy, Jim Purks, Jim Harper.

PHOTOGRAPHERS — Norman Kantor, Buddy Spoon.

Night Editor — GRAHAM SNYDER