

SPORTSMEN — DO YOU LIKE TO HUNT?

An Editorial

Asking a question like this may sound as silly as asking an amorous Swain if he likes girls! But, it leads us up to another very good question: Do you have a good place to go hunting for whatever game you want — or is most of the best gameland posted by the land owners?

Hunting is a thrilling sport. It gives a man a chance to get away from that day-to-day pressure that builds up from "bringing home the bacon" for the family. It gives him a chance to absorb the great outdoors and inhale that good clean fresh air in our surrounding hills and valleys. It also gives him a chance to relax as well as to be alone with his thoughts and commune with nature.

However, Hunting ALSO demands a great personal responsibility involving the safety of others — as well as the property of the land owner where you are more than likely a guest.

Every year many innocent people are wounded or killed needlessly by the improper use and handling of guns — and a great deal of property damage is done by careless, thoughtless or downright mean individuals carrying guns, under the guise of a hunter.

The Hunting Season has just barely begun — and already we have a report from a land owner who wishes to thank the trespassers on his property for their efforts in letting the air out of the tires of his hay baler as well as going to the trouble to remove the spark plug wires from the engine. He also told us that a gate was left open — as the ambitious hunter apparently didn't want to over exert himself by getting out to close it — while driving down to the woods where he wanted to hunt. Result — the farmer's sheep left their pasture and ate up 5 acres of oats which were about ready to be cut and threshed.

Now, can you truthfully say that you blame this Farmer — or any other Farmer — when he puts a padlock on each gate, and posts his land?

The one thing that many Hunters apparently fail to realize is that a hunting license doesn't give you the right to hunt on private property UNLESS you have permission from the property owner! (Even if the land isn't POSTED).

Since we are on the subject of hunting, we may as well pass along a timely reminder to Parents as well as Hunters — to check over all hunting weapons and the safety rules and regulations that should be observed while handling firearms.

After checking with several law enforcement agencies, here are some suggestions that should be followed:

For Parents: Don't Buy or Let Your Son Buy — or even Borrow an OLD gun to go hunting with! Buy a good second hand one, or if possible, a new one. At any rate, have it checked by a reputable local gun dealer — and also find out the kind and type of ammunition that can safely be used in it.

Make sure that your son knows the proper way to handle a gun and knows the State Conservation Laws and Regulations that are in effect in your locality. **Teach him to respect other peoples property!**

FOR ALL HUNTERS: Always consider every gun loaded until proven otherwise.

Never point a gun at **Anyone!**

Never look down the barrel of a gun to see if it is plugged or loaded — always open it and check from the receiver end.

Never climb through or over a fence without first unloading the gun.

Be extra careful in loading or unloading guns near cars, highways, or around other hunters. Remember also — It is a violation of the Conservation Law to have a loaded firearm ON or IN a Vehicle!

Last, but not least—follow all other safety regulations and laws and, above all — remember, a Hunting License is a Privilege that can be revoked!



50 YEARS AGO

Oct. 20, 1916

J. H. Backus, Publisher

Mrs. Laura Witter was installed as Noble Grand of the Andover Rebekah Lodge Wednesday evening.

Miss Anna Livermore of South Hill is visiting at the home of her brother, C. O. Livermore and family in Chicago, Ill.

Miss Celia D. Riley attended the Tracy-Corran wedding at Hornell Wednesday.

M. S. Moran of Cleveland, Ohio was visiting his father-in-law, John Kilbane, Saturday.

Mrs. B. E. Johnson of Chardon, Ohio, is a guest of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Will Burger.

A. R. Baker returned Saturday from New York City where he had been visiting his sister for a week.

Mr. and Mrs. F. L. Bloss returned Monday from several days visit with their son, Prof. L. M. Bloss.

Fred Snyder of Argentine, Kansas, has been visiting his mother, brothers and sisters in Andover this week.

Miss Caroline Hinehart left Hornell Monday for New York City, where she has accepted a position as bookkeeper in one of the large stores.

40 YEARS AGO

Oct. 8, 1926

J. H. Backus & Son, Publishers

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lynch are the parents of a son, born Wednesday, October 6th.

