

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. Opinions expressed in signed columns are those of the writer.

CHUCK BEGGS, Editor

LOUIE ABRAMSON
Business Manager

BOB CARL
Managing Editor

WILBUR BISHOP, JR.
Advertising Manager

MAXINE ELLIOTT
News Editor

PHIL SEMAS
Associate Editor

ALLEN BAILEY
Associate Editor

Page 6

University of Oregon, Eugene, Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Important Amendments

University students go to the polls Wednesday in the winter term ASUO primary election. They'll be voting for senator-at-large and some other Senate offices. There doesn't promise to be much of a turnout. Nor will there probably be a much better turnout next week for the general election.

And that's unfortunate. For also on both those ballots are some amendments to the ASUO Constitution.

They're the same amendments that failed in fall term elections because 25 per cent of the student body didn't vote.

In plain English this is what they'll do:

One limits a person from holding more than one office mentioned in the Constitution or financed by the ASUO budget. At present you can hold an unlimited number.

Three clarify terms of office for class officers and freshman men's and women's dormitory representatives.

Another one changes the wording of the section that puts a foreign student representative on the Senate to assure that that representative will be a foreign student.

One makes it invalid for Senate-passed bills to affect events that occurred before their passage. In other words, it makes ex post facto bills invalid.

One has class vice presidents succeeding to the office of president in case the president flunks out or becomes otherwise ineligible. The vice president will hold the office until the next spring elections when

a new president and vice president are elected.

They're all housekeeping measures needed to straighten out the sloppy writing in the Constitution. The need for each of them has been demonstrated in the past few months.

Yet some don't necessarily have to be made part of the Constitution. Law professor Wendell Basye, chairman of the ASUO Constitutional Committee, which interprets the Constitution, said last week that any Senate bill that does not conflict with provisions in the Constitution would be legal. Thus the Senate could make some of these changes—limiting offices a person can hold to one, eliminating ex post facto—without amending the Constitution. They may do that if 25 per cent of the student body doesn't vote either this Wednesday or next.

But some of these amendments represent changes in items already in the Constitution. Example: the succession of class vice presidents to the presidency or the clarification of terms for class officers.

And it's not really satisfactory to have these changes made by the Senate. It would be better to have them in the Constitution, where they'll be as hard to get out as they are to get in.

Students should keep things in mind and vote Wednesday to clarify these questionable passages.

Relief for the House

The proposal that drew the greatest applause from Congress when President Johnson presented his State of the Union message was one to lengthen Congressmen's terms to four years.

But those were mainly members of the House you heard clapping. The bill may have a tough time in the Senate. Senators would obviously be unhappy about a bill that would give members of the House a "free shot" at Senate seats. Since Congressmen are elected every two years, they must give up their House position to run for the Senate, whose members must run only every six years.

President Johnson has plenty of arguments for the bill. He should. After all, it's not a new idea. It would, of course, eliminate what he calls "the constant campaigning" that results because Congressmen must defend their seats every two years. It would make it easier for them to handle the longer sessions and heavier legislative burden which they now face.

President Johnson didn't mention it, but the proposal would probably help him, though not as much as some people are saying. He has proposed that Congressmen be elected only in presidential years. Some Congressional leaders, especially in the Senate, have charged that this will create a "coattail Congress," because the House will be dependent upon the party leader, the President.

It would certainly increase the probability that the President will have a majority of his own party in the House. The party that wins the Presidency almost always gains in Congress, too. But that's not complete assurance that Congress will follow blindly behind the President. When John F. Kennedy was elected in 1960 he carried into

Congress a good majority, but most of his legislative program stalled.

Still there's an argument to be made for one amendment that's been proposed in many quarters. President Johnson has proposed that Congressmen be elected in presidential election years. But many people in Congress, including Senate leaders Mike Mansfield and Everett Dirksen, have suggested that half of the House be elected every two years. That would alleviate much of the possibility of a "coattail Congress." It would also follow the logic that has one third of the Senate elected every two years, thus always assuring a nucleus of experienced legislators on Capitol Hill.

