

# The News of orange county

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1961

SEC. II, PAGE 1

## School revenue plan is totally indefensible

The boys in the capital corridors over in Raleigh should have far better information than the humble hometown reporter. They assure that Gov. Terry Sanford's \$70 million revenue plan for financing his "quality education" program is going to be approved.

But before this purported foregone conclusion becomes law, The News is anxious to make its stand clear one more time:

### Note these points . . .

(1) We support the proposed \$70 million educational enrichment program. We believe the money is necessary and is going toward a good purpose.

(2) The people of North Carolina are, we believe, willing to pay equitable taxes for this program.

(3) Luxuries should be taxed to finance the program before necessities are taxed.

(4) It is absolutely inexcusable to place the same sales tax limit on the purchase of new Mack trucks, huge auto transports, airliners, and busses as applies to the purchase of a modest \$2,000 family car. Terry Sanford would do this.

(5) It is totally indefensible to pass a food tax before every effort has been exhausted to gain all possible revenue from sources such as whiskey and tobacco, and possibly other luxuries. But Terry Sanford would do this, too.

### Silent on this . . .

The Governor and his lieutenants blandly say the luxury taxes can't be passed. No doubt they're correct, if this is all our leaders are going to try to do to get a fair tax program passed. (They are cautiously silent, though, on their blatant appeasement of the trucking interests!)

If the General Assembly and the people of North Carolina swallow this bill of tax goods as offered they're a mighty gullible pack of sheep!

Financing quality education by taxing food—without first exhausting the fairer sources of revenue—is a sorry means toward a worthy end.

Note: Your own views on the opinions expressed above are invited. If you agree, disagree, or have some additional insight on this matter you are invited to give the public the benefit of your thinking in a "letter to the editor." Please limit these to 300 words.

## Continuous progress teaching idea praised

A milestone in the Chapel Hill School Board's continuing effort to better serve the needs of each individual pupil was passed last week.

The Board voted to institute the un-graded primary school plan in the Carrboro School as of next fall. Under this system each child will progress at his own rate according to his needs and ability for what is now constituted in the first three grades of school.

Carrboro will be the first school in the County to put the new plan into full operation and Chapel Hill will be one of the first systems in the state to move its public education into this phase.

### Lack challenge, attention . . .

Lack of individual attention and the charge that the pupil does not find enough challenge are the two most frequent complaints about the public schools. Naturally a system that is democratically based on equal treatment of all will normally contain some hazards to excellence.

But the continuous progress system for an un-graded primary school sidesteps this hazard. With only a modest additional cost for extra books and teaching materials it provides the extra value of challenge and personal attention to the individual pupil.

The actual decision on moving toward this plan of teaching was made several years ago by the school board. Since then the "continuous progress" plan of instruc-



tion has been instituted in all local schools for reading and arithmetic classes. A pilot program for general primary school teaching has been successfully tried at the Northside School.

### Ahead of trend . . .

By converting the first three grades of the Carrboro School to a general un-graded continuous progress set-up the Chapel Hill schools are in the forefront of a national trend toward increasing the effectiveness of the public schools.

## Umstead's bill would eliminate confusion

The Raleigh News and Observer speaks straight to the point when it charges that the State Elections Board's proposed bill to force college students to vote at the home of their parents is "a way of taking care of the situation because they (elections officials) are too lazy to think up a good way."

The measure against which Chapel Hill representatives spoke so effectively last week is nothing but a deterrent to democracy.

### Like non-Red oath . . .

It's like a non-communist oath in requiring a student to sign a pledge that he intends to make his college abode his permanent home if he wishes the right to vote there. That is—it is totally meaningless. A communist would gladly sign a non-communist oath. And by the same token any student who signed such a residence pledge to gain a voting right could simply change his mind later.

Orange County Rep. John Umstead planned this week to introduce a substitute measure that would indeed eliminate confusion—the aborted intention of the elections officials in this matter. Rep. Umstead proposes to make college students eligible to vote at their college home if they choose to formally declare it their residence.

This is a good bill—and one that Rep. Umstead is confident will pass. More than that, it will make democracy more democratic. And that is a keystone purpose of voting in the first place.

## High court calendar should be un-jammed

"The Grand Jury has been made aware of the continuing and increasing backlog of cases to be tried in the various sessions of court in this county."

"Inasmuch as such delay often tends to defeat justice and, in addition, works an undue hardship upon people called time and again to testify in cases which are continued to later sessions of court, the Grand Jury respectfully requests the county commissioners to take steps to increase the court time . . ."

Now that's a mighty high-flown way of saying that the superior court dockets are jammed and ought to be un-jammed.

In last week's quarterly criminal term of Orange County Superior Court there were 115 cases on the calendar—about par for this course. There are generally 100 to 140 cases on the printed docket.

### Less than third settled . . .

Out of these 115, less than one-third were settled. Some have languished on the docket for three and

(Editorials continued on Page 2)

## Aycock keeps a perspective in cage issue

One of the University of North Carolina's most ardent sports fans is Chancellor William B. Aycock.

Anybody who goes to a Carolina football or basketball game with Bill Aycock knows that his enthusiasm for his alma mater and for the university of which he's chief administrator is far more than a debt of loyalty. Excitedly and delightedly, he is the Tar Heels' most enthusiastic rooter.

Refreshing it is, to have in Chancellor Aycock a man so dedicated to the furtherance of athletics at the University—and to the proper place of athletics at the University.

When University Coach Frank McGuire spoke out sharply while under fire in some quarters last winter the Chancellor quickly and forthrightly stated: "The coach is speaking as an individual and has a right to express himself. His work, of course, is highly satisfactory."

This choice of words was excellent and sincere. The Chancellor made clear his personal and official support of the basketball coach. But he carefully and conscientiously hedged to his primary goal as administrator of an educational institution. To have said more concerning the actual McGuire controversy he would have made himself a direct partisan in a controversy that had no bearing on the basic aims of a state university.

Now again Chancellor Aycock has spoken out—strongly, forthrightly, and effectively—on the issue relating to basketball at the University. Following his personal action in suspending cage star Doug Moe from the University last Thursday the Chancellor was subject to considerable student ire.

Although Moe had admitted accepting a \$75 bribe for his teammate Lou Brown from a New York fixer he was found innocent of any wrong-doing under the trial rules of the University's honor council. What this amounted to was that Moe couldn't be convicted because of technical precedents set by the Council in previous cases.

Chancellor Aycock discovered that Moe had three times directly lied to him in denying that he knew anything about the basketball scandals. Moe admitted this when questioned a fourth time and the Chancellor immediately suspended him, carefully pointing out that his decision could be appealed to the President and trustees. Moe chose not to do so.

But as the word spread across the campus hundreds of students chose to unofficially appeal in a purported "march" on the chancellor's home. They didn't have to. The Chancellor met them more than half-way—at the University's lower dormitory quadrangle.

At his suggestion they moved to Gerrard Hall "where we can all sit down and talk this thing over."

Speaking informally for more than a half-hour, the Chancellor won the respect of the students. "The first thesis of our honor system is that every single person here is a student first and anything else second," he said. "In all judgments on Doug Moe we considered him a student first and an athlete second . . ."