

# The News-Review

CHARLES V. STANTON, Editor and Manager  
ADDOE WRIGHT, Asst. Bus. Mgr.  
GEORGE CASTILLO, Asst. Editor

Member of the Associated Press, Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, the Audit Bureau of Circulations  
Represented by WEST-HOLIDAY CO. INC., offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—In Oregon—By Mail—Per Year, \$12.00; six months, \$6.50; three months, \$3.75. Outside Oregon—By Mail—Per Year, \$13.00; six months, \$7.00; three months, \$3.95.

By News-Review Carrier—Per Year, \$13.00 (in advance), less than one year per month, \$1.25.

Entered as second class matter May 7, 1926, at the post office at Roseburg, Oregon under act of March 3, 1917.

## DELINQUENCY CONTROLS

By Charles V. Stanton

Juvenile delinquents have been giving law enforcement officers a bad time in recent weeks. The holiday season, while normally bringing out the best in children, has seemed to develop the worst behavior among a minor segment of teen-agers and young adults.

Portland, in particular, has been having a hard time with rowdy and brutal gangs. Sadistic youngsters have attacked total strangers, beating some quite severely. Vandals have maliciously wrecked private property. Life has been endangered by pranks of hoodlums.

Here in Douglas County, attempts by Roseburg merchants to add to holiday enjoyment by lighting Christmas trees along the sidewalks were marred by vandals who stole bulbs and even strings of lights and knocked trees out of their bases. In addition to other acts of vandalism, a gang of youngsters poured a number of bad checks into business channels. All in all the past few weeks have seen a considerable increase in the number and viciousness of juvenile offenses.

### Control Methods Debated

Talking with a police officer a few days ago I found him very discouraged concerning the situation. He had worked hard to solve a difficult case and had brought in several young culprits. Among these youngsters were some who had been arrested previously.

"Why should we spend our time seeking out these kids when nothing is done with them after they are arrested?" the officer asked.

Institutions for handling juvenile offenders are already overcrowded. Juvenile courts dislike sending any youngster to a penal institution loaded with the toughest of junior criminals. Oregon has no intermediate institutions. About the best that can be done is to reprimand the offender and parole him to parents—a procedure which has been far from satisfactory.

A proposal recently was offered in Portland suggesting that confirmed juvenile delinquents be expelled from public schools. At first glance it seems like a good idea. Juvenile delinquents are but a very small percentage of our young people. Yet their activities are so much in the news that all too many people get the idea that the entire younger generation is involved. If the chronic and confirmed juvenile delinquent could be kept out of our high schools a much better school atmosphere could be maintained.

Our Oregon law, however, compels school attendance until the 18th year of age or graduation from high school. Many youngsters are in school against their will. Because their attendance is forced, and because they have no interest in education, they impair discipline and act as a drag upon ambitious students.

### Young People Should Act

One of the first steps in correcting delinquency is to identify offenders. If, after identification, offenders could be isolated, the situation could be materially improved.

Some experimentation now is in progress throughout the country with teen-age courts for traffic offenders. Young people elect their own police judge and court officers. Teen-age juries are empaneled and cases heard as in regular court. Penalties, for the most part, it is reported, have been more severe than an adult court would normally impose.

Young people, I am sure, could do more to clean up juvenile delinquency than can our best police forces, if they would undertake the task. Because the good reputations of so many are being damaged by the irresponsible acts of so few, I believe it is time that responsible young people took a hand in cleaning up the mess.

If the student body organizations of our high schools were to form committees to study ways and means of handling the problem, I'm sure they would come up with some mighty valuable ideas. If, in addition, they would provide liaison with the regular police agencies, not as informers or tale-bearers but as public defenders, helping in the identification and segregation of offenders, I'm sure the undesired stigma, which all too often falls upon all teen-agers because of the behavior of only a very small segment of their age group, would be quickly erased.

## Editorial Comment

From The Oregon Press

### RIGHT TO ARMS

By Bill Jenkins  
Klamath Falls Herald & News

One of the first steps taken by the Soviet invaders of Hungary was the almost immediate ban on possession of firearms. A natural enough precaution in view of the fact that the invader is always anxious to protect his aggression to the fullest extent. Any demand that the peoples of any country surrender their arms is tantamount to an announcement from the ruling party that democracy has run its course and that tyranny will rise from here on out sit in the seat of power.