With that one change, President Johnson's proposal sounds like a good idea.

Something for All

Collegiate Press Service caught this item in a newsletter put out by the office of Oregon Congresswoman Edith Green. It's an article called "Consistency is the Hobgoblin of Little Minds." It reads:

"In order to produce more tobacco, the federal government spent \$5,280,000 in fiscal year 1965 to improve tobacco farming techniques and methods of marketing. In addition, the U.S. tobacco subsidies to growers amounted to \$373,341 in 1965 and \$11,517,064 in 1964.

"In order to warn the public of the possible relation between smoking and cancer, the federal government spent \$3,335,300 on researching tobacco health hazards in the same year. U.S. law requires as of Jan. 1, 1966, every cigarette pack to carry a warning to smokers, the wording of which the industry will draft."

Cameron's Comment



OPEN SKIES

Letters to the Editor

Sherry Ross Protests

Emerald Editor:

We, the men of Sherry Ross, are writing a letter of protest on the standing policy of the Housing Department, that no pets are allowed in University housing facilities.

Because Sherry Ross is one of the oldest dormitories on campus we have a problem with mice. They chew on our furniture and are quite annoying when we are trying to study. So the men of Sherry Ross, using their American ingenuity, have employed the services of a Siamese cat, who we have nicknamed "Harry Ross."

In the last two days he has more than lived up to expectations by bagging three mice. While we are well aware that complete eradication of this problem is impossible even for Harry, so far he is really doing a job: the noise has already noticeably decreased and all further progress on our furniture by the mice has ceased.

Because of the important role played by Harry in our living quarters we plead that an exception be made in his case. So students of the University get behind the men of Sherry Ross and help us save Harry and control the problem in our living unit.

Men of Sherry Ross
Kenneth Aebi
Freshman, Journalism
Secretary

Sorry

Emerald Editor:

Re: Donald G. Hoffard's letter of Jan. 25. Amusingly pointed: the placement of it gives credit to your journalistic ability and sense of humor.

However, please inform Mr. Hoffard that I will be unable to vote for him because of his support of issue (4).

Becky Darling
Graduate, Sociology

Reply to Editorial

Emerald Editor:

In the past the Emerald's reportorial and editorial coverage of the actions of the Student

Conduct Committee have been objective and thought provoking. We were amazed, therefore, at the misinterpretations, inaccuracies, and attitudes expressed in your "Unnecessary Baggage" editorial on Jan. 20.

The amendment in question reads: "Sanctions may be imposed for infraction of rules pursuant to the following: . . . b. Each unit, building, or complex may, upon the initiative of a majority thereof, establish housekeeping rules for internal management. All such rules must be approved pursuant to I.E. 4. above (i.e., by Student Conduct Committee)." Since dormitory units previously have had the prerogative of establishing housekeeping rules, the only change effected by this amendment is one of enforcement.

While we agree that "the pressure from the majority of those students who agree upon these rules should render compliance from the dissenters," recent experience at McLean & Morton has indicated that present means of enforcement (i.e., social pressure) is not sufficient. The actions of the Committee provide an opportunity for units having enforcement problems to alleviate their difficulties.

We also agree that "the Code needs no excess baggage such as phone duty requirements or dress standards in its regulations" and that "such rules are for each dormitory to decide for itself, not for general policy decisions in the operation of the conduct program." This is precisely why the amendment provided for each unit's initiative

(Continued on page 7)

Oregon Daily Emerald

Rande Wilmarth, Sports Editor
Nomi Borenstein,
Assistant Managing Editor
Larry Lange, Assistant News Editor
David Brown, Religious News Editor
Shota Ushio, Photo Editor
Steve Dimco, Entertainment Editor
David Butler, Feature Editor
Editorial Board: Chuck Beggs, Bob Carl,
Maxine Elliott, Phil Semas, Allen
Bailey, Pam Bladine, Karen Winn, Cliff
Kaufman, Gene Sokolski, Nomi Borenstein, Scott Bartlett, Vance Welty.