

# Editorial Page

## The Shield Of Freedom

Today was the day 172 years ago when the blow was struck that shattered the chains of tyranny and guaranteed the dignity of man which God originally intended.

It was the day that the "Bill of Rights" of the U.S. Constitution went into effect.

Curiously, the drafters of the Constitution did not feel that such a "Declaration of Rights" was necessary. They felt that the Constitution, as they had drafted it, provided enough safeguards for the people.

However, North Carolina refused to ratify the Constitution without amendments on rights. Massachusetts and New Hampshire ratified with an appended urgent recommendation of certain amendments on rights; New York first ratified subject to the right to secede if her amendments were not accepted within six years.

The mass of amendments proposed in the first Congress was tremendous. 103 were suggested by the states themselves, 42 from minorities in the various states, plus long lists of rights from both New York and Virginia.

The House rejected all of them and decided on 17 in their stead. The Senate cut this list down to 12 and both Houses passed them. The first two were not ratified by the states, however, but the remaining 10 were accepted and ratified, going into effect on December 15, 1791.

Today, much is heard about these "Bill of Rights" but not enough study is given them.

Let's review them:

**Article I**—Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

**Article II**—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.

**Article III**—No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

**Article IV**—The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

**Article V**—No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury.

except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in the time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

**Article VI**—In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

**Article VII**—In suit at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

**Article VIII**—Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

**Article IX**—The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

**Article X**—The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to the States respectively, or to the people.

Today, 172 years after these amendments were effected, we find ourselves in complete accord with those dissenters who refused to ratify the original constitution until these amendments were added.

For truly, in these 10 amendments lies the entire safety of the people against a tyrannical government or an over zealous legislative body or a capricious executive or judicial body.

Without them, you would not today be enjoying the freedoms you possess.

Even with them, their is a constant attempt on the part of the Congress, the president and the Supreme Court to abridge them or to alter them by opinions and rulings.

Americans must constantly guard against any changes in these rights and be ever vigilant to preserve them.

As long as they are preserved, so long is a free America preserved, also.

## Forgotten Man Of History

By JOSEPHINE E. HARPHAM Eugene, Ore.

When George Mason died at his home, Gunston Hall, Va., in 1792, it might well have been said of him, as it was said of Abraham Lincoln by Edwin M. Stanton, then secretary of war, "Now he belongs to the ages." In actuality he became the "forgotten man of his-

tory," except for a specialized group of people interested and informed on the subject—such as professors, teachers, students, librarians.

George Mason (1725-1792) was a wealthy, scholarly Virginia gentleman and planter—and a close friend of Washington, Jefferson and George Rogers Clark—who possessed one of the finest minds and noblest hearts our country ever produced. In 1744 he authored the historic 24 "Fairfax Resolves," which outlined the Rights of the Colonies in relation to England. In Williamsburg, Va., June 12, 1776, his Virginia Declaration of Rights was adopted by the Colonial Delegates. The latter became the basis for the first 10 amendments to our Federal Constitution—the Bill of Rights.

Mason was also the author of the Virginia Constitution, the first to be drawn up in the Colonies, and later used as a model by most other States in the Union. In 1787 Mason was a delegate from the State of Virginia to the Constitutional Convention held in Philadelphia. His friend and neighbor, George Washington, presided over this historic gathering, which produced one of the most profound and farsighted structures of government the world has ever known.

George Mason, however, opposed the adoption of the Constitution, and also the ratification of it by the State of Virginia. His political philosophy would not permit of the adoption because, among a number of reasons, (1) it contained no Bill of Rights; (2) because it permitted the importation of

slaves for 20 years, and slavery was disgraceful to him; (3) because he felt it presented no adequate check and balance among the three branches of government; (4) because he thought there should be rotation in office in the U.S. Senate; (5) because he opposed government controlled District of Columbia.

In Richmond, Va., June, 1788, there assembled some of the greatest and most brilliant debaters in American history—among the supporters for the Constitution were James Madison, John Marshall, Light Horse Harry Lee, Edmund Pendleton and Edmund Randolph. Against adoption were: George Mason, Patrick Henry, James Monroe and others.

