

State needs to find new money source

For someone who hasn't officially entered the 1990 gubernatorial race yet, Gov. Neil Goldschmidt is sure making sounds as if he's going to run for a second term.

Goldschmidt has spent the better part of this week traveling around the state, delivering thinly-disguised campaign speeches. In Oregon, the governor usually gives a single "state of the state" speech at the beginning of the year. However, Goldschmidt, in an interesting political move, has given one speech a day for four consecutive days in different cities around the state.

So far, the most intriguing new piece came out of Goldschmidt's Tuesday speech in Bend. There, the governor proposed a constitutional amendment to finance his Head Start program with proceeds from lottery funds.

The Head Start program is part of Goldschmidt's well-known Children's Agenda. Voters liked his idea of a special emphasis on children's programs — after all, it helped get him elected in 1986 — but so far, the program has been less than what Goldschmidt had anticipated.

When the lottery measure passed in 1984, one of the bylaws was that 34 percent of proceeds would be used for economic development. Goldschmidt's new proposal would use 30 percent of that money, about \$20 million a year, to greatly expand the program. Of the 15,000 children in the state between the ages of 3 and 4, only about 3,900 are actually enrolled in Head Start.

The lottery was originally intended to create a pool of economic resources, but since its inception it's been mutated into something else. Lottery funds have been used to finance such things as intercollegiate athletics, prison construction, and now, children's programs.

There is nothing wrong with using lottery funds for social programs, but it is risky to base your state budget on a variable source of income. Just as homeowners wouldn't bank on winning the lottery, the state shouldn't create a budget based on lottery proceeds.

The obvious solution is to come up with another revenue source, such as a sales tax. In the past, Oregon voters have been adamant about rejecting tax measures, but the time is coming where there just won't be enough money to finance state services.

Unless Oregonians want to see massive cuts in social programs, they will have to approve some sort of new tax measure. A new source of revenue won't cure all of the state's problems (such as school finance, corrections, and high property taxes), but it will be a start.



Allocate money for Eugene school repair

Most Lane County residents are well aware of the problems in the state school system, but so far, Eugene schools have avoided the worst financial crunches so common in other school districts.

Last year, the district made several drastic budget moves, including cutting out 127 staff positions. Eugene voters approved a new property tax levy, but because of continuing budget deficits, will probably be faced with another one this year.

On top of their concerns, district officials learned from a capital improvements committee this weekend that the district's buildings are in dire need of repair. Most of the buildings are between 20 and 30 years old and face a variety of problems: structural unsoundness, as well as heating, roofing and plumbing ills.

The cost to renovate the buildings is high; the committee recommended allocating \$5.8 million over the next two years for the repairs. After that, voters will need to approve a capital maintenance bond of

somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10-\$15 million in 1991.

District residents are not going to treat this year's property tax levy and next year's maintenance bond too kindly. In the past, they've turned down other levies, such as in 1986 when they rejected a \$17.7 million capital improvements measure.

Nobody likes taxes, but right now there is no other alternative. While the lawmakers in Salem bandy about different school finance proposals and make waves over minuscule items, the state public school system continues to collapse. If district residents want their children to get a quality education, and get it in safe and upgraded buildings, they're unfortunately going to have to pay for it themselves.

Voters need to approve both the property tax levy and the capital maintenance bond. If residents show they are doing something to improve the state education system, maybe lawmakers will get their collective acts together and do something as well.

Letters

Unwanted

I agree wholeheartedly with your Dec. 5, 1989 editorial that states the University should refuse the Student Health Insurance Committee's plan for mandatory ASUO health coverage for all students.

For \$15 a month, I am covered for all medical expenses through CHAMPUS due to my service in the U.S. Navy. There is absolutely no reason I would need any additional health insurance, and I certainly don't need the \$300 expense that it would require.

I am already paying student fees for a myriad of activities that I do not partake in: LTD bus transportation, sports, etc. Let's not add an additional and unwanted expense on top of those.

To Andy Clark and Scott Wyckoff: Thank you for your concern, but I believe that I am old enough to take care of my own medical insurance needs.

Zall Villanueva
Student

Vocal boycott

I strongly agree with Elizabeth Consani (ODE, Dec. 11) regarding the repulsive nature of the name Cherry Poppin' Daddies. I am surprised they still, after much public discussion on the name, continue to plaster this campus and the city with their sick posters.

What's more disgusting is that businesses in this city continue to support Cherry Poppin' Daddies, as do radio stations. I suggest a very vocal boycott of these businesses; tell Taylor's that you will not frequent their establishment if they continue to support this kind of woman and child hating.

Personally, every time I see a Cherry Poppin' Daddies poster, I tear it down and throw it away. Consani, you're not missing the joke; you're getting it loud and clear.

Laurel Sharp
Student

Uncontrollably

I laughed uncontrollably

through the duration of the first day of finals week. This odd-timed behavior was not due to a sudden loss of "marbles" during the most crucial point of the term. My intermittent chortling was fueled by reading Marianne Gabrielsen's letter "True definition" (ODE, Dec. 11).

In it, she criticizes what she feels to be the intolerable liberal slant of the *Emerald*. She justifies her criticism by stating that the *Emerald* is always putting someone down. This, she concludes, has led her to "the true definition of liberal — hypocrisy and intolerance."

I am laughing, but I'm confused at the same time. I mean, if the *Emerald* is hypocritical, intolerant, and thus, liberal, then what are you Gabrielsen? You certainly don't seem to be tolerating the *Emerald*.

David Coey
Geography

Evaluate

Mark Fink (ODE, Dec. 11) asked why don't I just give up trying to convince others of abortion's fundamental inhu-

manity. He argues for abortion-on-demand while simultaneously inquiring, "Why do you insist upon arguing an unresolvable conflict?"

Correct me if I am mistaken, Fink, but isn't one of the central functions of a liberal arts university to advance diverse, or even controversial ideas for evaluation and perhaps incorporation into a student's own set of convictions? If your mind is already fixed Fink, what are you doing here?

Surely there must be some open-minded individuals on your campus. Individuals who will evaluate without prejudice the wisdom of maintaining a woman's unlimited legal right to abortion-on-demand (including sex-selection, means of birth control and post-viability abortions) vs. a preborn baby's right to continue his or her ex-

istence. It's those individuals I would hope to reach, not you.

And come on Fink, cut me a break! It's obvious your major isn't biology, but still — that tired argument that the pro-life position requires "beliefs ... with some deity unknown to the rest of us." Any competent high school biology textbook will indisputably verify the fundamental humanity of the preborn.

As even Planned Parenthood used to admit before becoming the nation's largest abortionist, "Abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun." It's sad to see you choose to believe it's appropriate to kill a member of our human race just because you've not yet directly observed it.

Jon Wollander
Eugene

Letters Policy

Letters to the editor must be limited to no more than 250 words, legible, signed and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is submitted.

The *Emerald* reserves the right to edit any letter for length or style.