The confiscation of arms walks arm and arm with suppression of freedom of the press. Now is probably as good a time as any other to take a look at the situation here in the United States and reassure ourselves that our Constitutional rights regarding firearms are not violated. It is an important point, not only in the spirit of owning firearms freely, but because each year sees some legislation in one of the 48 states aimed at curbing this right. And each one of these moves is one step more in the direction of more power in the hands of the government at large and less power in the hands of the people as a whole.

In the American Bill of Rights, which constitutes the 10 original amendments to the original Constitution of the United States, Article II says, "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

This amendment, if you will remember your history, was put in force on December 15, 1791. You can go back even further if you wish to 1688, and the original Bill of Rights proposed to the Prince and Princess of Orange providing that subjects of the King, be they Protestants, have the right to carry arms for defense.

The right to own and carry firearms has been a priceless American heritage. If we defend that heritage to the fullest extent, I think it safe to say we will never face the same predicament in which Hungary and much of the rest of the world finds itself today.

Why keep such a close watch over this right? Well, mostly because if we don't we'll lose it little by little in a manner so imperceptible of threat as to slip by unnoticed. Much of the anti-gun legislation of the United States is fomented by well-meaning people. Some of it is proposed and fought for by crackpots. Into the first category fall those people who would prevent needless accidents through a limitation of the rights in bearing arms.

At the last session of the Oregon legislature, I believe, a bill was proposed and subsequently defeated which would ban the carrying of a loaded firearm in an automobile. On the face of it a sound precaution and one which would both protect and insure the right of no one. At first I admit I was rather skeptical as to the wisdom of such a move. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

## Democrat And Republican Campaign Expenditures Ran About On Even Basis

By PAUL W. HARVEY JR.

SALEM — The campaign expenditures in the November election were almost even between the two parties, with the Republicans having a slight edge.

The campaign probably cost close to a million dollars, and that might be a new record.

The Republicans have reported to the state Elections Bureau that they spent \$421,924 for candidates running for the eight top offices on the ballot, and the Democrats have reported spending \$397,363. Usually, the Republicans outspend the Democrats by a big margin.

It cost the Democrats \$266,431 to elect Sen. Wayne Morse, while the Republicans spent \$229,680 for Doug McKay.

Gov.-elect Robert D. Holmes, campaign cost \$47,248, while supporters of his Republican opponent, Gov. Elmo Smith, spent \$79,332.

Here are the total expenditures reported for the congressional contests:

First District, Democrats \$10,290; Republicans \$3,272; Second District, Democrats \$18,949; Republicans \$18,040; Third District, Democrats \$22,165; Republicans \$33,954; Fourth District, Democrats \$10,323; Republicans \$18,887.

The successful campaign of Mark Hatfield, Republican who was elected secretary of state, cost \$23,258, compared with \$21,019 for Monroe Sweetland, Democrat.

State Treasurer Sig Unander's Republican supporters spent \$15,491 for his reelection, while the campaign of Wiley Smith, his Democratic opponent, cost \$1,007.

The accent will be on youth when Gov.-elect Holmes and Hatfield take office. With an average age of 41, Oregon may have the youngest Board of Control in its history.

Holmes is 47, Hatfield 34, and State Treasurer Unander 43. Pat Dooley, Democrat who will

be speaker of the House, is only 37.

Randall B. Kester, Portland attorney who is the newest justice of the state Supreme Court, is a courageous man. He demonstrated that a year ago when he challenged the entire Supreme Court.

The overburdened court persuaded the 1955 Legislature to ease its load by allowing the court to name, temporarily, circuit judges to the high bench. The Legislature complied without a murmur.

When the Supreme Court appointed three circuit judges as temporary supreme justices, Kester objected.

He brought a suit claiming that the action was unconstitutional. In effect, he was asking the Supreme Court to rule against itself.

While this act of Kester was considered a little brash, he was sound legal ground that the Supreme Court did rule for Kester, and tossed out the law that it had sponsored.

