

Clean Air Act is a signal of change

Though there had been a raging debate all week, by the time the U.S. Senate sat down to vote it was all but academic. In a dramatic show of bipartisan support, the Senate Tuesday approved 89-11 a wide-ranging plan to clean up the nation's air.

The Clean Air Act has been one of the most controversial and complex pieces of legislation to ever come before Congress. Contained in the omnibus were bills to impose tough restrictions on industrial pollution and automobile emissions, and to clean up the 100 most polluted areas in the United States by 2005. Los Angeles was given an additional five years to cleanse its skies.

The act also dealt with acid rain and toxic air pollutants, and contained legislation to dramatically curtail both.

Both party leaders in the Senate, Republican Bob Dole of Kansas and Democrat George Mitchell of Maine, praised the passage of the bill. Dole called the Clean Air Act "landmark legislation." Mitchell labeled the vote "a historic victory."

But as with most compromises, some sides of the argument still aren't satisfied. Industry officials, seeing pollution restrictions as impositions on their profit margin, say the bill went too far and will hurt business. Environmentalists claim the regulations and timeframe for the act are too loose and underestimate the immediate health risks of polluted air.

The environmental impact of acid rain, smog and other industrial-produced hazards cannot be forgotten. The Clean Air Act is not an end-all by any means. It is a start. Additional steps must be taken. Air pollution is only one aspect of the damage we've done to the planet. Toxic waste dumps, nuclear waste and overflowing landfills still need to be addressed.

But for the moment, there is reason to be optimistic. Given the large margin of approval (the only dissenters came from Midwestern states, worried about the financial impact on the area's numerous industrial plants and mining operations), there is a high probability the House will pass the bill intact. And since Bush himself approved the compromise, it guarantees his signature. By the end of the session, the odds are good the Clean Air Act will become law.

Mitchell deserves much of the applause for getting the bill through the Senate. For years he has been a leading advocate of environmental legislation. Coupled with the Bush administration's softening on pollution issues, Mitchell's hard work paid off. The Clean Air Act is the result.

Finally, something to feel good about.



Fadeley violation example of poor rule

With scandals, rule-breaking and cover-ups dominating political headlines of late, it was only a matter of time before controversy crept into the courtrooms.

To be specific, Oregon Supreme Court Justice Edward Fadeley has been caught for violating a code against soliciting campaign contributions. The Commission on Judicial Fitness and Disability, a state panel which oversees such matters, has recommended Fadeley be censured for his lapse of ethics.

This is the first time in state history that a supreme court justice has had to come in front of his peers for a disciplinary hearing. Though the commission suggested only a reprimand, the other justices could decide to suspend or even remove Fadeley from the bench.

Fadeley's mistake was personally asking for donations to pay for his 1988 campaign. In December, 1988, he signed a letter to the editor that ran in the Labor Press newspaper, asking for donations. Fadeley has also admitted his solicitation of contributions from private citizens.

The judicial ethics canon forbids judges from personally seeking campaign contributions. But in a hair-splitting display of logic,

the rule allows judges to establish committees to seek donations.

Whether or not Fadeley willfully and knowingly broke the campaign-financing laws is still under debate. Although one cannot praise or condone Fadeley's actions, it is easy to see how he could be established as a victim of ethical canon semantics.

The code that prevents judges from personally soliciting funds, but permits them to create "committees" that do the same thing just doesn't make any sense. Claims that the rule distances the judges and judicial candidates from political partiality is whitewash.

The canon needs to be changed.

Fadeley has admitted his mistake, but still deserves punishment. A censure is the best thing. Removing him from the bench would be a major mistake. Justice Fadeley is one of the most well-respected people in public service. He is fully capable of doing his job, despite the scandal.

Unlike U.S. Supreme Court justices, the Oregon variety is elected to their posts. Fadeley will have to face an election in 1994. If voters think he has done a bad job, they'll remove him from office.

Letters

Heartless

Real cute picture of Mr. Potato Head there (ODE, March 30) ... As my roommate would say, "ahh, you kill me!" ... Perhaps if you held the proper surgical tools, and my mother had allowed many years ago, you would have indeed killed me. I wouldn't be here to write this letter, but it's too late now, dude! Even Bert Tryba (ODE, March 30) and I are protected by the laws of this land.

By the way, Tryba, I am sorry people calling themselves Christians have persecuted you. This does not surprise me, as history shows record of many assaults mounted by police calling themselves by Christ's name, but doing things Christ would not have done. If anyone is "driven to acts of violence," it is not the teachings of Christ they have been heeding.

Anyway, because Oregonians can't "draw the line," it is legal to kill creatures which panic in their mother's womb as the abortionist's tools pursue them to destruction. With this reasoning, why not legalize

murdering at least anyone who is dependent on another? In contrast, some silly people in Idaho have a hole in their head because they take an "if I'm not sure, I won't kill it" stand.

Oh, Mr. Editorial Editor ... perhaps you could do a cartoon of a little duck ... with a gaping hole located somewhere near the heart.

Bob Weigel
Lab tech

Open fire

I was not at the parties that were raided by the police last Saturday, but I've been to enough of them that I feel qualified to comment.

What the hell is going on here?! I've never heard of tear gas being used to stop people from making noise or pissing on lawns. From the reports I've heard from my friends that were there, there was no riot until the police showed up.

It is clear by now that the Eugene police have a problem with their testosterone levels. After issuing dozens and dozens of fines and tickets for trivi-

al offenses, they have now decided that students need to be punished for standing up for their rights. And that is just what happened at the parties: some students didn't move fast enough for the police. It's not enough to confiscate beer and turn off music.

Frankly, I think we students had better be seriously careful this spring. The use of tear gas has frightening memories for me. With the 20th anniversary of Kent State University coming in a few weeks, I am reminded — they used tear gas on those students, too. Right before they opened fire on them.

Tim Hughes
Student

Challenge

I wrote my letter (ODE, Feb. 26) challenging people to abandon the narrow-mindedness and lack of compassion that allows them to ignore the pain and suffering of some of their fellow creatures. Fourteen members of Coalition For Animals and Animal Research re-

sponded just as I expected — by completely evading this challenge.

They wanted to talk about thalidomide. Okay, briefly, thalidomide was tested on animals before it went on the market. After it was suspected of causing human deformities, it was then tested on pregnant dogs, cats, rats, monkeys, hamsters and chickens without producing deformities. It was only a certain strain of rabbit that finally showed deformities similar to those found in humans.

As is the nature of animal testing, it is pure chance that one animal reacts to a drug in a similar manner to that of another animal. The list of examples attesting to this phenomenon is endless.

However, as I stated clearly in my first letter, this is just one of many, many arguments to be made against vivisection. Clearly, my challenge to people is for them to imagine the torture human animals are inflicting upon non-human animals, and to question the justification for such torture.

The issue of thalidomide is nothing in the face of this question.

Thalidomide was simply another sleeping pill — something we could do without another of. Certainly not worth the enslavement and the pain of the above-mentioned animals.

Nicole Bourcier
Student

Prolong

Regarding the anonymous "Back off cops" message: You have now made your point and must think you are pretty smooth.

Accusations abound; both sides have conflicting stories as to what occurred in the tear-gassing incident. C'mon, be brave! Come out of hiding and take your concerns to the police. Try to establish a serious dialogue between student groups and the EPD instead of further alienating the two.

I challenge you to be mature and leave behind this "in-your-face" attitude that can only worsen and prolong the conflict.

J. Brett Wilson
German