

The News-Review

Published Daily Except Sunday by the
News-Review Company, Inc.

Entered as second class matter May 1, 1950, at the post office at
Roseburg, Oregon, under act of March 3, 1879.

CHARLES V. STANTON, Editor and Manager

Member of the Associated Press, Oregon Newspaper Publishers
Association, the Audit Bureau of Circulations
Represented by WEST-HOLLIDAY CO., INC., offices in New York, Chicago,
San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver
Subscription Rates—In Oregon—By Mail—Per Year, \$12.00; six months, \$6.50;
three months, \$3.50. Outside Oregon—By Mail—Per Year, \$13.50; six months,
\$7.50; three months, \$4.00.
By News-Review Carrier—Per Year, \$13.00 (in advance), less than one year,
per month, \$1.25.

COURT REPORTING

Charles V. Stanton

We found most interesting the comments of Frank Jenkins in his column in The Day's News in this newspaper when he said: "I think the time will come when radio and television can be admitted even to our court rooms and our congressional hearings in congress and elsewhere. They are certainly a legitimate part of what we call 'the press.'"

Here in Douglas County we have probably done more pioneering with camera and radio in the courtroom than any other place in the country. In this pioneering venture we have enjoyed exceptional cooperation from Circuit Judge Carl E. Wimberly and the pro-tem judges serving the court during his illness.

Of course we haven't tried television in our local courtroom because we have no television facilities.

Throughout the entire country there is a raging battle between the press and the courts over the matter of reporting with camera and by radio. Television also is trying to get into courtrooms. Lawyers at their meeting in Chicago have been quite vigorous in their debate on the subject.

Many judges and lawyers believe the press in all its forms should be barred from courts. Some object to any reporting of a case prior to the time it has been brought to trial and a verdict returned. These extremists hold that news items are prejudicial to defendants.

Prohibition On Cameras

Courts quite generally frown upon the use of cameras. While judges and lawyers objecting to newspaper coverage of court news are few, a great number opposes radio. Television finds very little favor.

Only a few years ago the newspaper was virtually the only vehicle for the dissemination of news. But in late years we have seen the rapid growth of news photography. Close on the heels of photography came radio. Now we have television. Each is utilized in conveying news. The camera, either in its still form, as motion picture or video, is an extension of the public eye. Radio is the extension of the public ear.

The use of the camera in the courtroom was successfully introduced by the *The News-Review* several years ago. It was done unobtrusively.

This newspaper believes in upholding the dignity and decorum of the courtroom. But it also believes it can carry out its reporting duties with pencil, camera and radio without interference with court dignity.

Bob Grant, news editor of our radio station, KRNR, has proven that radio definitely can be fitted into court procedure.

Judge Wimberly was so interested in the results of the first broadcast experiment that he installed tape recording equipment in his courtroom to ease the labors of the court reporter. Grant learned that by plugging his equipment into the court reporter's amplifier, he could get fine reproduction with his own machines entirely outside the courtroom.

News Or Entertainment?

We believe it has been amply evidenced that newspaper reporters, news photographers and radio news technicians can do their work in a courtroom without interference with the court or without detracting from its proceedings. We also believe that camera and radio have an equal place with the newspaper reporter in reporting courtroom news. With cooperation on both sides there need be no conflict.

But it is our opinion there should be a clear-cut definition of the purpose to be served.

If camera or radio are to be used in the courtroom the purpose should be strictly confined to dissemination of news or information.

The court is not a place of entertainment. Yet it would be easy for either radio or television to cross the line of news or information into the field of entertainment. We fear there will be a strong temptation to make entertainment of our courts. Reporting media must strictly regulate themselves.

The "right of the public to know" demands the fullest use of all news media, but it is not to be desired that our courts supply entertainment.

It may be difficult to draw the line in the proper place. It may be hard to determine, particularly on the television screen, where viewers cease to be informed and begin to be entertained. Yet there is a distinction, and this distinction, we believe, should be most religiously observed.

