

the Presidency

Editor's note: The Emerald has offered editorial space to all the candidates for President of the United States whose organizations we were able to contact. The candidates were asked to deal primarily with student issues. Articles from all who respond will be printed.

Oregon Students for Carter will present the argument for their candidate in Wednesday's Emerald.

Gus Hall for President

Things are not good. They are not getting better. The continued deterioration of the quality of life in this country, and this state, constitute a crisis that now reaches out to engulf the once seemingly comfortable life of a student at the University of Oregon. Tuition is rising faster than income. Opportunities for fruitful summer or part time employment are shrinking rapidly. Career opportunities for university graduates are dim, and looking dimmer every spring. Teaching faculties are shrinking, classes are getting larger, facilities of every kind from gym space and laboratories to library collections are diminishing. Housing is becoming scarce and expensive.

The Democratic and Republican parties have ruled this country for more than a century, and they have given us a rising crime rate, rampant corruption at the highest levels of government, and a virulent racism as a legacy to pass on to future generations. A vote for either of the ruling parties in the coming elections is a vote for more of the same.

The Communist candidates Hall & Tyner promise a policy of free tuition and free books for all students, for more housing, and rent controls, and better high schools and elementary schools. This can be done by re-ordering the priorities of this country away from huge budgets for the military and peanuts for the rest of us. This can be done by taking many of the large industries out of the hands of the profiteers and turning them to production for the public good.

Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner have a Communist answer. It is jobs at home. Thirty hours work for forty hours pay and full employment for all. The Communist answer is a national medical care program.

To a greater and greater extent, what happens in the foreign policy arena has a direct impact on domestic programs. Any politician who supports the cold war policies of the past five administrations while professing to be for detente is not only deceiving himself but they are also rendering a public disservice.

The Communist Party stands for stopping the Cold War, ending military adventures overseas, and disbanding the CIA. We also associate ourselves with the Black liberation struggles in Southern Africa.

Every vote for the Communist candidates is a clear warning to the ruling parties, a warning that the people are prepared to strike back at the insane system of super-profits, super-unemployment, and super-pentagon war budgets. You can be sure that each vote will be heard by the old line politicians. The larger a Communist vote in November the more clearly will the message be stated that the American people have begun to search for political answers that will mean peace rather than war, prosperity rather than poverty, jobs rather than idleness, love and respect among peoples rather than racism. As the Communist Party is not on the ballot in this state we are conducting a write in campaign. The method is relatively simple. You can write in the names of Gus Hall for President and Jarvis Tyner for Vice President when you vote. Make your vote count this year—VOTE COMMUNIST!

Submitted by the Oregon Committee For the Election of Gus Hall for President and Jarvis Tyner for Vice President on the Communist Party Ticket.

endorsements

'Just plain Blaine' for no. 2 spot

The secretary of state is Oregon's number two political honcho.

The differences between the two candidates for the office this year are not great, and both are well-qualified for the job. Several minor considerations add up, however, causing the Emerald to urge voters to choose the Democrat, Blaine Whipple, over the Republican, Norma Paulus.

One of these considerations is the contrast between the voting records of the two candidates on taxation issues. As a member of the state senate, Whipple voted for HB-2006, a corporate tax increase, and HB-2008, a personal income tax increase on incomes over \$30,000 a year. As a member of the House of Representatives, Paulus opposed both measures. The secretary of state supervises the State Audit Bureau, and it would be better to have someone unsympathetic to big money interests in that position.

Paulus and Whipple also differ on the issue of public financing of state campaigns. Whipple supports ballot measure number 7, and Paulus opposes it. Paulus has managed to outspend Whipple three-to-one so far in the campaign; obviously

she doesn't think she needs public help. As Oregon's chief elections officer, the secretary of state should place the interests of the people above those of corporate campaign donors.

Both Whipple and Paulus support the notion of performance audits of state agencies, and both would like to see "sunset laws" that would cause agencies to be disbanded when their function was fulfilled. Neither Paulus nor Whipple would bring any drastic changes to the State Land Board, and the Oregon Environmental Council rates both candidates about the same. On the more important issues in the race, the choice between Whipple and Paulus is a tossup.

Whipple, however, deserves support because of his proven record of imaginative lawmaking (Whipple sponsored legislation exempting the 1974 federal tax rebate from state taxation and legislation that requires interest to be paid on property tax reserve payments) and his commendable stands on campaign financing.

Vote for Blaine Whipple for secretary of state.

Yes on 7 for clean government

We have seen public campaign financing work at the national level, and this fall, Oregon voters have the opportunity to approve an even better system for state races.

Ballot measure number 7 has been endorsed by nearly everyone in the state, from Gov. Straub to the Oregon Student Lobby, and for good reason. Measure 7 would make it nearly impossible to buy an election in Oregon.

It would work like this: taxpayers would check a box on their state tax return similar to the one on federal tax forms allowing the state to place \$1.50 of their taxes in a campaign fund.

After the primaries, candidates would begin raising money on their own, same as always. The state campaign fund would provide matching funds up to \$90,000 for major state races, \$4,900 for state senate races, and \$2,450 for House candidates.

But if private contributions to a particular campaign exceed the limit of matching funds, the amount the state kicks in will

decline by that amount. So if a candidate for governor, for instance, manages to raise \$100,000 in private contributions, the amount of state money available to that person would be only \$80,000.

The great advantage of this system, and of all public campaign financing schemes, is that candidates are less likely to owe favors to campaign donors. Oregon politicians would owe their political favors to the people of Oregon. What is more, politicians would have time to do things besides raise money.

Measure 7 also requires that state campaign money be spent on communication. The matching funds would have to go for radio and television spots, campaign literature and so on. The money could not be spent on travel, fancy offices or staff salaries.

The only fault with measure number 7 is that it applies only to the general election, not the primaries. Even so, it should open the electoral process to newcomers.

Vote yes on ballot measure number 7.

Letters

Gamer for IFC

The Incidental Fee Committee must allocate \$1.3 million of your money as it sees fit. Without that

money there would be no coffee buzzed political raps in the EMU, nor the many service related organizations that now exist on this campus. As for the justification of these services, just ask someone

in ESCAPE whether their time is well spent, or an individual in the Survival Center the importance of what they are working for.

Of course there are issues surrounding the IFC. Should

minorities get money? I say yes. When they have the steam to organize and they show positive efforts towards the self-realization of an individual, they will get my support. How about athletics? The administration would like a set fee taken directly from the students' tuition going towards sports. This would take away student control over this money that we now have. I firmly believe we should have a say in sports-related money.

There currently exists a myriad of around 50 organizations that receive fractions of our cash. One way to help make more money available for these or alternative groups, would be the awareness of certain budgetary control methods. A function of the IFC should be to work with these groups in showing how money can be saved.

Up in Salem there are legislators and administrators that seem to be far removed from alternatives aimed to improve the system of higher education. I plan to lobby for measures that would put in motion greater self-determination for students.

If you can picture this school as a stew with tidbits of OSPRG, Inter-Fraternity Council and other morsels simmering; and then you toss in chunks from your frig, such as suggestions and some effort, there's bound to be quite a feast this year.

Gary Gamer
Senior, International Business
Candidate for IFC

Quiet or passive?

To Don Loving, Kurt Williams and Lee Errend, candidates for freshman class offices, I'd like to express my respect for the quietness of your campaigns. I do, however, hope that if and when you are elected to office, you will not be equally as passive. If you are, the story of this freshman class will be that of most across the country — a lack of a voice in student affairs and chronic apathy concerning university activities.

Liz Butcher
Candidate—fresh sec.
Tuesday, October 19, 1976