Virginia ratified the Constitution by a margin of 89 to 79. The price of approval, however, was a promise that a set of amendments embodying a bill of rights would be introduced into the first Congress. Therefore on the next day George Mason drew up 20 proposed amendments founded on his own Declaration of Rights, which in essence later became the Bill of Rights. Life, liberty, pursuit of happiness and safety; liberty of conscience; free press; judicial safeguards; the right to vote; civil supremacy are perhaps more significant today than they were nearly 180 years ago.

George Mason's contribution is deeply significant, timeless, and enduring, for he helped to translate the political theory of the rights of man inherent in English law into political reality—no longer now forgotten, he does indeed "belong to the ages."

## Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Sunday, Dec. 15, the 34th day of 1963 with 16 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The evening stars are Saturn, Venus, and Jupiter.

On this day in history:

In 1791, the first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as the "Bill of Rights," went into effect following ratification by the state of Virginia.

In 1890, Sitting Bull, chief of the Sioux Indians, was shot and killed in South Dakota, following a skirmish with federal troops.

In 1946, a federal grand jury indicted Alger Hiss, a former State Department official, on two perjury counts.

In 1957, a series of earthquakes struck in western Iran, killing 1,392 persons in the tremors that began Dec. 13 and continue through Dec. 17.

A thought for the day—American fiction writer F. Scott Fitzgerald said: "The test of a first rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in mind at the same time and still retain the ability to function."

## Letters To The Editor . . .

### Firearms Right

By ELMER AMUNDSON USMC, Retired

For more years than I care to consider, I have listened to the anti-gun people rant and rave about doing away with firearms, and disarming the private citizen of these United States. They say that guns are made to kill with, and thus are something to be feared and hated. They say that there will be no more crime, that the burglars and murderers won't be able to ply their trades if they don't have the guns with which to rob and kill.

They don't believe in the right of the private citizen to keep and bear arms, a right, incidentally, guaranteed to all of us by the Constitution of the United States. They say that guns were a fine thing when this country was in its infancy and they were needed to procure food and to defend oneself, but now that we are so civilized and sophisticated they are no longer necessary.

They say we now have adequate armed forces and adequate police protection, paid for by our high taxes, and we no longer have the need of firearms. They say there are too many people killed and injured in hunting accidents, and that this is bad and when a thing is bad it should be done away with immediately.

They say that if guns can't be taken away from all law-abiding citizens then they should all be accounted for by being registered with the police so that if a crime is ever committed with a gun it can be readily traced to its owner and speedy justice meted out for its misuse.

Since we have had to listen to this babble for so long I believe it only fair that we drag all these statements out into the light of day and examine each one minutely. So let us proceed.

Basically, guns are made to kill with, but they are also made for sport—hunting and target shooting. Each year finds 15 to 18 million licensed hunters afield in pursuit of large and small game. These hunters get out into the great outdoors, get close to nature for a few hours or days, and spend some of the happiest hours of their lives there.

True, some of them do get killed or injured occasionally, but not nearly so many as the participants in any other sport one cares to name. A gun, by itself, will never be able to kill anyone, it must be aimed by a human hand, and directed by

a human mind. Therefore, do not legislate against guns, but do, by all means, legislate against the improper use of them.

The right of the private citizen to keep and bear arms is guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States. Surely, this right is as important or more so to us today than when our founding fathers, with their great wisdom, wrote it into our Constitution. The safety of the country today could depend to a great extent upon the armed citizen, even when one considers the terrible weapons of war we have developed.

How would a man defend his family and property if he were left alive after a nuclear explosion? Don't you think there would be looting and crime of all kinds? There would be.

For that matter, how is a man to protect his family and himself against the armed, lawless element if ever the need arises without having a gun? They will surely be armed, because they fear no law, do not abide by laws, and will not register or turn in their guns if ordered to do so.

