

## For Feldman

I would like to urge University students to re-elect Gary Feldman to the I.F.C. Last year Gary served as vice-chair for the committee and is currently serving as chair. He is also presently serving on the EMU Board. Gary's past experience and level-headed objectivity with your incidental fees, undoubtedly makes him the most qualified person among the sixteen candidates in the race. Gary has demonstrated the ability to weigh carefully all considerations involved in the budgeting process before reaching the most equitable decision. I believe that his candidacy represents a true choice for you, the students, and an opportunity to have your needs and considerations dealt with fairly. Again, let me urge you to re-elect Gary Feldman to the I.F.C.

Gail Ehman  
Senior, History

## Not within rights

Letter to James MacDonald, English major:

This is a reply to your Thursday, October 7, 1976 letter, Mr. MacDonald. You stated, and I quote, "But, if people fire a person on the basis of what that person thinks (?) or says, especially in jest (?), then there is something wrong with the way we seem to define freedom of speech. Butz has that freedom too."

Sir, a person(s) in the capacity of representing an organized structure such as the U.S. Agriculture Department has no or very little freedom of speech on certain sensitive issues as "off-color" cracks, etc. I put this statement in the context of public opinion. If Butz has thoughts and sentences of these kinds he should keep them where they will do the least harm — behind closed doors and not in press conferences.

But in the firing, let us remember that Butz was an advocate of these attitudes and policies not the executive who carried out these policies but only an advocate!

Adisa Oluwa  
Psychology

## Food facts faulty

In a recent editorial, you state (1) that one percent of the nation's farms produce 25 percent of the nation's food and (2) that Del Monte absorbs 80 percent of the country's vegetables. You conclude that we have an oligopoly in food production and distribution in this country.

In 1974, however, the one percent of most productive U.S. farms numbered some 28,000 units — sufficient, I submit, to provide each other with substantial competition. Not to mention competition from the other 99 percent!

As for your Del Monte assertion, it is so much fruit salad. According to the U.S. Statistical Abstract, U.S. farmers marketed some \$5.2 billion of fruits and vegetables in 1974 whereas Del Monte's Annual Report indicates the company paid about \$200 million for the U.S. fruits and vegetables it processed that year. Thus, Del Monte absorbed less than four percent of U.S. farm output of fruits and vegetables — 1/20th of the fraction you give.

Your editorial also states: "Foods are overprocessed and laden with possibly dangerous additives because the more a company can do to a commodity the more they can charge for it." But we now have no price controls on food at any stage of production in this country. And while particular sellers may ask whatever they like — whether for potatoes, potato chips, or potatoes au gratin served amid incense and violin music — no one has to buy their product. In particular, those worried about additives and excessive processing are free to eat raw organic carrots — skins and all. As Chairman Mao never said, "Long live consumer choice and the free market."

Henry N. Goldstein  
Professor, Economics

## White House wit

The Honorable Elliot Richardson  
Secretary of Commerce  
Department of Commerce  
Washington, D.C.

Sir,

During your appearance at the University of Oregon the evening of 11 October 1976 you recited with approval the following aphorism: "Never run after a woman or a bus, there will be another one along in a minute." This statement certainly seems to equate, in terms of relative importance, women and buses. While, as a male, I do not find this remark personally denigrating, I am personally offended by the fact that my mother, wife, sisters and daughter can be maligned by a Cabinet Officer in such a cavalier fashion. Unfortunately, time did not allow an unlimited question and answer period following your speech, and I was unable to question you personally concerning the propriety of your remark. Had I been allowed that privilege, I would have asked the following questions:

(1) Does your remark indicate that you (a) assign a low priority to women's rights, or (b) assign a high priority to public transportation?

(2) Does the use of the anecdote, in which this statement appeared, indicate that you have relieved Earl Butz in his former duties of White House Wit?

(3) If the answer to question (2) is in the affirmative, do you know any good ethnic jokes?

W.B. Cole  
357½ N 16th  
Springfield, OR

## Views clarified

Thanks for covering the debate between Dave Frohnmayer and myself on Thursday at Harris Hall.

Just two or three points I'd like to make:

Field burning — I'm quoted as saying "I will stand firm against attacks on the field burning phase down." When I said "I think we have to be realistic" I believe I went on to say that the rest of the state would probably not be sympathetic to our plight here in Eugene. But this makes no difference to my stand in opposition to field burning. I am in total opposition.

I am completely in opposition to repeal of land use planning, which I feel is vital to Oregon's future.

Rosemary Batori  
Democrat for State Legislature  
District 40

## Lansing for State Treasurer

Clay Myers, Republican candidate for treasurer, was probably right when he said, "to many people it's (the treasurer's office) an invisible office." We're convinced Myers would make the office more visible, but not necessarily better.

