

How do we spell (tax) relief? M-e-a-s-u-r-e 11

Tax fever is infecting America. At first glance, it doesn't look like a disease most students need to worry about catching. But their immunity exists only on the surface.

Tax relief — and the effects on state and local government that obtaining that relief will create — should concern students. From their perspective, it's important that Ballot Measure 6 not succeed in the November election.

Relief provided by Measure 6 will go mostly to wealthy property owners and businesses at the expense of renters and the less affluent generally. Measure 6 remains a copy of a measure — Proposition 13 — designed in California, which suits well neither that state nor our own.

The Oregon alternative, Ballot Measure 11, also targets the majority of its relief for persons higher on the income scale than students. But 11, shaped in a special session of the legis-

lature, doesn't threaten severe disruption of government programs — programs from which students benefit considerably. Measure 6 does.

Especially vulnerable to the impact of 6 is Oregon's Homeowner and Renter Relief Program (HARRP).

Under that program, relief checks are sent to homeowners and renters earning less than \$16,000 a year. Approved by the 1973 Legislature, HARRP gives Oregon one of the most progressive tax systems in the country.

HARRP ensures that those who earn more, pay more. But the \$170 million that finance HARRP during the last two years would probably become one of the first victims of the budget axe if 6 passes.

Although they contribute — via rental payments — 17 percent to Oregon's total property tax, renters could not expect to find the benefits of Measure 6's tax relief passed on to them by land-

lords. Measure 11 would not discriminate against renters who comprise 36 percent of Oregon residents, in providing its tax relief.

The Legislative Revenue Office estimates that passage of 6 would take more than \$850 from local governments during the 1979 fiscal biennium. These taxing units would undoubtedly turn to the state for money needed to finance schools, law enforcement and other services.

Measure 11, on the other hand, will cost an estimated \$525 million over the next two years. It also imposes spending lids on both local and state budgets, thus striking at the causes of overspending of which high taxes appear as symptoms.

Measure 6 remains critically flawed by its lack of such controls over spending, an omission that reveals the single-minded and self-serving motives of its prime movers.

But HARRP is just one state program.

Tuition support, veterans loans and child-care facilities — all of which benefit many students — also depend on state resources. The \$325 million difference between measures 6 and 11 could become crucial in determining whether these social-aid programs receive sufficient funding.

Students would probably be better off in the short run if the tax situation remained as is.

But that's unlikely. Polls indicate that one if not both of these relief measures will pass. Most citizens are feeling unfairly burdened by taxes and less able than ever to affect the public decision-making process.

The issue of tax relief — and the accompanying goal of reducing the size of government — should transcend parochial interests.

Measure 11 will serve these, and students', interests much better than 6.

YOURS

Open faculty evaluations

As Chairman of the Student University Affairs Board I would like to bring the matter of course evaluations to the student's attention. I wish to do this for two specific reasons: 1) because course evaluations are a potentially useful resource to students in choosing classes, and 2) to stress the importance of SUAB to the students and the University.

Investigations into the possibility of general university course evaluations has been going on for some time. These are not to be confused with the evaluations many departments now use. The critical side of this issue is whether or not the information should be released to students.

As a full-time student myself, and as voting member of the University Senate, I am completely for the release of the information compiled from the evaluation forms. This information can be used in a sensible manner to assist students in the selection of their courses. The ramification of this use is direct, i.e., getting the best possible education for the money we are now investing in our futures.

The senate meeting of Wednesday past brings out a very important aspect of SUAB's existence, the fact that SUAB is the students direct voice of input into the legislation on this campus. On issues such as course evaluations, this function becomes magnified.

Your voice in university legislation such as this is a rare privilege, because very few universities have combined student-faculty bodies. This privilege must be exercised in order to make the things you want out of your university a reality. Students may attend, as observers, the special session of the Senate this afternoon at 3:30 in Room 229 of the Law School.

There are currently three SUAB positions for which no one has filed. They are: #3 and #4 — Business and Economics; and #11 — Fine and Applied Arts, Art History, and Art Education. If you're interested in becoming heard, come in to EMU, Suite 4 and find out about write-in campaigns. If your major is already represented, come in and find out who your representative is, and where you can contact him or her, to make your opinions known.

Finally I would like to encourage all students to vote in the upcoming (Nov. 1 and 2) ASUO elections. The key to a successful student government is increased participation on the part of the students. The SUAB and the ASUO are here to serve you; your part is to become involved.

Gary McMahon
SUAB Chairperson

Brotherly blindness

Reverend Ray proclaims his sainthood on top of the EMU terrace (ODE 10/23), and proclaims ideal justifications on unreal behaviors for people. His proclamations are

theirs



ideals that even himself cannot attain.

The reasons for his continued practice lie in both his reasoning beyond nature, and his strict adherence to a dogmatic belief not of nature.

One can peer through their own delusional truths by a reality test, by asking them some of the hows and whys about the nature of Christ. I attempted to do this with one of his devout financial campaigners.

He first off denied a natural father to have been a part of the conception of Christ, as I showed the deductive aspects of the nature of all life. In my reasoning to him I shed light on the truth of the divinity of the Christ conception, involving Joseph and Mary whom I consider to have been 'of the Holy Spirit that the Christ was conceived 'in,' and showed by deduction the hows and whys of the actual divine nature of the Christ conception as manifested by the will of God.

At that point, he did, in pure denial toward the real substance of life, emit vile accusations in front of my face! 'You're gonna burn, you Anti-Christ,' he blasphemed at me.

My God, what had I done! I was attempting to reason with him objectively and he began to get irrational! He proclaimed the Christ not to have been of nature, and instigated a delusional creed bound dogma belief of the attitudes of a Holy Ghost conception of Mary!

His proclamations of the word of God in the Bible met defeat when I showed him the deducing interpretations and still he provoked irrational tomes! Such a fundamentalist gone to proclaim a Jesus coming from the clouds.

I proclaimed that his bizzareness was delusional and that he had better seek help in some mental hospital! In our final arguments with one another, I disclosed that he would have to lay down his burdens sometime, and in his fundamentalist fashion he said he would have to say some prayers for me.

There is no real truth except natural truth, no love except natural love, and no conception without actual conception! Though the actual natural truths of the divinity of the Christ nature are diluted by creed-bound fundamentalists with their attitudes toward their icon God-man they have made and of their idolary worship of that icon within themselves. It is truth, beauty and goodness which are the necessary ingredients for arriving at the divinity of the natural Christ truth. It is not dogma but letting natural reasoning prevail in the search for objective truths.

Les Frye
Psychology