Hal Boyle

Just as a mature woman wisely overhauls her charms from time to time, the U. S. Navy is engaged in the continuous task of facelifting its ammunition, too.

This is one of its jobs the public rarely hears about. But ammunition, like most things in this world, often becomes out-of-date or shows the wear-and-tear of age.

Here in the Mare Island Shipyard, which next month celebrates the 100th anniversary of its founding by Adm. David G. Farragut, a great depot overhauls the ammunition of the long line of ships that come here to drydock. It is a strange kind of beauty parlor.

The depot, two-thirds of a square mile in area, has 137 buildings, 30 miles of railroad tracks and 25 miles of paved roads.

The work is highly skilled and potentially dangerous. A single static spark from a human body could cause a disastrous explosion. Some 8,000 tons of ammunition are stored in underground bunkers—enough to make a baby A-bomb blast.

To prevent the buildup of static electricity the technicians wear "leg irons" that ground them at every step. Visitors check their matches and cigarette lighters at the gate.

"In the last fiscal year the depot produced 5,130 tons of new ammunition and overhauled 22,623 tons of unserviceable ammunition," said Lt. Cmdr. William F. Gaddberry.

When ammunition deteriorates so far that it is too dangerous to be

broken down and put to new uses, it is taken to sea and dumped. Nice job—if you can get it, and enjoy ocean cruising. Bound to give a man something to worry about, besides seasickness.

Few things give a man more of a feeling of the erosion of money than a change in the prices of haircuts and hotel rooms.

Somewhere in my youth I got the idea that a quarter was the proper price for a haircut, and that an eternal law of nature held that a barber would rent for \$2 a night forever.

But today in some big American cities it costs \$2 a day-up to \$10 a week for a haircut in San Francisco. The price was \$1.50, and I don't have enough hair left to cause the barber to work up a sweat while mowing it. Actually, he could have done the job with a pair of fingernail clippers, except barbers like to put drama in their work.

"Down in Los Angeles they are talking of putting the price up to \$2," he said.

Somehow that made me feel

In The Day's News

(Continued from Page one)

mustn't say in the future that Republican brains are good and Democratic brains are bad — or vice versa. If we are to survive, we must use the best brains we have, regardless of political labels, in our handling of our foreign affairs.

We must learn the all-important technique of WORKING TOGETHER in the matters of foreign policy, no matter how sharply we may divide on domestic issues.

Domestic issues are another kettle of fish. Plenty of differences will be there. There will be sharp cleavage lines between contrasting philosophies of government and economics.

The Democrats will be for going back to the philosophies of the New Deal — Big Government, big spending, rising public debt, rising inflation. They will be strong for public power. In its upper echelons, the political campaign in Oregon already revolves around Hill's Canyon — which is in IDAHO. The Democrats will favor more government in business, rather than less.

The Republicans, backing the middle-of-the-road philosophy of President Eisenhower, will favor cutting down Big Government to more manageable size, bringing more government back into the states, the counties and the cities, curbing spending, an ultimately balanced budget, putting a stop to the long rise of inflation, etc. They will be for public power only in those cases where the projects are so big that only the federal government can handle them. They will favor giving private power a place in the economic picture. In general, they will be for less government in business, rather than more.

All this, I think, is good, not bad. It is as it should be in a two-party political system. A sharp cleavage in domestic issues, such as the campaign that is now beginning will have, will give people something to BELIEVE IN when they go to the polls.

That will be good for all of us.

Up in Washington the State Department of civil defense is planning a practice test that will be called Operation Floodout. The problem will be how to meet the emergency that would be created if an enemy should knock out Grand Coulee dam.

Destruction of the 550-foot high dam by an H-bomb would unleash a torrent of RADIOLOGICALLY POISONED WATER to go roaring down the Columbia, crippling traffic and power production and forcing evacuation of an estimated 70,000 persons.