Myers can't run for Secretary of State again, the people have told him three times he can't be governor and it would seem he's running for treasurer because it's the only office left.

Democrat Jewel Lansing, on the other hand, is making her first try for state-wide office. She is seeking the job because of a sincere feeling she's qualified for it and can serve the state well. We agree.

At 46, Lansing is currently the Multnomah County Auditor and up to 1974 spent 12 years working as a certified public accountant.

The most important task of the state treasurer is managing the state's investment funds. More than \$2 billion are invested by the state, and the interest earned

is used to offset taxes and provide funds for public employee retirement plans. Lansing's interest in and work with financial management have prepared her to keep state funds working every day. Lansing has also stressed that she will work to keep state investments within state borders whenever possible, a plan Myers would not be as committed to.

Additionally, Lansing has promised to simplify tax forms so people won't have to hire professional tax experts and has advocated providing an option to public employees on how their retirement monies are invested.

As treasurer, Lansing would be a member of the state land board, which administers state-owned lands. Lansing has the endorsement of the Oregon League of Environmental Voters and would strike a good balance between the need for state revenues and the need to protect the state's livability.

Oregon's voters should place Jewel Lansing in the office of treasurer.

## The minor measures: good and bad

One of the best reasons to go to the polls this November will be to vote on the 12 state ballot measures.

Three of the measures, nuclear safeguards, land-use planning and state campaign financing, are of vital importance and have sparked much debate. These will be examined in detail in these columns at a later date.

The remaining nine are less controversial, more obscure, obviously good or obviously bad ideas. It is important that the good ones be passed and the bad ones rejected.

**MEASURE NUMBER 12** — Anyone who votes for this turkey ought to have his head examined. Number 12 would repeal huge chunks of Oregon law, making regional cooperation between local governments impossible or illegal. It plays upon an understandable fear of Big Brother in government and attacks one of the most promising and progressive movements in government, the move toward regional coordination. Vote no on 12.

**MEASURE NUMBER 6** — This is the one that would allow churches and charities to sponsor bingo games. Our reaction is, why not? Organized crime isn't likely to take over grandma's favorite charity, and the organizations that would be allowed to sponsor the games can always use more money. Number 6 would be a painless and potentially amusing way of giving worthy causes a new source of revenue. Vote yes on 6.

**MEASURE NUMBER 11** — Fluoridation is a tricky issue. This measure would prohibit fluoridation of community water supplies, but mistakes in the wording of the measure limit its scope and allow slaughterhouses and feed lots to contaminate water supplies without violating the law. The question of whether a government has the right to add a chemical substance to water should be debated, and concern about the possible long-term effects of fluoride have been raised. Still, the measure is poorly drafted and should be defeated. Vote no on 11.

**MEASURE NUMBER 8** — This measure would increase Oregon's gas tax, and through the miracle of matching funds bring \$100 million to the state Highway Fund. This would be a user tax, raising fuel taxes by a penny per gallon and commercial mileage rates by an average of 26 per cent.

Commercial traffic would pay most, though perhaps still not enough, of the increase. All in all measure number 8 sounds like a good deal. Vote yes on 8.

**MEASURE NUMBER 5** — Measure 5 is a constitutional amendment that would allow the legislature to call itself into special session. Currently the Governor is the only one who can do this. Special sessions, though historically rare, have become quite frequent in recent years. The power to convene the legislature in an emergency situation should be a legislative as well as a gubernatorial prerogative. Vote yes on 5.

**MEASURE NUMBER 4** — This measure gives voters a chance to repeal legislation that was the product of cold war paranoia. Number 4 is aimed at a section of the constitution which was designed to make it easy to fill state offices at a time of emergency, meaning enemy attack. The section measure 4 would repeal involves the state in costly busywork and listkeeping, and order of succession to state office is already well outlined in other parts of the state constitution. Vote yes on 4.

**MEASURE NUMBER 3** — Number 3 would allow 18-year-old Oregon citizens to serve in the legislature. Few people are swayed by arguments charging 18-year-olds with immaturity or lack of political consciousness. 18-year-olds pay taxes, vote and serve in the armed forces. Vote yes on 3.

**MEASURE NUMBER 2** — It often seems that city and county elections take the back seat in voters' minds when they are held at the same time at state and national elections. Measure 2 would allow the legislature to study the possibility of holding local elections on a different date. Changing the date might lead to lower turnouts for local races, but awareness of local issues might be higher if voters were not distracted by state and national politics. The legislature should examine both sides of the question. Vote yes on 2.

**MEASURE NUMBER 1** — This one is a natural. There is really no excuse for voting no. What it does is streamline the law-making process by amending the constitution so that if two laws are passed that amend the same section of existing law both laws hold good so long as they don't conflict. Number 1 eliminates a constitutional oddity that has served as loophole in the past. Vote yes on 1.