The court thinks a lot of its legal ability. And that suit is one reason why.

The biggest bargain the state gets is the \$27,376 a year that the Legislature appropriates for basic research in the institutions of higher learning. Chancellor John R. Richards of higher education calls it "seed money."

It is used to permit research scientists to go into the realms of pure science.

When a researcher runs into something that looks promising, his college tries to interest the government or some foundation in financing the whole project.

The result is that this little bit of "seed money" is getting the state a million dollars a year in research grants from the outside.

Dr. Richards is asking the next Legislature for an additional \$20,000 a year in state research funds.

These funds are hard to get from the Legislature, which is slow to agree that basic research pays off. In such projects, it's impossible to see what the ultimate result will be, in contrast to applied research.

**Hal Boyle**

NEW YORK — The Elvis Presley sideburns have become something of a badge of honor among the teen-age rock-'n'-roll crowd.

It could be a lot worse. What if they were old enough to grow handlebar mustaches—or honest beards?

Many of us red-blooded, clean-shaven elders who rage against the Presley-style sideburns forget the hirsute sins of our own youth.

If any balding grandpa will just thumb through the family album to a portrait of himself, when he was a dashing young "rake" in the flaming 1920's, what will he see? He will see a youthful caricature in white pants, a pork pie hat and wearing sideburns. And if he's a fussy grandpa, he'll tear the picture out of the album so his grandkids never get to see how ridiculous he looked when young.

One man with an historical perspective on the Presley-inspired vogue for sideburns is Meyer Schmitzler, who may know as much about whiskers as anyone in America.

Schmitzler, vice president in charge of research for the Gillette safety razor, has made a lifelong study of man's relations to his whiskers through the ages. Here is what he has to say about the new juvenile rage for sideburns:

"They apparently come into vogue during periods of unrest and especially in post-war eras. 'This whisker trim was named after Gen. Ambrose Burnside, a Civil War officer, whose colorful sideburns set a fad among young Union soldiers.'

"What he was to them and Rudolph Valentino to the women of his sideburns"—was to the youngsters in the 1920's, Elvis Presley is to the rock-'n'-roll crowd today.

"What'll happen? Why, they'll outgrow the idea."

Schmitzler, a tall, scholarly-looking scientist, bristles like a porcupine with statistics on whiskers. He believes that his firm is the only corporation in America that encourages its employees to come to work unshaven—and whack off their whiskers on company time, so they can be used

closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

But it is these little, seemingly meaningless moves which all mount up eventually to the end of the Constitutional right of every American to keep and bear arms. And I stoutly maintain that this right, along with freedom of the press and our other civil rights and liberties, are the best insurance we have against oppression.

Oregon has so far maintained a sane attitude regarding firearms legislation. I sincerely hope that this situation will remain and that it will apply to the rest of the United States as well. Certainly, to any thinking person, a glimpse at the world situation will convince him that these rights must remain inviolate. The idea that it can't happen here is as exploded a myth as it is old. However, upon a closer scrutiny, the fact dawned on me that this might be the opening wedge to even further limitations concerning firearms in the hands of private individuals. Consequently, I've changed my mind on this and would oppose a bill were it brought up again.

A much more dangerous proposal and one that is almost invariably introduced by some crackpot is that one banning the carrying of hand guns by private citizens. This bill has been introduced in numerous states in the past years and is in full effect in at least several states east of the Mississippi. To my knowledge, New York and the Manhattan area have the strongest restrictions on the use of firearms.

## Teamsters Given Until Jan. 15 To Get Records

WASHINGTON — The Senate Investigations subcommittee said here that it has given the Western Conference of Teamsters until Jan. 15 to produce subpoenaed financial records which may become the center of a fight.

Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel, said the subcommittee originally had ordered union officials to surrender the documents by Thursday for use in an investigation of the spending of union funds by some officials of the Teamsters and other labor groups.

Kennedy said the Western Conference, which embraces Teamsters' locals in 11 Western states, has protested that the subpoena may violate its constitutional rights to protection against unreasonable search and seizure.

Kennedy said the union contends the subpoena should be more specific. But that this claim is without merit. He said the subpoena was based upon "specific information" and that it would be wrong and contrary to normal procedure to "let them decide which papers to surrender."

