Editorial

Legalize marijuana safely, responsibly

We support the intent of the Oregon Marijuana Initiative, Ballot Measure 5, but we cannot support this measure.

The measure would not legalize selling marijuana or driving under its influence. It would legalize what hundreds of thousands of Oregonians practice, harmlessly, today.

However, we do have concerns with this measure.

Marijuana was legalized under Alaskan state law when the Alaskan Supreme Court ruled that an individual's right to privacy outweighs the state's interest in prosecution. We

However, the Alaska Legislature followed up by defining personal possesion and use very specifically. Any measure or bill that would legalize this drug in Oregon must define legal ambiguities such as "personal use" and "intent

Oregon, with a climate that supports marijuana plants and an already large marijuna trade, must be particularly cautious of potential for abuse of this law.

We are also concerned that legalization might lead to increased use among 18- to 20-year-olds, who would be able to smoke marijuana, but not drink.

Oregon must be careful about what drugs minors have access to. If the measure would lead to a drop in marijuana prices, as many supporters feel it would, the increase in use among minors could be doubly bad.

Oregonians can make responsible, adult decisions about marijuana use, just as they make this decision about alchohol. Most marijuana users do make responsible, recreational use of marijuana.

Measure 5 makes an important statement, but it should resolve any legal problems before they arise and maintain consistency in what drugs minors have access to.

Oregon has a unique climate in which good, innovative ideas abound about how to govern the state. Measure 5 is one such idea, but Oregon must legalize marijuana safely and responsibly.

Lab break-in, destruction only discredits intention

If the people responsible for the break-in and destruction of animal research laboratories on campus are afraid the intent of their action has been lost in media reports, they are

The intent of the action was lost in the action itself. It was a mindless, irrational effort to make a point that had already been made in the community.

The University implemented an extensive policy last fall that demands that the animals be treated humanely; the policy covers the treatment of animals in research, stressing the health and comfort of the animals and that research only use animals where necessary.

Thus the University had committed itself formally to the "humane and ethical care and use of laboratory animals," as University President Paul Olum put it.

Animal rights advocates were pleased with the new rules, but as time wore on it became clear they wanted nothing less than an absolute moratorium on animal research.

Such a stand ignores how essential animal research is to medical and biological understanding. Animal research was, and is, used in the fights against polio, bubonic plague, diabetes and cancer. Sometimes the point of research is not clear to laymen, but the research is critical. There is n necessary animal research going on at the University.

The animal lab raid was perhaps intended as a blow against all animal research, but with damages estimated at \$50,000, the University and its researchers will pay the price.

The University has better things to spend \$50,000 on than mopping up after a small, irrational group of people.

We also wonder how those who broke in will be able to care for so many animals, most of whom had been raised in a laboratory environment. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals was very concerned about the animals' well-being in the labs; we hope the members of PETA who endorsed the action will now try to ensure that the animals are safe.

The researchers, who cared for the animals, are certain that many of the animals are already dead.

The research community has rallied around the researchers, and the response to animal rights activists has not been favorable, as they would have liked. Thus the result was exactly what the result of any destruction should be the victims have been strengthened and the perpetrators discredited.





Letters

Real abusers

If the anti-vivisectionists have a problem with animal research. why don't they go after the real abusers: the third-rate scientists running product-testing labs where sanitation is nonexistent, animals die from exposure, hunger, dehydration, and self-mutilation; where animals disappear during ex-periments, and data is falsified, invented or suppressed according to the requirements of the contracting company that wants to prove its product is "safe."

Huge numbers of animals are abused and destroyed in product-testing labs. Most of what goes on there has no legitimate scientific value, only commercial value. 'results" of product-testing on animals, doctored or manufactured according to need, are used to justify registration with federal agencies of all manner of dangerous and often worthless products.

The usual practice is to register anything on which certain animal tests are reported to have been done. The regulators rarely read the reports. If they look at them at all, they only read the conclusions, which of course claim the product is "safe." Never mind the data

if there is any.

Do the anti-vivisectionists care? I don't think so. Like the clinic bombers, they are mainly concerned with suppressing thought - not with saving

> **Ann Tattersall** Post-Bac, geology

Constitution

What's next - lie detector tests to verify athletes' class attendence? You say that would constitute a clear violation of 4th Amendment rights? We want to point out that the athletic department's drugtesting policy represents a similar violation.

Athletic department: "Athletes sign contracts, and thus consent to testing.'

Fact: If the student body were subject to this loss of rights we know what would happen. No one would enroll at Oregon and there would be no University. Relocation by an athlete is dif-frcult and costly (NCAA policy). Thus the athletes have much less power over their situation. It is our opinion that the athlete's high visibility and vulnerability are being exploited by the athletic department in an effort to clean up the image of college athletics.

Athletic department: "Not only was the fact that we tested for drugs well-received by student-athletes...we received full support," Bill Byrne.

Fact: Picture this; you are stripped to the knees, shirt above your chest - you are closely observed by athletic department staff while you urinate into a cup. This test was a surprise (athletes have 12 hours notice). According to every athlete we spoke to, the process "humiliating," "degrading." These are hardly words of complete support.

Finally, we want to note that no U.S. citizen can "sign away" his/her constitutional rights. Hence, Mr. Byrne and Ms. Voelz, a signature on a release form implies neither consent nor support. Just ask.

> **Bryon Robertson** Eugene

A solution

For a solution to the current campus parking crisis I suggest the University hire Sacred Heart Hospital as they seem quite adept at creating parking lots in the campus area.

> **Steve Orosz** History

Oregon Daily

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Monday through Friday except during exam week and vacations by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

General Staff
Advertising Director
Production Manager
Classified Advertising
Assistant to the Publishe

Advertising Sales: John Boiler / Sales Manager Teresa Acosta, Paul Anderson, Ann Cole, Brent C Beryl Israel, Janelle Heitmann, Laura Goldstein, LaFleur, Catherine Lilja, Joseph Menzel, Wildermuth

News and Editorial Display Advertising and Business Classified Advertising

gher Education / Administration niversity Affairs udent Government udent Activities

anaging Editor

Shawn Wirtz Chris Norred Stan Nelson Sarah Kitchen

Photographers: Shertyn Bjorkgren, Shu-Shing Chen, Maria Corvallis, Derrel Hewitt, Bobbie Lo, James Marks, Dan Wheeler, Michael Wilhelm.

Production: Michele Ross / Ad Coordinator
Kelly Alexandre, Elizabeth Asher, Ronwin Nicole Ashton,
Sandra Bevans, Janet Emery, Manuel Flores, Shannon
Gaither, James Kenny, Donna Leslie, Curtis Lott, Kelli
Mason, Mike McGraw, Rob Miles, Angelina Muniz, Kara
Oberst, Ami Pate, Julie Paul, Jennifer Peterson, Kristin
Sanburg, Nils Tjolmn, Michael Wilhelm, X.Kang Xie.