If we are compelled to register our guns, as people are in some states, did you ever stop to consider what this could mean if we were invaded? You say it can't happen here? Ask the people of Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Hungary and many others, and the answer will be very loud and clear. The invader simply avails himself of the gun registration records, and the populace is at their mercy.

The people of the United States have a record of getting an immense amount of legislation through Congress under a great deal of emotional pressure. Don't let this same thing happen again, based upon the misuse of a gun which was placed in the wrong hands.

What would have happened if President Kennedy had been killed in a plane crash or an auto accident? Should we then legislate against the proper use of planes and autos? I think not.

## . . . The Readers Write

We have a right in this country to keep and use our guns, as long as we don't misuse them, and I don't think we should have to continually fight for this right.

Do you think that we are civilized and sophisticated when every public figure must have police protection? I think not.

I do not believe that a gun should be placed in the hands of the unsupervised and untrained juvenile. I do not think that guns should be placed in the hands of the mentally incompetent. Neither do I believe that an automobile should be entrusted to these people.

What do you think?

### Thanks Staff

So little is said in thanks to the staff of the Herald and News for all its cooperation and service it gives to all publicity chairmen in all these organizations.

So will you please publish this thanks in the space you use for the letters to the editor.

I especially want to thank Dan Walters, grange news editor; Ruth King, Helen Bechen, June Johnson and last, but certainly not least, all the girls who answer the phone down there for their courtesy and kindness to me this past year. I know the new Midland publicity chairman will get the same.

Mayme Cammock, Publicity Chairman, Midland Grange.

### Stand Okay

Congratulations to the Herald and News (Dec. 5) for taking a stand against blaming the extremists for what took place in Dallas on Nov. 22. I would like to exercise my inalienable privilege of adding a few thoughts of my own. Saying we must stop all hating ("extremism") if we would curb violence such as this, is faulty, harmful advice.

If the late Lee Harvey Oswald is guilty of the crime committed on that day, his act certainly was not the culmination of all our hates, as some would have us believe. (Our good representative, Edith Green, for one.) That act had its seed

planted the day he opened a book entitled "Das Kapital" by Karl Marx. Has not Marx's theory of communism brought about more foul deeds than history can possibly record? — the murders, the purges, the enslavement of peoples? — the broken promises, the worthless treaties, the denouncement of democracy, of capitalism, of Almighty God?

I believe we do not hate enough that which we should hate. Our leaders shake hands with, back-slap, sup and consort with these advocates of Marxism, they do business with them, sign treaties with them, and make all the emerging nations wonder whose side we are on. They go to great ends to put a smile on Khrushchev's face when a frown would add greatly to my feeling of security.

Our government decrees that minorities have a right to be heard. I agree but I do not think they have a right to rule. Let them talk and rave. We needn't listen to them or hate them, but in some cases we can certainly hate what they stand for.

In the mid 1800s the slavery of the black people was opposed by many on moral grounds. Practice of it was hated by enough people to bring about its abolishment. The Communist form of slavery should be opposed on moral grounds also. We, as a nation should never go soft on it or let up in our hate for it. We are on very firm ground here with our government's roots in the sanctity of Almighty God. All we need to do is hold to it and act accordingly. Communism will fall if we stop helping it as we have been doing. Our experts from J. Edgar Hoover to Dwight Eisenhower refer time and again to "the fallacy of communism." A fallacy cannot stand for long.

Yes, the deed of Nov. 22 in Dallas was just one more dastardly act wrought by a mind twisted by this fallacy and deprived of its logic because it ruled out God in favor of Karl Marx.

Eleanor Thomson, Bly, Ore.

## State Editors Report Give Back Her Life

(Salem Statesman)

The American people are searching for some way to pay proper tribute to the widow of their martyred President. Her dignity—the British called it majesty — amid her grief assured her the devotion of Americans everywhere. We would suggest one which may be beyond the power of an overgrateful public to bestow. Simply let her return to private life.

Americans should have no trouble reminding themselves of what they do to their heroes. They pry into their private lives. They magnify their every move. They hound them unmercifully in the name of public interest.

