

Freeman ad a cheap shot

"Honesty in government," say State Reps. Paul Hanneman, R-Cloverdale, and Roger Martin, R-Lake Oswego, in an ad in Friday's Springfield News, "begins with honesty in campaigning." If the honesty the two exhibit in the ad is any indication of their conduct in office, an investigation should be called immediately.

According to the ad, Democratic candidate in District 42 Nancie Fadeley has been falsely claiming original sponsorship of the Oregon Bottle Bill. To support their claim, Hanneman and Martin quote an Oregonian story which introduces Fadeley with the phrase, "known for her sponsorship of the bottle bill..."

C'mon. It's obvious the writer mistakenly gave Fadeley credit for sponsoring the bill, not that she took the credit herself. Besides, a quick review of the legislation shows that Fadeley's bottle bill credentials are in order.

Originally introduced in 1969 by three Republicans, including Martin and Hanneman, the bottle bill was not passed until 1971. Even then, the bill was less than effective. The '71 legislation was worded in such a way that grocery stores were refusing to give deposits on beer bottles to minors (the legislation required deposits returned to consumers, and stores argued kids couldn't consume beer) and the penalties for non-standard bottles could not be enforced. In 1973, Fadeley entered the picture.

During the '73 session, Fadeley chaired the House Committee on Environment and Land Use and it was this committee that plugged the loopholes in the earlier bill. The bottle bill wouldn't have been the success it has if those changes hadn't been made, and it's interesting to note that Hanneman voted against the bill as it came out of Fadeley's committee.

For Hanneman to call Fadeley dishonest and then take credit for the success of the bottle bill when he voted against it in its final form is like Earl Butz calling Gen. George Brown indiscreet.

The crowning touch, though, is that Hanneman, Martin and Fadeley's opponent Vance Freeman, R-Springfield, (whose campaign funds paid for the ad) waited until the last edition before the election to make their charges. The three attacked Fadeley knowing full well she would have no chance to respond. It's the kind of cheap shot we've come to expect from Martin, but it's a shame Freeman has adopted the style for his own.

Roger, Paul and Vance, the next time you're sitting around complaining that people aren't voting, remember it's the use of half-truths and loose logic like yours that have tainted American politics to the point many people no longer want anything to do with them.

For Stewart

According to the Oregon Environmental Council, representative Mary Burrows had the worst environmental record in 1975 of the five representatives of the urban Eugene-Springfield area.

With environmental matters becoming more and more important we must question why Republican Burrows environmental record became worse in the last session. Rep. Burrows, reflecting the views of industry, voted against timber taxes — taxes which were designed for conservation. She has extensive support in her campaign from the forest products industry. She voted against needed regulations on outdoor billboards. People in the billboard industry have given Burrows, a Republican, financial support in her campaigns.

Mary Burrows voted against legislation to support the Willamette Greenway. The Oregon Environmental Council called this "perhaps the biggest environmental defeat of the year."

John Stewart, the Democratic candidate, has been endorsed by the Survival Center for his strong environmental views. He has demonstrated this by his dedicated work with Oregonians for Nuclear Safeguards.

Let's replace our Republican representative with John Stewart. He's concerned with our future, and not repaying political debts by selling out on environmental issues.

Warren Westfall
Junior — Political Science

Charges unfair

Last minute paid advertising charges by my opponent have tried to discredit my connection with the Oregon bottle bill by saying that I was not an "original sponsor."

I have never claimed to be an "original sponsor" as a bottle bill was introduced before I was a member of the Oregon Legislature. That bill failed to pass.

The bottle bill which passed

after I was elected to the House had some serious loopholes which threatened its workability. In 1973, I was chairman of the committee which revised the bottle bill to close those loopholes. My work with the existing bottle bill law has been widely recognized. I have been called to testify about it by legislators in other states. Former Governor McCall is among the many who have praised my bottle bill efforts.

It is significant that these charges which question my honesty have not been made during the campaign (Freeman failed to show up to our scheduled debate in the Forum last week even though he promised he would), but instead are being put out by paid advertising at the last minute.

It is also significant that the statement which my opponent uses in an effort to discredit me is one by Republican House leader Roger Martin.

Martin obviously made this last minute attack because he wants to be Speaker of the House and thus put the Oregon House of Representatives under Republican control. He is making similar attacks on other Democrats running for the House.

