

## Drunken Drivers Are

 Not Always Convicted rusing stumbling defying "gantieman" policeman-kind from the sanctuty of nis own property where a warrant signed by some complainant would be necessary to enter inorder to arrest the man, obviously under the influence of intoxicants. The other person
present was reluctant to go that far for family consideration since no damage was done and nobody else was present to hear the mouthings
coming through said gentleman straight from coming thr
the bottle.

After an excess of such carrying on, the man moved toward where his car was park-
ed in the yard. The policeman left for the patrol car in a hurry, saying, "If he drives away from that yard, III get him
The man drove away from his yard, and the policeman DID get him and carried him in to city hall. From this point on the story is quite different from what you might guess, or
what the above details might lead you to believe.
ff Police P. O to the foregoing asked Chief of Poilice P. O. James later in the day what
happened to the man. The chief replied, "We sent him home.
Somewhat shocked, the witness asked No charges?" Chief James replied, "None." already expressed some disgust for such a police department before the police chief explained his side.
Here's the gist of the reasoning which led
the chief to free a man who had been observ-
ed obviously under the influence of alcohol by the policeman who brought him in, as well as the other witness, five minutes before driv-
ing on Mount Olive's streets: ing on Mount Olive's streets.
Trove policeman observed the way the man drove. There was no weaving, he apparently had control of the car, made all stops and up. At the police station, he walked and talked, the chief said, all right. With these things
observed, even if the shock of arrest had the observed, even if the shock of arrest had the
sobering effect, on what grounds could he cite the man for driving under the influence of intoxicants?

This didn't completely satisfy the chief's questioner, but he began to see in his mind's He could see a smart defense lawyer make a fool out of the police if they didn't see him drink, and he drove, walked and talked in a satisfactory manner. Even with two witnesses that he was acting in a drunken manner five minutes before he drove his car, there would be little use in prosecuting such a
case. Who could swear he was drunk instead of sick, like the famous case of the judge sometime ago?

A driver in the shape that man must have been can often make a long trip without mishap, as long as nothing but steering the car
is involved. However, even one drink in the drinkingest drinker around affects his reflexes. What if some child had darted suddenly in front of the car? In his condition, he might have pressed the accelerator instead of the brake. Yet, according to Chief James
reasoning following many such eases, the ac cident would be waavoidable"-because "h straight."
Something is wrong with a law or court which won't allow conviction of a man for drunken driving until he's so drunk he can' start the car to begin with. Ask any patrol man, anyone in the highway safety de partment, the drinking driver most in volved in wrecks and causing the mos deaths and injuries is not the "sloppy drunk-it's the one who's had "only one or
two" drinks, or a beer or two, and can "drive two" drinks, or a beer or two, and can "dr
straight, walk straight and talk straight."

Just a smell of the.breath is all that shoul be necessary. If a man has drunk ANY alco hoice beverage, he is and therive. If he does "degree" of alcoholic influence. He had it in him, or he didn't.
North Carolina has cut traffic deaths so far this year way under last year, an accomp lishment which should earn the highway pa trol, police and drivers a pat on the uppe spine. If something could be done to put th above type of driver off the highways, ther would be the biggest drop in traffic deaths in motoring history.

If some law is possible to allow the one drink driver to suffer the penalty all drink ing drivers deserve, it most likely will never
be passed. Why? Because drinking to some extent is so universal now that there probably will never be enough legislators who are tee totallers, or who NEVER drive with a recen drink under their belts, to vote for and pass such a bill.-E.B.

## ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

## Writing in a national magaine recently, Ja

 R. Morris, a University of Chicago economist anspecialist on labor unions, deals in considerable detail with a case which, in the view of many, ma
prove to be a milestone in the tangled history o labor legislation. The case is that of Sandsberry vs. Sante Fe , and Mr. Morris' article carries the de
scriptive title ". Curiously enough, as Mr. Morris points out constitutionality of compulsory union membership as a condition of employment." Now there are severa
cases involving the issue which may reach that tribunal. And one of the most significant of thes ssberry vs. Sante Fe. in 1932, compulsory union membership was prohibit ed-any railroad worker was free to join or no join, as he chose. In 1951, Congress amended the act to make the union permissible. The Sante Fe
Railway opposed the demands of the unions in this regard, even though threatened with a strike. Then
in 1953, thirteen Sante Fe employes went into th in 1993, thirteen Sante Fe employes went into the
108th District Court of Texas and asked for a perm 108th District Court of Texas and asked for a perm
anent injunction against a union shop agreement anent injunction against a union shop agreement
between the Sante Fe and the unions, on the grounds that such ar agreement would deprive them of tions. jury held for the plaintiffs and against the
Thions The jury held for the plaintiffs, and against the
unions. Last February 6th the judge, E. C. Nelson
granted granted the desired injunctions and, additionally, en-
joined the union from striking to coerce the Sante Fe into signing a union shop contract. It is Jud
Nelson's reasoning which, Mr. Morris writes, ".. based upon the jury's findings of fact as well as
upon the Court's conclusions of law," that is of exceptional interest and significance. Judge Nelson Act which legalized the union shop is beyond the
power of Congress, and is a violation of the First Fifth, Ninth, Tenth and Thirteenth amendments to the U. S. Constitution.
He also held the
and applicable. He said Congress' right to regulate interstate commerce ". does not mean tha Congress has the right to regulate matters tha
have no essential relation to interstate commerce way ognized as necessary and pmor, which are ". . . rec require membership in any organization as a condi
tion of to American concepts of individual freedom." American concepts of individual freedom."
Finally, and perhaps most important of all, Judge Nelson drew an analogy between the old, and long
outlawed "yellow dog" contracts and , contracts. Here he haid: "The evidence indicates there was a period of union busting and head busting that time, thank Goid, has passed. And it is jus compel men and women to join a union at the
price of holding their jobs. The right they must be free ${ }^{\text {t }}$
sons choose to do."


## AN INVITATION....

To The People Of SOUTHERN WAYNE, DUPLIN, SAMPSON \&-LENOIR COUNTIES


WHEN IN GOLDSBORO - Eastern Carolina's Šhop ping Center - Patronize the Progressive Firms Whose Advertisements Appear Herel

## A. T. Grifin Manufacturing Co.

- LUMBER
- Millwork
- BUILDING MATERIABS

Bemeys' Loan Co.
"LOANS"
mado an Diamonde - Waches - Jomalry - All Kinds
We Trede In Any Article of Valus.
We Buy old cold, silver 201 E. Waln
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