Jackie Kennedy is still a young woman. Sooner or later she will lay aside her widow's weeds. The American public cannot expect she will remain a symbol of the act of an assassin. The task to which she must address herself is to find a new life into which she can fit the raising of her children.

The public took the past three years from this woman. The greatest gift it can now offer is to give her back her own life.

## Abdicated Responsibility

(Bend Bulletin)

Members of the Oregon Legislature have closed up shop for the time being. Most residents of the state, one gathers from the street-corner comments, are perfectly happy to have the legislators do so. The lawmakers, just as they did in the regular session earlier this year, managed to drag out their chore for a longer time than was felt necessary. By no means all of the extra length was caused by the Boardman hassle.

The Legislature, in one regard at least, abdicated what many feel was one of its prime responsibilities in the special session. This was the job of drawing up a sales tax proposal by the Legislature, to be submitted to the voters next year.

After the Oct. 15 special election, it was obvious some sort of sales tax proposal was in the works. A considerable portion of the vote against the Legislature's tax program was predicted upon the belief, perhaps mistaken, that such a vote would make a sales tax election mandatory.

Prior to the time the special session convened, it was known that at least three different groups were preparing sales tax measures for possible initiation. Each was busy grinding its own axe. Each exempted different things, and each treated the income from the potential tax in a different manner.

The only possible way to make sense out of the whole thing would have been for the Legislature to write a sales tax proposal itself. The Legislature is not perfect. But it does represent a wide variety of geographic, economic, and political differences in Oregon. Its membership was far better equipped to draw up a reasonable sales tax measure for submission to the voters than was any single pressure group. It is unfortunate it did not take that opportunity.

## Can He Do It?

(Eugene Register-Guard)

Already the railroads are at work, hammering out presidential and vice presidential tickets. Who, for example, will run on the ticket with President Johnson? Should he be a Catholic, a big city man, another and more conservative southerner? Ought he to come from the North, and ought he to have a record as a fighting liberal?

These questions are presumed to be important. But they are not as important as the larger question: Could he, if called upon, do the big job?

We have had some very competent men who were called to greater things than the voters anticipated. God willing, President Johnson will be among them. We must not forget that Theodore Roosevelt and Harry Truman, both of whom must be rated as "strong" in their leadership and ability to make decisions, came to the presidency in the wake of death.

But so, we must remember, did the hapless Andrew Johnson, and so did Tyler, Fillmore and Arthur, the three of them now all but forgotten. And so did Coolidge, who, whatever his merits, was sure no ball of fire.

And one shudders at the thought that some of our vice presidents, men right out of the "The Godfather" tradition, might have had to preside over the inauguration. Probably the tragic events of Nov. 22 will change this, at least in the next campaign, we pay more a attention to the running mate.



## IN WASHINGTON . . .

## One Way To Halt Waste

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

President Johnson has said that he wants a full dollar's value for every defense dollar spent. This is an admirable position to take—as if the idea were a new and unusual one. If the President really wants to cut out waste, I suggest that he call in Rep. Earl Wilson of Indiana to give him some help and advice.

It should be recalled that Mr. Wilson has carried on a one-man battle from the floor of the House to put a stop to improper and costly procurement procedures in the Defense Establishment. His main targets have been those civilian officials at the Pentagon who by-pass regulations by awarding contracts on a sole-source (non-competitive) basis. The law demands that contracts be let after competitive bidding, except in cases where an emergency prevents it.

For several years now, Representative Wilson has turned up case after case in which sole-source procurement has cost the taxpayer up to hundreds of times the proper price for defense equipment. Secretary McNamara reacted to the Wilson disclosures by cutting him off from the sources of his information and by attempting to treat him as a pariah.

The electronics industry, however, estimated that Mr. Wilson had saved the taxpayer some \$1 billion by his insistence on laying the facts before the Congress and the public. After some controversy, Mr. McNamara was forced to make information on defense contracts available once again to the Hoosier congressman. There were, moreover, fervent promises from the Pentagon that there would be no more sole-sourcing.

