

Should North Carolina governors have right to succeed themselves?

Yes

No

By DEAN HOBBS

"The Right to Reject or Re-elect" has become the battle cry of the forces seeking passage of the gubernatorial succession amendment on Nov. 8. Although the right of the voter to pass judgment on a governor after his first term is one of the important facets of succession, there are many other strong arguments to consider.

The possibility of an eight-year tenure would allow a governor an advantage in planning long-range programs, making appointments and controlling the bureaucracy. A longer tenure would help balance the legislative/executive power scales which now are tipped heavily in favor of the General Assembly.

Legislative opponents of succession, including Lt. Gov. Jimmy Green (who will also be allowed a second term if succession passes), are claiming that succession will allow the governor to dominate the legislature as well as his own branch of government. North Carolina's legislature, the only one not required to face a gubernatorial veto while at the same time capable of limiting the governor's statutory appointment powers, continues to rank low in national ratings. Succession would stimulate the General Assembly to increase its own efficiency (through a revamped committee system and increased power for its leaders), and that could result in better government for North Carolina from both the legislative and executive branches.

Much of the opposition's argument centers on the injustice of allowing the

incumbent governor to benefit from the amendment. In the first place, it probably would have been impossible to get the amendment passed in the General Assembly and to the voters without the inclusion of Gov. Hunt. Secondly, nine of the last 10 states to pass succession have included the incumbent governor, so it is by no means an innovation.

Forty-three states and the national government allow their chief executives to succeed themselves in office. Unlimited terms are allowed in 23 states. In the 45 states where the lieutenant governor is elected statewide, only three — Kentucky, North Carolina and New Mexico — do not allow succession in that office.

Perhaps the best evidence of this is the testimony of the past five governors of North Carolina who are all on record as favoring succession. They have testified to the problems of organization and the helplessness of the lame duck status they experienced at the end of their terms. Two of them, Democrat Terry Sanford and Republican Jim Holshouser, helped organize the Committee for the Right to Reject or Re-elect, which is spearheading the support for succession.

All other major officers that figure in state government — state representatives and senators in the General Assembly and Council of State members — are allowed to run for unlimited terms. It is a great injustice to limit the top two officers to one term when all persons that hold lower offices can remain indefinitely. North Carolina has received great service from several long-term Council of State members,

such as Thad Eure (41 years) and Edwin Gill (25 years). Our top executive officers should be allowed to serve at least two terms.

By focusing on Jim Hunt, the opponents appear to be trying to make the Nov. 8 election into a referendum on his popularity. Fortunately, Gov. Hunt has stayed out of the campaign for the amendment although it is no secret that he strongly supports it. If he entered into the discussion at this point, the vote on succession would become just exactly what the opponents would like — for or against Jim Hunt, instead of for or against the issue of succession.

Succession is a right that will extend beyond Gov. Hunt to each governor in North Carolina's future. It will not insure any incumbent a second term by any means. Approximately two-thirds of the incumbents run for a second term and only about one-half win.

The voters of North Carolina will by no means assure Jim Hunt of a second term by voting for succession on Nov. 8. They will, however, reserve themselves the right to "reject or re-elect."

The election on Nov. 8 promises to be a low-turnout affair due to issue-oriented questions on the ballot. In this case, each vote becomes more important as the issues may be decided by a small majority. Based on a thorough look at both sides of the issue, I believe North Carolina's voters will decide to vote for themselves and their leaders greater rights and powers by voting for Amendment 3 on succession.

Dean Hobbs is a first year law student from Fayetteville, N.C.

By MARSHALL HURLEY

A brief history lesson can help clarify the current controversy over gubernatorial succession. To examine the seeds of opposition to the Nov. 8 referendum, we can look back to 1973 when Gov. Jim Holshouser proposed a referendum on gubernatorial succession. Had this legislation passed, it would have applied only to future governors, not Holshouser. The issue could have been settled on its merits, without the interference of personality politics. State legislators, usually reluctant to grant new powers to anyone, quickly killed the 1973 bill. The same bill was defeated again in 1975.

In 1977, however, Gov. Jim Hunt demanded passage of the bill, and the General Assembly approved it with hardly a whimper of objection. Hunt effectively pressured the legislature: 24 opponents of the 1975 bill were cosponsors in 1977! The only difference between the 1975 bill and the 1977 version was the provision to allow Hunt to succeed himself. Clearly, this is legislation of Jim Hunt, pushed by Jim Hunt, for Jim Hunt. Without his insatiable political ambition, there would be no Nov. 8 referendum.