Defense officials say such a flood would be worse than any ever seen in the Columbia Basin. Even as far downstream as Portland, they estimate, the water would be THREE STORIES DEEP around the Multnomah hotel.

Pretty scary? Gives you the shivers?

Wait a minute. Before going out and jumping in the lake and ending it all, remember the predictions of a few years ago of the comets that were going to side-sweep the earth. Their poison gas tails were going to swirl around and envelope the globe and KILL EVERY LIVING THING.

Well, it DIDN'T HAPPEN! Perhaps an antidote for some of these ills would be the realization that we as individuals will not be here forever. The time of our presence here on earth is only the fractional portion of a second, compared to the duration of time. Why, they have discovered some minute algae in the ancient rocks of the Bend country that are reputed to be a million years old. That is twenty thousand times the life span of an ordinary man. How long was the rock there before the algae? Well, anyway we are dizzy and assume you are the same.

But the point we want to emphasize is the fact that study of history engenders a deep sense of humility. Our other observation is that obviously precious few pol-

iticians ever study history. As for our individual selves we are happy when we consider we are not immortals, but rather temporary residents whose job is to build for the future.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

In the absence of those proofs, the only reasonable judgment must be that the Reds have not given up their dreams of world conquest; that they talk "peace" only to divide and delude their enemies.

The proofs are unlikely to materialize. Should the touring Britishers accept anything less as justification for relaxing the West's guard, they merely will demonstrate their own unwisdom for governing. This trip is as much a test for them as for the Communists they would study.

It's Good to Know When to Toss Out the Ballast



In The Day's News

(Continued from Page one)

iticians ever study history. As for our individual selves we are happy when we consider we are not immortals, but rather temporary residents whose job is to build for the future.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

In the absence of those proofs, the only reasonable judgment must be that the Reds have not given up their dreams of world conquest; that they talk "peace" only to divide and delude their enemies.

The proofs are unlikely to materialize. Should the touring Britishers accept anything less as justification for relaxing the West's guard, they merely will demonstrate their own unwisdom for governing. This trip is as much a test for them as for the Communists they would study.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

In the absence of those proofs, the only reasonable judgment must be that the Reds have not given up their dreams of world conquest; that they talk "peace" only to divide and delude their enemies.

The proofs are unlikely to materialize. Should the touring Britishers accept anything less as justification for relaxing the West's guard, they merely will demonstrate their own unwisdom for governing. This trip is as much a test for them as for the Communists they would study.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

In the absence of those proofs, the only reasonable judgment must be that the Reds have not given up their dreams of world conquest; that they talk "peace" only to divide and delude their enemies.

The proofs are unlikely to materialize. Should the touring Britishers accept anything less as justification for relaxing the West's guard, they merely will demonstrate their own unwisdom for governing. This trip is as much a test for them as for the Communists they would study.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

Bruce Brossat

(Continued from Page one)

iticians ever study history. As for our individual selves we are happy when we consider we are not immortals, but rather temporary residents whose job is to build for the future.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

In the absence of those proofs, the only reasonable judgment must be that the Reds have not given up their dreams of world conquest; that they talk "peace" only to divide and delude their enemies.

The proofs are unlikely to materialize. Should the touring Britishers accept anything less as justification for relaxing the West's guard, they merely will demonstrate their own unwisdom for governing. This trip is as much a test for them as for the Communists they would study.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

In the absence of those proofs, the only reasonable judgment must be that the Reds have not given up their dreams of world conquest; that they talk "peace" only to divide and delude their enemies.

The proofs are unlikely to materialize. Should the touring Britishers accept anything less as justification for relaxing the West's guard, they merely will demonstrate their own unwisdom for governing. This trip is as much a test for them as for the Communists they would study.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

In the absence of those proofs, the only reasonable judgment must be that the Reds have not given up their dreams of world conquest; that they talk "peace" only to divide and delude their enemies.