Those promises and a penny will get you a stack of gum. The service assistant secretaries have gone right back to their old practices. Representative Wilson, therefore, has returned to the attack. The figures he cites may seem picayune. Fifty-thousand or 100,000 wasted dollars may not seem much in this billion-dollar era. But when these sums are added up they come to millions and billions.

Recently, Mr. Wilson took to the floor to tell his colleagues how defense funds were being wasted. The cases are sometimes complex. But here is one in which \$120,000 went down the drain because someone at the Pentagon did not want to open bidding to all comers.

The Navy was purchasing AT 948-U antennas from one company for \$1,254 each—on a sole-source basis. An attack on this by Mr. Wilson led to the cancellation of the contract. Bids were invited and the low bidder won with a figure 69 per cent lower than what the Navy had been paying. (Now the AT 948-U cost us \$397 each.) The original manufacturer's quotation, let it be noted, was 42 per cent lower than his previous price. The savings on each antenna: \$857.

In another case, investigated by the General Accounting Office, the U.S. Army had paid about \$850,000 of the development costs on a navigational computer and then allowed the maker to retain all the patents—thereby forcing the Pentagon to buy at non-competitive prices. When Mr. Wilson protested, he got a rattle-dazzle answer which turned into apologies after the GAO report.

To give another example: The Navy issued a call for bids on the AS-1018-URC (XMI) antenna in a manner which the GAO described as "less than fully revealing." The wording, whether deliberate or not, was such as to frighten

away competitors. Representative Wilson's complaint was brushed aside and the offending words were defended by Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris, who told reporters: "We haven't found anything we consider a departure from good practice." Nevertheless, exposure forced the Pentagon to change the wording of the invitation for bids. By that time, \$50,000 had been wasted in overpayments. But in allowing competitive bidding, another \$108,000 which would have been lost was saved.

It is no wonder, then, that Mr. Wilson says, "Our defense dollar is buying less than 50 cents worth. This is the reason the tax bill is higher every year."

The Wilson dossier on improper procurement by the Defense Department would fill several books. Representative Wilson's experience in spotting this wastage of public funds is invaluable. If President Johnson meant what he said about "frugality," and I am certain he did, then Mr. Wilson should be invited to the White House and asked to pitch in. The job is tremendous, but it can be done.

## Agriculture Agency May Surpass Farmers

(National Association of Manufacturers Editorial)

The day is not far off when the Department of Agriculture will be larger than agriculture itself, if present trends continue. Even today, the department's own projections into 1964 show farmers with a net income of less than \$12 billion. And the department's budget is half that, \$6 billion.

Almost \$2 billion of the department's budget is used for payment to farmers, and that is included in the figure for the farmers' incomes. The rest of that department budget—about \$4 billion—goes for many purposes, ranging from a salary for Orville Freeman to research into Dutch elm disease.

Lots of the department's budget is spent on shipping surplus food out of the country, an activity in which it has engaged with a certain devil-may-care attitude, to judge by the record of millions of bushels of lost wheat. Lots more is spent storing past surpluses, which represent the failures of past policies. The feed grains program, which has cost hundreds of millions of dollars, is about to re-

sult in larger surpluses of corn than ever, so the present policies don't seem to offer much hope either.

So, the Agriculture Department's budget is likely to grow faster in the future than the farmers' income, as Luther G. Tweeten, an economist at Oklahoma State University, sees it.

By his figures, farm programs could cost us from \$2.6 to \$10.1 billion a year by 1967. Net farm income in 1967 he sees falling to \$7.4 billion by then, if the Agriculture Department's programs are niggardly, or \$14.5 billion if they are financially generous but with total controls over the farmers.

Either way, the Agriculture Department's income in 1967 appears to be bound to be far more than half as large as that of the farmers it was set up to serve.

Out of all this emerges a theory for Washington: If you want to grow, fall to solve a temporary problem. Then you will be given more money to perpetuate the problem. Avoid finding a solution, and your agency will live and grow forever.