

oregon daily emerald

Vol. 82, No. 73

Eugene, Oregon 97403

Wednesday, January 7, 1981

Car smashing

About 80 University students, possibly frustrated by the vicissitudes of registration, took turns Tuesday demolishing this 1970 Toyota for the benefit of the University Model United Nations.

For 25 cents a hit, people could swing a sledgehammer at the car. Those with more than the usual number of frustrations could take five shots for a dollar.

The club made about \$20 on the venture, according to Tim Mitchell, fund-raising coordinator for the group. The money will help cover the cost of transporting club members to Model UN events in Washington and California.

Although the club hoped to make more, Mitchell said he considered the project a success. The club will probably hold another car demolition by the end of Winter term, he added.

Mitchell estimated that a total of about 500 people stopped on the corner of 13th Ave. and University St. to see the Toyota abused.

"We always got a crowd when someone really started beating on it, when there was a lot of noise," he said.

The car, donated to the club by Stiles Imported Motors, Inc., of Springfield, held up surprisingly well and wasn't totaled until the club members took some free shots as a tow truck showed up to take it away.

"The tow truck was there, so we decided to have our last shot at it," Mitchell said.



Photo by Steve Dykes

Legislators prepare for redistricting battle

**Analysis by
GREG WASSON
and DANA TIMS
Of the Emerald**

The 1980 federal census figures triggered the re-shaping of Oregon's state and national legislative districts.

For the first time in this century, Democrats control both houses of the Oregon Legislature. And according to House Majority Leader Grattan Kerans, his party wants to control the numbers because numbers control the process.

The importance of that objective can't be overstated. Consider this example of being on the short end of things around the Statehouse at decision-making time.

Republican Bill Rogers leaned forward in his chair. He was exasperated at committee head Glen Whallon's repeated use of majority power.

"I'm still uneasy about this portion of the amendment," Rogers declared. "And I have to object."

Roger's hesitancy temporarily stymied the subcommittee, but Whallon wasn't concerned.

"Well, representative, we'll just get the full committee together and run right over your objections."

Ten years ago, the party roles were reversed. Only a few political observers then bet on anything but a continuation of Republican dominance. For partisan Democrats, the situation worsened when the 1971 Legislature wouldn't agree on a plan and the duty fell to Secretary of State Clay Myers, a Republican. Myers' scheme withstood court challenges and GOP leaders readied to usher in a more Republican decade.

Within four years, however, the House flip-flopped from 33 Republicans and 27 Democrats to 38 Democrats and 22 Republicans. And the conservative coalition that had ruled the Senate was swept aside.

Kerans charges that Myers tried to ensure that the 1971 reapportionment benefitted the Republican party — but failed. Myers responds that he had no such intentions and that the constitutional amendment regarding reapportionment — an amendment he helped write in 1952 — protects the process from manipulation.

"Nobody can screw up the system," he contends. "That kind of occurrence (the dramatic party shift in the

1972 election) is just what happens when you do a truly non-partisan job. If you do it right, it's up for grabs."

This time Kerans contends things could be different. Senate Bill 305, approved last session, established the general criteria for re-districting.

The legislature also has made arrangements to use computer services, the map-drawing facilities at the University and extensive materials gathered on case law and the mechanics governing reapportionment.

Still, the realities of political survival guarantee the process won't be smooth.

"I would bet that the horse trading on this will be intense," Kerans predicts. "Everybody will be trying to find leverage to do this or that, and protect their own districts."



Consider Multnomah County, where population losses since 1971 mean the elimination of three representatives and one and one-half senators, all of them currently Democrats. It's an instance where majority status provides no solace.

"In a sense," says Myers, "it's poetic justice. They don't have a single Republican seat to give up."

Such losses prompt him to predict that any reapportionment plan will benefit Republicans. The suburbs and rural areas are growing faster than Democratic Portland.

If the legislature defies precedent and approves a plan, it must then be signed by Republican Gov. Vic Atiyeh. A successful veto would throw the issue to Republican Secretary of State Norma Paulus, who is

generally considered a gubernatorial aspirant. Paulus probably wants nothing to do with the issue, Kerans says.

"She's spent many years developing the image of being almost above the partisan pay, I'm sure she'll be in Vic's office hollering for him to sign it, saying 'I don't want this thing.' She can't win if she has to get involved with that tar-baby."

Paulus agrees. "I'm assuming that since the Democrats control both houses, they'll be able to do it. It's the legislature's job, and I'm not particularly looking for it."

Yet no matter who draws the lines, the final decision lies with the state supreme court. Any citizen can challenge an apportionment plan — whether issued by the legislature or the secretary of state — and this year's product will probably end up in court like the past three plans.

In 1971 the Democrats challenged Myers' plan which would have created subdistricts in counties served by four or more representatives, but would still have allowed candidates to live anywhere in the district and run for any position.

Lane County was a primable to the voters by making the constituencies smaller.

"If you believe in elected officials being errand boys for their constituents, that's a fine plan," says Klonoski, who just finished his term as chair of the state party. "That's what Clay believes they ought to be. But when the supreme court extended his version, I think it was just out to kick (the Democrats') butts."

But while the procedure for re-drawing state legislative lines are clearly delineated by the state constitution, many questions remain about what happens if the lawmakers are unable to re-partition the state's congressional districts.

"The statute is silent as to what happens," says Paulus, "So I would assume that I would have to go into federal court and ask for a declaratory judgment about what I should do."

This phase of reapportionment takes on added importance in 1981 as livable Oregon has attracted

Continued on Page 6