The proofs are unlikely to materialize. Should the touring Britishers accept anything less as justification for relaxing the West's guard, they merely will demonstrate their own unwisdom for governing. This trip is as much a test for them as for the Communists they would study.

The real test will come when the Laborites seek to apply their

power of judgment to the experiences they are having.

One cannot imagine that any of the Britishers, with the possible exception of Bevan, will prove so amiable as to believe the visual picture they get of the Communist is the full and true one.

As for what they will have been 3 by Communist leaders, the Laborites may find it more difficult to be realistic. In Moscow they listened to a lot of fine words about peaceful coexistence. They are getting more of the same in Leipzig. And most of the delegation are so eager for that kind of a solution to the world struggle that they may be predisposed to believe what they hear.

The question is, as it always has been, what proofs of sincerity they will demand. The Laborites did not need to go to Moscow and Leipzig to learn that Red dictators are willing to talk "peace." The trip could only have real meaning if they should learn that the Communists are prepared to do something about it.

Additional Information

Needed On Conservation

ROSEBURG — (To The Editor) — In a recent editorial, you described some cuttings made by Roseburg Lumber Company on national forest land and predicted that some erosion would follow. In a subsequent editorial ("The Logger Complains"), August 11, you presented the views of a logger friend whose opinion differed from yours. May I enter the discussion?

I, too, have some opinions on the subject. I can agree with both of you in part but with neither of you completely. When opinions diverge, it is frequently caused by lack of information — or lack of facts. This is one of those cases. None of us have all of the facts needed to say whether a specific cut will erode or whether it will not. None of us can say with certainty that one "show" can be tractor-logged without excessive soil and water damage, whereas another show should be logged by the high-lead system.

Your friends in the timber industry made one good observation: much of the precipitation at high elevations falls as snow and consequently contributes less to soil erosion than if it fell as rain. But it is dangerous to generalize from that and infer either that the headwaters of Little River receive "virtually no rain" or to infer that the area is erosion-proof. The greatest erosion damage occurs during the big storms. During the big storm that caused the flood of October 1950, the freezing level was 6,000 feet. Consequently, that storm dumped an inch of liquid water all over the Little River drainage. And in case anyone's memory is growing dim, that was "virtually no rain."

I do not know how much rain falls on the head of Little River, but I believe it is safe to say that little snow accumulates there before the first of December, and most of the precipitation after April will be rain. For one-third of which 10 days? In the months of April through November, these are facts. Consequently, I cannot accept your friend's opinion that upper Little River receives "virtually no rain." And for the sake of Little River and its productive soil, I believe careful logging and erosion control works are in order, even as high up as the top of Taft Mountain.

I firmly endorse one of your statements: "...there should be no compromise with watershed protection." Now, at this point I enter a controversy between the timber harvesters and the Forest Service. So I had better make it clear that although I work for the Forest Service, I am not a policy maker. I am a researcher; a fact-finder for the policy makers. The views to follow are strictly my own.

Your friend complained of the Forest Service's "high-lead logging is required on too many shows where cat logging would be far cheaper and would do no material damage." Can the areas your friend had in mind be cat-logged without "compromising" watershed protection?

The Weyerhaeuser Timber Company is interested in growing trees. Consequently they are studying the effects of logging on erosion on their soils. They found that 4 trips over dry soils with an HD 20 tractor reduced the infiltration capacity of the soil by 80 percent. One trip over the soil when wet (winter conditions) reduced infiltration capacity by the same amount. Do you know what that means? It means that the soil will absorb water only one-fifth as fast as it did before the tractor ran over it. It therefore means more surface runoff. As you know, the steeper the ground, the faster the water runs. When the velocity of the water is doubled, its soil-carrying capacity is increased 4 times. At this point, I run out of facts; but from where I sit, it seems that the ground would not have to be very steep to risk "material" soil and water damage by cat logging.