If Hunt would make the statesman-like decision to remove himself as a potential candidate in 1980, we could debate only the relative advantages and disadvantages of succession. However, Hunt's ambitious drive for an eight-year governorship makes it impossible for most voters to decide the succession issue on its theoretical values alone.

We all recall the tragic results of the

"imperial presidency," when personal ambition was extended beyond the law. North Carolina needs no "imperial governorship."

Today, the conduct of the pro-succession campaign could serve as the basis for a new television series entitled *Raleigh: Behind Closed Doors*. For only one example, three senior deputy attorneys general ruled that contributors to the anti-succession campaign would not be required to reveal their names. Many opponents frankly fear some type of reprisal if they oppose Hunt publicly. Despite the ruling of the Attorney General's office, Wake County District Attorney Burley Mitchell said he would prosecute the Hunt opponents anyway if they failed to report contributions. Mitchell (according to the *News and Observer*, Oct. 11) "is considered the top prospect" for a seat on the Court of Appeals — to be appointed by (who else?) Gov. Jim Hunt! Perhaps threatening the governor's political opponents is a good way to become a judge, but such threats have no place in a system of justice. The alarming possibility of the governor's potential appointee prosecuting the governor's political enemies certainly approaches the immoralities of the Watergate era.

Some voters have admitted Hunt's conduct is questionable, but reason, "This is our last chance to have succession." This is not true. In 1973 both the Equal Rights Amendment and a liquor-by-the-drink proposal were defeated, yet proponents did not quit working. The year 1973 was not the "last chance" for the ERA or for liquor-by-the-drink; 1977 need not be the last

chance for succession. Other succession proponents argue: "Let the people decide. Give them the right to reject or re-elect." One wonders how Hunt and his political organization would react if the legislature had provided for succession, but had cut the governor's term of office to two years, beginning with the incumbent. Chances are good that Hunt would cry, "This is tampering with the governor's office," rather than "Let the people decide."

Finally, we hear, "Four years isn't enough time for Gov. Hunt to develop his programs and policies. It takes time to learn the job of governor." Memory fails when we try to recall Hunt campaign rhetoric to the effect of, "Elect me in 1976. I won't really have time to get much done, and I'll need a couple of years to get the experience I'll need to serve as an effective governor."

On the contrary, Hunt's campaign claims stressed his experience on the public payroll and his ability to do the job in four years. Only after his election was secure did he begin his personal campaign to "change the rules in the middle of the game."

To consider the succession referendum without considering Hunt is like considering recent Chicago politics without considering the late Richard Daley. Political machines can exist only with the consent of the voters. On Nov. 8, let's bring a halt to the Jim Hunt Machine. Let's vote "NO" on Amendment 3 — the imperial-governorship amendment.

Marshall Hurley, a senior, is a political science major from Greensboro, N.C.

GREG PORTER
Editor

•

BEN CORNELIUS, Managing Editor
ED FRANKIN, Associate Editor
LOU PHILIPIS, Associate Editor

•

LAURA SCISM, University Editor
ELLIOTT POTTER, City Editor
CHUCK ALSTON, State and National Editor

•

SAJJA BULLARD, Features Editor
CHIP ENSSLIN, Arts Editor
CIENE UPCHURCH, Sports Editor
ALLEN JERIGAN, Photography Editor

85th year of editorial freedom

The Daily Tar Heel

Landmark decisions don't change hatred in hearts

By STEPHEN HARRIS

We have heard all the dire warnings of what the Bakke case may mean. Leaders of affirmative action programs claim their programs' existence is at stake. Conservative commentators claim dangerous new racism is being bred.

Meanwhile Carol Murray will not go home. The Associated Press (AP) reported the story of Robert and Carol Murray last week. The Murrays moved into Oakland's Sobra Park, a predominantly black area, three years ago. The Murrays are white. Carol Murray told the AP that trouble

started soon after they moved in. Blacks called them names, she said, and neighbors called their dogs on them. Once her husband was chased by children with sticks.

Once, Carol Murray was driving and a man leaped onto her car and smashed a window.

Once, a neighborhood rummage sale refused some clothes Carol Murray brought.

Robert Murray tried one last time to win acceptance in his neighborhood, his wife said. A new youth center had been built in the community and Murray went to a meeting to donate some athletic equipment.

On his way home, he was jumped. Ambulances arrived and rushed Robert Murray to the hospital but in vain.

Carol Murray will not go back home. She's had enough. She's going to move.

I wonder if we sometimes forget what is really important.