Nancie Fadeley
State Representative
District 42

12 raises doubts

The Joint Land Use Committee of the Oregon Legislature is concerned about ballot measure 12, which the state's voters will act upon on November 2. The full effects of the measure are unclear, but important questions have been raised.

— Measure 12 does away with the Columbia Region Association of Governments. What will happen to federal funds for water quality, highway, and other programs received by the Association? Will Oregon lose this money?

— Measure 12 eliminates all other regional councils of government. Who will take over their coordination functions in different parts of the state?

— Measure 12 repeals laws allowing local governments to enter into voluntary agreements. Will this affect agreements for water service and police or fire protection?

No one has offered a good answer to these questions, and it is possible that ballot measure 12 causes more problems than it tries to solve. We urge voters to look it over carefully.

Representative Stephen
Kafoury,
Chairman
Joint Legislative Committee on
Land Use



The Emerald does not intend to endorse a presidential candidate. We feel there is little we can add to the debate already presented on these pages and in other media. We also realize that no candidate's presidential hopes hinge on our opinion while the effect we may have on a few races closer to home may be significant.

endorsements

County measures: good and bad, cheap and costly

There are sure to be some Lane County voters who go to the polls Tuesday for no other reason than to vote on county ballot measure number 21, the much-discussed nudity ban.

Measure 21 would make it illegal for anyone over eight years old to be naked anywhere in the county. The measure would provide for fines up to \$1,000 and jail sentences of up to 30 days for getting caught. The County Commissioners would have the authority to designate certain areas where nudity is permitted.

Apparently sponsors of the measure think discretion and taste must be legislated. Nudity is offensive to many people and is inappropriate under most circumstances. We think most people who are inclined to bathe in the buff are conscious of this and that Lane County does not need a law to remind them of it.

Neither candidate for Lane County Sheriff has said he would make an effort to enforce measure 21 if it passes. Measure 21 would be another piece of public morals legislation that would be enforced selectively, and selective enforcement is worse than no enforcement at all.

We encourage people who are offended by public nudity to let naked people know about it. There must be a more direct means of reaching an accommodation than calling in the sheriff. Vote no on 21.

Another issue that has sparked much discussion is the proposed reorganization of the board of county commissioners. Two plans have emerged,

each intended to address the legitimate gripe of Lane County's rural areas that they are under-represented on the commission. Neither plan, we think, deserves approval.

Measure 16 would increase the number of county commissioners from three to five, each elected from a separate district. A five member commission might be a good idea, but separate districts would bring regional factionalism to the board. Each commissioner would be responsible to a segment of Lane County, not the county as a whole. Vote no on 16.

Measure 17 is an alternate plan for reorganizing the county commission. It would replace the three member board with 15 part-time commissioners, each representing a special district. The board's administrative powers would be shifted to a new department under a county administrator. Measure 17 contains all the flaws of the five member plan and compounds them with the confusion and infighting sure to arise whenever 15 people try to decide anything. Vote no on 17.

Lane County has been agonizing over what to do about its overcrowded jail for years now, but nothing has been done about it. Measure 19 would allow the county to issue bonds to the tune of nearly \$9 million for construction of a new facility adjacent to the present jail. We don't really like this plan; we think other means of financing and other locations could be considered. But the people of Lane County have to deal with an emergency situation and realize that nothing will make everyone happy. The

county government must be told that a new jail is a top priority with voters, and measure 19 seems to be the only way to do it. Vote yes on 19.

Measure 18 is a proposal that would make all county elections nonpartisan. A nonpartisan system might be a good idea for the offices of sheriff and assessor, and we have seen it work well in races for district attorney. However, we think voters' choices would be restricted in county commissioners' races. This year's county commissioner races would certainly have been different under a nonpartisan system; at least one candidate we can think of would not be on the ballot. Vote no on 18.

Lane Community College, like many educational institutions, is forced to go to the voters quite frequently to get approval of budgets outside the six per cent limitation. LCC's tax base is currently \$3.1 million, and the budget can only exceed that amount by six per cent unless voters approve additional spending. Expenses, however, rise much more than six per cent a year, and pretty soon the old tax base is little more than a bookkeeping fiction. Measure 14 would increase LCC's tax base to \$4.9 million, a figure more in line with fiscal reality. Passage of the measure would allow LCC to function without calling for a budget election every six months or so. Vote yes on 14.

Measure 20 is one of those rare proposals that does a lot of good without costing very much. For pennies a year, property taxpayers would finance bookmobile and library assistance programs for rural areas of Lane County. Vote yes on 20.

Monday, November 1, 1976