Who is to say how much erosion must be tolerated in a cut-over without more facts? Who is to say at what point we start to "compromise watershed protection" — without more facts? But shouldn't the agencies in charge of the public forests lean over backwards to be on the safe side — until we get more facts? Perhaps the Forest Service is too lenient with cat logging.

I had the interesting experience last week of attending a public hearing in Sacramento, California, concerning the preservation of water quality in the Sacramento River. A new industrial plant had applied to use the river for disposal of industrial wastes. To this hearing came the State Health Department and told the amount and kinds of contaminants that could be permitted in water that was to be used for domestic purposes. The irrigation specialists told what could be permitted in irrigation water. The Fish and Game Department established water standards that were needed to preserve the fish life. The State Water Resources Board had an analysis of the river water as it is today. The representatives of the industry told exactly how much and what kinds of contaminants they would place in the river. It was then simply a matter of arithmetic to determine if the river could accommodate the extra load without impairing existing or contemplated uses of the water.

Do we need similar information for the Umpqua River? You have stated that water is life itself. If so, the Umpqua River is the lifeline of the people of the Umpqua Basin. This lifeline heads on the lands that support the number 1 resource of the basin — timber. It irrigates soil and waters livestock for the number 2 re-

Neuberger Secretary

Says Bills Batted Down

PORTLAND — (To The Editor) — Your editorial of August 18th, entitled "The Neuberger Myth," takes State Senator Richard L. Neuberger to task because many of his bills in the Oregon Legislature did not pass.

This is the last thing, in my opinion, to which a conservative Republican editor would want to call attention. Senator Neuberger's forward-looking proposals have been batted down by reactionaries who want no progress in Oregon. I am willing to let your readers judge a few of the bills which Richard Neuberger has sponsored:

1. Registration and reporting of expenditures by lobbyists as is done in 30 states. Neuberger's bill was patterned after the model act pushed through the California Legislature by Governor Earl Warren, to control the lobbyists who swarm into capitol buildings.

2. Extending the World War II bonus to veterans of the Korean hostilities. If a \$600 bonus was fair for veterans of World Wars I and II, why not also for the men who slugged through the mud of Korea?

3. A Code of Ethics for politicians, to prevent legislators from profiting off appearances before state agencies. Although this was turned down by the Oregon Legislature, a similar code recently was enacted in New York at the insistence of Governor Thomas E. Dewey, twice Republican nominee for President of the U.S.

4. Statewide meat inspection to safeguard the public health. Although 30 per cent of the meat sold in Oregon for human consumption is not inspected for purity, the Neuberger bill was defeated. Forward-looking states have such legislation.

5. A guardianship act to protect the estates and assets of war veterans in mental hospitals. Although this exact bill is law in 40 out of the 48 states, the reactionary Republicans in the Oregon Legislature turned it down. Neuberger sponsored it in the 1951 and 1953 sessions.

6. Artificial chemicals in bread. Richard Neuberger sponsored a bill to forbid the deceptive and often dangerous chemical "softeners" which are used to make state bread seem soft and fresh to the consumer's touch. The legislature passed the bill, but in very watered-down form.

7. Control of political slush funds. Neuberger sponsored a bill to hold down the huge sums of money spent to influence elections. Although his bill was defeated, the Oregon Council of Churches this year unanimously resolved that "the excessive spending of money to win elections imperils the high ethics and morality which we expect of government."

8. Director of Elections. Neuberger sponsored a bill to take Oregon's election machinery out from under partisan politics. Although the State Corrupt Practices act has not been enforced in recent years, the legislature rejected his measure.

9. A bill to forbid discrimination on the job against elderly men and women solely because of their age. Despite the acute problems facing the older people who look for work, the Legislature did not even give this bill real consideration.

10. An Oregon Constitutional Convention. Although the Legislature rejected Neuberger's bill, such a convention in his inaugural message, copying his views almost wholly from those of Neuberger.

I could recite many more such important