Kennedy said the documents sought are "certain financial records" of the Western Conference, its subordinate Joint Council No. 28 operating in the Seattle area, and Teamsters Local No. 174 of Seattle.

HILLSBORO — Documents subpoenaed by the grand jury which indicted County Judge Harry M. Seabold on a charge of receiving a bribe, are being studied by Seabold's attorneys.

Seabold had contended he could not receive a fair trial unless he were allowed to study the material on which his indictment was based. Circuit Judge Carl A. Dahl of Portland, appointed to hear the case, upheld his motion.

## Documents In Bribery Case Given Study Nod

HILLSBORO — Documents subpoenaed by the grand jury which indicted County Judge Harry M. Seabold on a charge of receiving a bribe, are being studied by Seabold's attorneys.

Seabold had contended he could not receive a fair trial unless he were allowed to study the material on which his indictment was based. Circuit Judge Carl A. Dahl of Portland, appointed to hear the case, upheld his motion.

## IN THE DAY'S NEWS

By FRANK JENKINS

(Continued From Page One)

60 million more people in our country within 20 years. Our rate of population increase is greater than that of India and higher than the average of the whole world.

REALLY growing.

A thought: Let's keep our agriculture—which is presently suffering from overproduction—on a free enterprise basis. With 220 million to 230 million people in the U.S. by 1975, there should be markets for everything we can grow.

It would be a pity if in these problem years when the political

ans are moving in on the farmers in the hope of harvesting a bumper crop of votes we should permit our agriculture to deteriorate into a sort of government-supported pensioners' home.

And—Here in the West—Let's go on battling determinedly and unrelentingly for reclamation and irrigation, which are essential to our type of agriculture.

If our population is going to pass the 230 million mark by 1975—as these learned gentlemen tell us—our country is going to need ALL the Western land that can be reclaimed and put under irrigation in these next two decades.

Conservation Foundation President Osborne went on to say: "Such benefits as may come to our country through a much larger population will be balanced by disadvantages and problems that will arise. . . Every city will be almost twice its present size. Countrysides will become suburbanias. The traffic trickles of 1935 will become ever-flowing rivers."

And the sky above us will be full of jets, coming and going.

He is talking about the country's already swollen metropolitan cities and the suburban districts that are growing up all around them. It won't be that way in Southern Oregon and Far Northern California.

We will grow. We will grow greatly. But we will retain our own present primary economy, with OUR OWN supporting primary industry. We won't be just the BEDROOM of some huge metropolitan city.

We have great resources in the way of power, water and raw materials, and we're remote enough from the present big centers of population to have OUR OWN INDEPENDENT ECONOMY.

## Atomic Energy Agency Capital Far Over Billion

WASHINGTON — In its 10 years, the Atomic Energy Commission has grown into one of the government's biggest agencies.

The AEC, marking its 10th birthday today, reported its investment in plant, property and equipment now totals nearly seven billion dollars. In 1947 — its first year — that capital investment came to \$1,200,000,000.

The summary reported these major developments:

1. "The nation's nuclear arsenal is being expanded in number and variety. . . . Government scientists have evolved 'tactical' as well as strategic nuclear bombs, and families of weapons 'adapted' to the specific needs of various branches of the armed services."

This evidently referred to development of small-scale nuclear bombs and atomic artillery shells and missile warheads.

2. Steady progress has been made in the atomic ship program and in a 250 million dollar effort aimed at developing a civilian nuclear power industry.

3. "The current program has attained its goal of geographic dispersion of vital components, of the weapon 'assembly line' — an apparent reference to scattering of atomic weapons plants to make them more difficult targets in the event of an enemy attack."

The AEC report said the United States now ranks as the world's greatest uranium producer, with more than 1,000 mines in operation.

TO INTRODUCE BILL

WASHINGTON — Rep. Walter Norblad (R-Ore) said Wednesday he will introduce in Congress on its opening day Thursday a bill to authorize the Yaquina Bay project.

This work, he said, would improve the bay for shipping with the Army Engineers authorized to spend \$12,800,000 on it.



Clean Sweep Sale of