Miss Lillian Whitford and Jesse Clark of Hartsville Hill, were united in marriage Wednesday, October 6th by Rev. Edgar Van Horn of Alfred Station.

W. F. O'Connell was pleasantly surprised Friday evening, October 1st, by a group of friends and neighbors in honor of his birthday.

Harold Hardy and family of Independence have moved to Andover, where he will run a barber shop.

Miss Grace Burdick of Geneseo Normal is passing the week-end with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Menzo Burdick.

Mr. and Mrs. D. D. Wallace of Perry, were from Thursday until Monday guests at the home of his son, Mr. and Mrs. Benj. Wallace.

Lawrence Hunt of Washington, D. C., came Saturday for a two weeks visit with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jesse Hunt.

Mrs. Emily Perry has been visiting the past week at the home of Clifford Ormsby of Alfred Station.

Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Walters and Mr. and Mrs. Michael Cannon visited John W. Cannon Saturday, and Sunday at Mt. Jewett, Pa., where they saw the Kinzua bridge 103 feet in height and 2,250 feet in length, near Mt. Jewett.

30 YEARS AGO

Oct. 9, 1936

J. H. Backus & Son, Publisher

Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Cartwright have purchased the G. B. Proper farm in East Valley.

Leo DeRemer is working in the Harrison Radio Factory in New Jersey.

Lawrence Cocoman, not to let Andover be outdone by any other village, picked a quantity of fine red raspberries Saturday, October 3rd.

Miss Florence Grantier of Little Valley is visiting Mrs. Charles Clarke of Independence.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Halsey of Angelica were weekend guests of their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Halsey of Davis Hill.

Mr. and Mrs. Steve Ordiway of Davis Hill are the parents of a daughter, born last week.

Mr. and Mrs. Fred Updyke and family of West Union spent Sunday at the home of her sister, Mr. and Mrs. Dan Witter.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Church and daughter, Roberts, motored to Bath Sunday where Miss Church entered the Bath Extension School.

Benj. Reisman returned to his home in Philadelphia, Pa., Thursday after passing three weeks with his brother, Simon Reisman.

Coming Constitutional Convention

By J. Murdoch Dawley Professor of Political Science, State University of Fredonia

Who should select our judges? Should the fact that candidates are Republicans or Democrats be one of the bases for their selection? These are questions which will confront the 1967 State Constitutional Convention.

Present Constitutional provisions require the election of most judges "by the electors" of the particular area in which the judges have jurisdiction. One exception is the Court of Claims whose members are appointed by the Governor. In those courts in which election is by the voters the nominations of candidates are made by political parties. This is done by party conventions for Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, and by direct primary for the lesser courts.

There are several alternatives. One is the system of nonpartisan nominations and elections now used in a dozen states. This retains selection by the voters, but eliminates party labels. Another is the federal system of appointment by the chief executive with the consent of the Senate. The supporters of this system assert that a president or governor is better acquainted with qualities needed for a judge than the voters are. Opponents feel that it is no less political than election and is undesirable because it removes all direct authority from the voters.

A compromise which its supporters say involves the best elements of the two systems is one which is found in California, Missouri, and in several newly adopted state constitutions. This involves appointment by the governor,

either from a list of three given him by a bipartisan commission which includes the chief justice and members designated by the Bar Association, or with approval by such a body. The appointee serves for a year and then the voters vote on whether or not to retain him. He is thus not running as a party member nor is he running against a party member. He is simply running on his record. If the voters approve, he serves a full term; if not, there is a vacancy to be filled by the same process. At the end of his term the voters again vote on whether to retain him for another term. Supporters of this procedure claim that it eliminates political partisanship as much as possible, provides for original nomination and appointment by professional experts and gives the voters the final say. Opponents say it is too involved and does not give the people enough direct voice.

