

Vote down ASUO health insurance

Here are the final four *Oregon Daily Emerald* endorsements of ballot measures for Thursday's and Friday's ASUO general election.

Measure 6 would give graduating students the option of signing a pledge of social and environmental responsibility. The pledge would be entirely voluntary, and would continue to be part of graduation ceremonies every year.

Urging students to be socially conscious is something everybody needs to do, but we wonder if the measure is really necessary. The pledge asks students to "investigate and take into account the social and environmental consequences of any job" they might consider. But how serious will students take this? These kind of pledges are currently in vogue. Will students really follow the pledge's guidelines?

However, the above reservations don't detract from what Measure 6 is trying to do. The reasons for the pledge are good, even if a bit naive. We urge students to not only vote **yes on Measure 6**, but to sign the pledge and take it seriously.

The ASUO health insurance plan, Measure 7, is by now familiar to most students — especially to readers of these pages. Of all the ballot measures, it is the one that has garnered the most pre-election discussion and generated the most controversy.

In short, Measure 7 will ask voters to choose one of four options for the ASUO Student Health Insurance Program. The first would require mandatory enrollment in the insurance plan. Next would be a mandatory plan with a restrictive waiver. Third would be a mandatory program with a loose waiver, and the final option is voluntary enrollment in the insurance plan.

Our stance on the ASUO health insurance proposal has not changed. A mandatory health insurance plan of any kind is too much to swallow. Forcing students, who are already shackled with tuition burdens, to accept an insurance plan just to go to college is unacceptable.

No matter what the potential gains, students should have the choice about their own health insurance. Getting an education and acquiring a health insurance policy have nothing to do with each other, and should not be linked in any sort of way.

Put simply, vote **Option D for Measure 7**.

Measure 8 is another incidental fee allocation; this time for the University Counseling Center. Students are asked to support a self-imposed increase of \$1.50 per term to fund staff increases for next year.

In general, a 60 percent increase from last year for a student group would probably be unpalatable. However, given what the Counseling Center can accomplish and where the money is going, it's hard not to fund the increase.

What makes Measure 8 even better is the \$72,000 in matching funds (50 percent of the total Counseling Center budget) the University will kick in if the ballot measure passes. The administration is finally realizing they have a responsibility to the students outside of the classrooms, especially international students and minorities. The University cannot ask students to fund the Counseling Center on its own, and thankfully, it does not.

Vote **yes on Measure 8**.

The final measure on the ballot is an incidental fee request for the EMU Child Care and Development Center. Students are asked to approve an additional 80 cents per student, per term (for a total of \$2.80) to cover state-mandated wage increases.

The type of student attending the University has changed over the last two decades. Now there are more non-traditional students on campus; many of them are older students with children. The only way they can go to school is to have some sort of an affordable on-campus child care facility.

Unfortunately, students again are asked to shoulder the burden for what should be a national, state, local and University problem. Parent fees currently cover 62 percent of the cost of the EMU center. Students pay 30 percent of the costs, while USDA meal grants pay for the remainder.

Clearly, the government and University administration need to contribute, but in the meantime, it's up to us. Vote **yes on Measure 9**.



Letters

Nukes

I believe it is a mistake to put the controversy over the proposed nuclear free zone in terms of growth vs. no-growth. The issue is what type of economic development in our community, and how fast do we want it.

More importantly, I believe the people of Eugene are concerned about who has a say in our economic growth.

Traditionally those types of decisions have been left to an elite few business leaders and closely allied politicians, and I think the people of Eugene are more than ready for a change of "business as usual."

The same local ballot measure for a strong nuclear free zone that is up for a vote May 15 was approved twice before — in 1986 and again in 1988, each time passing by a majority of more than 59 percent of the vote. However, in prior years, that measure was dramatically watered down by the mayor and city council.

This time around, the measure (20-01) will be a charter amendment, so when the voters speak, the city government will not be able to thwart the will of the people.

The vote this May 15 will be a chance for people to express their freedom of choice on an issue of economic development. The question is simple — do we want the nuclear weapons or nuclear power industries to be allowed to set up shop in Eugene?

If we do not speak out now in favor of our right to choose the type of industry we want in our community, our power will be diminished in the future.

John Jordan
Eugene

No more trees

So environmentalists are causing timber workers to lose their jobs by creating a timber shortage, are they? Well, I have a little story for all believers of this myth.

Once upon a time, back in the 1950s, the Forest Service decided to allow a temporary increase in the timber harvest, knowing that this above-sustainable yield harvest could not

be continued for more than a few years without devastating the Northwest's forests. In those years, new jobs were created and the economy boomed.

But when the USFS called for a decrease back to previous harvest levels, the timber industry cried foul and complained of all the poor workers who would lose their jobs. Under industry pressure, the USFS succumbed and allowed the logging to continue, year after year.

Now we're in the 1990s, and few significant patches of old-growth have escaped the chain saw. Meanwhile, the timber industry greedily argues for even more trees.

So what if we allow the timber industry to log our remaining old-growth? Jobs will be maintained for a while, but soon there will be no big trees left to cut. As a result, jobs will be eliminated and ancient forests will exist only in our memories.

Thirty-five years of overcutting by the timber industry now threatens the Northwest's forests, its wildlife, its economy and its residents. So let's stop blaming environmentalists for timber industry problems. Let's stop old-growth logging now.

Scott Ladd
Geography

TRASH

With the 20th celebration of Earth Day over, we are once again reminded of the sometimes ruthless effect our behaviors have on Earth. Great change is necessary so that our planet and the species on it may continue to coexist. Each individual has the responsibility to promote this coexistence.

One simple way to improve this situation is to promote the concept of precycling, reusing, reducing and recycling. Packaging is responsible for taking up 50 percent of all landfill space. Consumers can change this by demanding environmentally sound packaging that is effectively reusable, recyclable or made of recycled materials.

The Recycling Advocate Student Harbingers, a student group, are dedicated to environmentally sound packaging

through the Oregon Recycling Act. For more information, call TRASH at 344-0812 or 683-9036.

Kyle Anderson
Stephanie Haver
Students

Peyote

The ruling has been handed down and it isn't at all surprising.

I am referring to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision that peyote use by Native Americans is not protected by the Constitution. The ruling was lead by Antonin Scalia, a Reagan appointee (gee, what a surprise).

This is truly fitting. After all, when has the white man ever done anything to preserve the dignity and rights of this country's indigenous people?

Every other vestige of Native American culture has been trashed; why not go for what's left? Isn't that right, Dave Frohnmayer?

That's right, Oregon Attorney General and GOP gubernatorial candidate Frohnmayer was instrumental in having the case reviewed.

The reason that he didn't want two fired drug abuse counselors to be eligible for unemployment was based on the fact that they used peyote in a church ritual. He was so determined that he got on an airplane and flew all the way to D.C. to testify before the high court.

Frohnmayer seems to believe that allowing Native Americans to use peyote would set a precedent for any group that tried to form and receive rights for drug use as a religious practice. The fact that peyote rituals have been continued for hundreds of years obviously meant nothing to him.

Please be reminded that this petty man is running for governor of Oregon. I only hope that people concerned about Native American rights will "just say no" to Dave Frohnmayer.

Tim Webber
Student