We hammer out the issues day after day because the issues are important, and we must write about them until we have covered them well; thus the endless stream of quotes, charges, stories and debates. It comes without ceasing, and we read without ceasing, and we talk without ceasing. But what good is it? What good is it, really?

Before this country is going to change and before our society is going to change, we're going to have to remove the hate from our hearts. A hundred Bakke decisions won't

mean a thing, won't change a thing, until we change.

The need is everywhere. We even have our own example here at UNC with last spring's Avery incident. We first need to change our hearts.

The problem will be with us as long as we hear from our friends and from ourselves about "the whites won't even speak to us" or "the blacks are always bitching about something."

The problem will be with us as long as we feel the hesitation when we see an all-black or all-white pick-up game in Woollen Gym.

The problem will be with us as long as we have to fill out a question asking "race." The problem will be with us as long as we speak of "the black dude" or "the white dude."

I wonder if we've forgotten what is really important.

The decision is coming on the Bakke case. You can almost see the fireworks crew on the Supreme Court's front steps. When the decision comes, it will be hailed as a landmark, and we will be told that things are going to be different.

But I predict that the hate will still be there, the snobbishness will still be there, the corny jokes will continue and the cold stares will not change.

We have our laws, but there is always a way around a law if the urge is strong enough. And though some may get that extra money with that other job, there are going to be many others that will be crippled for life by the hate, bitterness or even the snobbishness that is within them.

The hardest thing for us to do is to sit down and resolve to make a decision of our own to start looking at others equally, as the law tries to do.

Isn't the law only as good as we make it? Remember Carol Murray when the Bakke decision comes out.

She couldn't care less about it.

Stephen Harris, a senior journalism major from State Road, N.C., is a staff writer for the *Daily Tar Heel*.

Informed votes on issues for today and tomorrow

Events one week from today largely will determine the quality of life in this University community. The future of public transportation in Carrboro and Chapel Hill is at stake next Tuesday. The fates of thousands of students who depend on adequate off-campus housing will be decided. The long-term course of action on the perennial water crisis will be established. The level of student input in a predominantly student community will be outlined.

These and many other pressing questions will be answered at the polls on Nov. 8 when the Carrboro and Chapel Hill alderman races, as well as the Carrboro mayoral race, are concluded. Those who are elected next Tuesday undoubtedly will encounter some of the greatest policy problems ever faced by the municipal governments of Chapel Hill and Carrboro. And their decisions are sure to affect not only the older permanent residents of the community, but each and every student, faculty and staff member associated with the University for years to come.

Also, there are a number of statewide questions on the ballot this November. Gubernatorial succession heads a list of constitutional amendments facing the voters. Amendments on a balanced budget, insurance, joint ownership of electric generation facilities and the homestead exemption are also up for approval. Two bond authorizations are on the ballot, too — a \$300-million highway issue and a \$230-million authorization for water supply and treatment.

Of course, these issues also affect the students, faculty and staff of UNC. Consequently, it is important that members of the University vote next Tuesday. But it is even more important that they inform themselves before entering the polling booth.

Starting today, the *Daily Tar Heel* will present a series of events and articles intended to educate more completely the voters of the UNC community about the questions and candidates on the Nov. 8 ballots.

Today, arguments for and against gubernatorial succession have been provided. It is our hope that they fairly and accurately summarize the major supporting and objecting points which have surrounded this hotly debated issue.

Today at 5 p.m. in Room 202-204 of the Carolina Union, the DTH and Student Government will present the first of two on-campus forums for the municipal candidates. The candidates for mayor and aldermen in Carrboro will be questioned by campus media representatives and will field questions from the floor.

The second forum, which will feature the Chapel Hill Board of Aldermen candidates, will take place Wednesday at 7:30 p.m. in 104 Howell Hall.

On Thursday, the *Daily Tar Heel* will open its editorial page to the candidates for mayor and aldermen in Carrboro. Each candidate will outline his or her views on several issues of primary concern to the members of the University community.

The bond authorizations and constitutional amendments will be examined on Friday, along with the Chapel Hill-Carrboro Board of Education race. The referenda, as well as the major issues facing the city schools, will be spelled out for University voters.

Monday's editorial page will feature the Chapel Hill Board of Aldermen candidates. They will address several questions and will try to present their stands on a number of issues of special importance to the University and its students, faculty and staff.

We are firmly convinced that the 1977 election is one of the most significant contests the University, Chapel Hill and Carrboro have ever experienced. Not only the immediate, but the distant future, will be determined next Tuesday. We strongly urge every member of the University community to attend the forums tonight and Wednesday night and find out what the candidates are all about. We urge you to bone up on the issues which will be decided on Nov. 8 and cast informed votes on Election Day.