REDUCE COURTS

Another important question concerns the structure of the whole court system. Article VI of the Constitution does indeed provide that "there shall be a unified court system for the state," but it does not go on to provide one. One way to accomplish this is to build the court system with a district court as the basic unit. This would in effect eliminate town, village, city and county courts, and replace them with a single court in each district. Supporters feel that this will take the financial burden off local units and thus give more uniform support, simplify court structures and make it more efficient and economical. Opponents assert that present local courts are desirable because they are close to the people, can quickly resolve their minor problems, and that the people have more confidence in them.

LESS TRIAL BY JURY

A third matter which is equally contentious is the question of abolishing jury trials in civil cases, especially in negligence lawsuits. Supporters say this will diminish court congestion by speeding up the procedures, will keep verdicts to more reasonable amounts, and will substitute the trained and experienced evaluation of a judge for the untrained and sometimes emotional evaluation of a jury. Opponents claim that this will reduce judicial procedure to a mechanical activity, will substitute the decision of a single disinterested judge for that of a dozen interested human beings, and that the system has worked well for a long time.

These problems and others affecting our courts will be studied, debated, and answered in one way

or another by the Constitutional Convention delegates who will be elected on November 8.

Should an 18-year old person be allowed to vote? Do today's 18-year olds know as much politically as their grandparents did at 21? If a person is allowed to drink and compelled to fight for his country when he is 18 should that entitle him to vote at the age? These questions, and many more like them will be asked at the State Constitutional Convention next year when the question of voting qualifications is presented to it.

Requirements in this state have remained unchanged for a long time. United States citizenship and 21 years of age are traditional. All states have the citizenship requirement, but Georgia and Kentucky have the 18 year minimum age, it is 19 in Alaska and 20 in Hawaii. Proponents of 18 years insist that today's education puts this group ahead of people of 21 a century ago. They see the "old enough to fight" argument and also assert that most young people become interested in politics and government in high school but will lose that interest if compelled to wait for another 3 years before putting it in operation.

Opponents say that 18-year olds may know many facts, but lack the maturity of experience to make sufficiently intelligent use of them. Further, the impact of juvenile delinquency is on the rise, and inasmuch as much of it occurs in the 18-21 group this shows that they should not be trusted with the ballot. Also, it is said that members of this group are much more susceptible to propaganda and emotion than their more sophisticated and stable elders. What do you think should be done?

The present State Constitution requires the ability "to read and write English." The 1966 Federal Voting Rights Act specifies that "no person who has successfully completed the 6th primary grade in a public school, or in a private school, accredited by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the language of instruction was other than English shall be denied the right to vote in any election because of his inability to read or write English." What did this do to our State Constitutional provision?

The question has certainly been answered for the time being by a June 13th U.S. Supreme Court decision that the Federal statute prevails over the New York State Constitutional provision which is thereby invalidated. Two of the nine judges dissented, though on rather technical grounds. The problem still remains what specific provision shall be put into a revised State Constitution in the light of this decision?

Quite possibly the matter of the shortening of residence requirements will be decided by the voters through their November 8 vote on Amendment Proposal No. 6. This changes the present requirement of one year in the state, four months in the county, and 30 days in the district (except for presidential elections) to 3 months in the State and also in the voter's county, city, or village. Should this be rejected, the Convention will be faced with the problem of producing a modification which will be acceptable, for there seems to be strong sentiment that the one year requirement is too long for a citizenry which is as mobile as ours.

The question of shifting from nomination of statewide candidates by primary is proving contentious. The state legislature's attempts to do this have been met by gubernatorial veto. A primary for this purpose will not be really new, for it was used in New York State prior to the adoption of the present provision in 1921.

Supporters of the primary feel that a Constitutional requirement is the only sure way of achieving it, and feel that the nominations will more nearly reflect the choice of party members. Supporters of the convention assert that a better selection results from the method we have been using since 1921. One possible compromise is a runoff primary upon the demand of a candidate who had received more than 25% of the vote of the delegates to a convention. Arguments have been heard pro and con whether this device favors a candidate of great wealth.

THE ANDOVER NEWS

Published Weekly by: The News Printing House, Andover, N. Y.

Jeanne Backus Allen and Ralph A. Allen, Owners, Andover, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at the Post Office at Andover

N. Y., under the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879.

Subscription Price \$3.50 a year