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE ONLY ALTERNATIVES TO BE OFFERED TO DRAMA MAJORS AT UNC:

1. SHARE THE DRAMATIC GOLD MINE AT UNC WITH THE PRC!

THE PRC GETS THE GOLD... YOU GET THE SHAFT



2. WORK IN THE NEW FACILITIES* PROVIDED BY THE PRC MOVING INTO THE PAUL GREEN THEATRE:



3. TRANSFER SOMEWHERE ELSE WITH A BETTER DRAMA DEPT!



How to create a niche called home

Reliving the old days at family dinner table

By JEFF TAGGART

We all have powerful memories of growing up, and none is more ingrained than the warm family scene at the dinner table: mommy home from a long day at the lumberyards, da-da in from the garden where the vegetables were furiously photosynthesizing, Lil' Bru' eyeing the heaped mashed yams and ribs most suspiciously, as if I wanted to eat his share, too. And of course I did. Shadow, our cat, with whom I'd performed a blood-brother rite years earlier, listening to the domestic sounds which such a feast engenders. Rainbows of food and flushed faces: who wouldn't want to recreate this glory in the present?

Recently, I set out to achieve, and perhaps even top, the meals and atmosphere of my ancestral home. Although my resources were limited severely, I felt that I could make a luscious supper and eat it too.

First, I needed a big, grumbly old stove, huge and black, radiating warmth and confidence into the cavernous kitchen. My deluxe G.E. Toasteroven was perfect for the task. Next, I required a large, heavy pot in which to plop the fresh vegetables and meat chunks that were to compose this "first supper." I went to the freezer and extracted the ice-cube tray, ejected the cubes and form, and placed the tray on the counter. Metal and slightly dented, there are few things on earth as good as a meal cooked in an ice-cube tray.

Now for the fixin's: those things I was to bequeath my stomach in honor of a remembered past. To begin, I lightly coated the ice-cube tray with the remains of a year-old jar of Guldens Mustard. Golden and brown. Then I carefully opened a gleaming can of Food Town spaghetti and chipped beef and spooned out a generous portion. Onto this I added four ounces of "Big John" Beans and his special sauce. I dusted the pile with garlic powder. My mouth was watering, as were my eyes. I was thinking, "Wouldn't daddy be proud of me now!" Using the can opener, I integrated my dinner. To the refrigerator again, I picked a tomato that had grown up in a greenhouse outside Madison, Wis. In it went, diced. Somewhat stimulated by this, I sprayed a jet of canned cheese all over the top of my din-din. As a final coverup, I swished on a handful of carcinogenic food coloring. My ice-cube tray was ready for the oven!

There was a tradition in the Taggart household that the evening meal be eaten in front of a cracklin', poppin' fire in the fireplace. On an old oak table, scarred and worn. My father would wheel Lil' Bru' in, followed by mommy carrying a yeasty mound of her hot, homemade bread. We would sit down, wait for the cat to meow and then spread on the freshly churned butter. With this background, is there any doubt why I turned out the way I did?

I had to bring it back, that atmosphere, warmth, love... and the balding feline. So, I placed the well-worn card table next to the hot and cracklin' radiator. Onto

the table went my see-yourself china and silver, which amounted to a plastic fork and spoon from Hardee's and a Sierra cup that held enough for half a person. I'd had it for years. Next, I poured some milk into my Jif Peanut Butter glass and stirred in Ovaltine in remembrance of a rotund adolescence. I pasted recent letters from my parents on their chairs opposite mine. Then I hauled in enough Bunny Bread and Squeeze Parkay for all of us. Out of the oven hopped my dish: I was ready to dig in.

But something detained that first bite... To facilitate the commencement of eating, I aimed my window fan at the old kitchen door and turned it on. A cat-like screeching resulted as the door slowly closed.

Outdoors in the cold and clear twilight, sounds of other persons could be heard as if from distant light specks across a quiet lake. Inside my attic abode, all I heard was sap hissing from the radiator and my childhood friend meowing for a taste of my dinner.

Years ago when I went off to college, my little brother Bruce told me, "Jeff, I'm sure that someday you'll find yourself a home like the one we have known." Recalling this after finishing the last morsel in my ice cube tray, I marveled at the truth in his words. Though occasionally alone and lonely, I have succeeded in creating a niche which I call home.

Jeff Taggart is a graduate student in city and regional planning from Ann Arbor, Mich.