

EDITORIAL

Absence by Denny proves self-Interest

Republican Congressman Denny Smith has shown his priorities this week. His number one priority, as a representative of Oregon citizens, is to make sure he gets re-elected.

While the rest of Congress was in Washington, D.C., battling for a budget compromise, Smith was here in Oregon campaigning for re-election. He claims that as one of the state's representatives, he gets to decide which tasks are most important. Smith decided that making sure he has a job next year was more important than making sure the government has money to operate this week.

In his campaign ads, Smith has assailed his challenger, Mike Kopetski, for being out of touch with Oregonians and for playing to special interest groups such as environmentalists.

But throughout his tenure in Congress, Smith has made a habit of pandering to the special interests that elected him. Most notably, he is being investigated for his involvement with one of the nation's many failed savings and loans.

Smith allegedly tried to use his position as a representative to protect his partners and himself from any civil lawsuits stemming from their S&L involvement. He also tried to use his influence to get the government official who would not agree to this protection fired.

After this week's behavior it is easy to see what Smith's favorite special interest is: the re-elect Denny Smith group.

Representatives are elected with the understanding that they will go to Washington to represent Oregon citizens. A re-election campaign does not constitute representation — voters, not politicians, have the responsibility for choosing the best person for an office. Smith should realize that if his campaign is failing, it might be because he is not the person Oregonians want in office. The best way to win re-election votes is to stay in Washington when important decisions are being made, not by kissing babies 3,000 miles away.

Smith's decision says a few things about how important he is to the Oregon public. If he feels that his presence in Washington is not important to the interests of Oregonians, maybe this November voters will agree with him.



Locker room policy should be consistent

Locker rooms used to be for taking showers — plain and simple.

Nowadays, however, they are arenas for the battle of the sexes.

Women reporters have been harassed the past few weeks in locker rooms from Arizona to New England. Some male athletes don't want women reporters in locker rooms. Some athletes don't want any reporters in the locker room.

Reporters like to talk to athletes right after a game while the memory and feeling of winning or losing a game is at its peak. That is understandable.

However, athletes should be able to weep or wail in private if they want to. They don't owe reporters or fans anything except for their performances on the field.

Luckily for sports reporters, most athletes believe talking to the press after the game is part of their job, and good press relations is important to teams.

Right now, female reporters are most affected by locker room policies, but someday

a male reporter may want to enter the women's locker room, perhaps after a women's NCAA basketball final. If female reporters are allowed in men's locker rooms, then male reporters should be let into women's locker rooms.

A universal decision must be made on the issue that applies to all. Either let all reporters into all locker rooms, or let none in at all.

Athletic facilities should designate a separate room for post-game interviews. If an athlete wants to be interviewed in the nude there, so be it.

Sexual harassment charges are not to be taken lightly. There will always be a few "little boys" in the locker room who haven't grown up yet.

While there is no excuse for harassment, a whole organization should not be penalized for the idiocy of a few.

Until all athletes understand about sexual harassment, there should be separate rooms for interviews.

LETTERS

No power

In an *Emerald* article (*ODE*, Sept. 26) it is reported that "students and administrators have reacted most favorably to a decision to run the ASUO executive office as a co-presidency."

An *ODE* editorial later endorsed this move.

Is everyone serious when they say it is fine for the executive office to make this decision on its own?

I certainly would refuse to accept Sheila Stickel's signature on a document that required the signature of the president.

There is no constitutional power behind her signature.

No matter what she says, she is still vice president.

How would everyone feel if Bush and Quayle suddenly decided that they were going to run a co-presidency because they thought it was a "neat" idea?

Just imagine it. Take a moment, sit back, and hear the screams.

Matthew W. Derby
Accounting

Bad enough

I am writing to you concerning the article on Derek Horton (*ODE*, Oct. 3).

Did it ever occur to you that Mr. Horton is not guilty until proven so?

After your article, it does not matter if he is innocent or guilty. Because of your article, Mr. Horton will be branded a "sex offender."

If Horton is proven guilty, then print an article telling the public. If Horton is innocent, did it ever occur to you that he could never have a normal life in Eugene?

It is bad enough that you printed his name, but you had to print his picture, also.

I have never met Derek Horton, and this is the first I have heard of this incident, but if I did meet him, I would be frightened. That is wrong.

I am all for freedom of the press, but before you print an article, think about who you could be hurting.

Kelly Mattern
Eugene

Deserve-nots

Unfortunately, as a senior citizen coping with the steadily increasing cost of living — not the least of which is health care — I could not afford a ticket to Johnny Clegg and Savuka, although I was anxious to hear them.

At the same time I wondered how many students could afford them at \$14 a ticket.

When I was a student at the University of Vienna, the state owned theaters which were the most prestigious, had a policy of selling unsold tickets at a huge discount shortly before curtain time to people who had waited patiently in line, sometimes for hours.

It seems to me this would be a good example for a University affiliated organization to follow.

But then, I am probably an aged simpleton for expecting a modicum of social responsibility from sellers of shoes or culture in the United States, instead of the pure capitalistic thought: have-nots are deserve-nots.

A.E. Brettauer
Eugene

Sorry

I would like to apologize to Junior for not acknowledging "Air Jamaica" in my statement about the lack of reggae in this town (*ODE*, Sept. 17).

Junior is the host of "Air Jamaica," a reggae show on KLCC Fridays from 11 p.m. to 2 a.m.

I accept Junior's offer of help and shared knowledge concerning the music and traditions of the island and hope that reggae may assume a more dominant role in local programming in the near future.

James January
KRMA

Sizing it up

It was reported in the *Emerald* (*ODE*, Oct. 4) that in President Brand's state of the University address he said, "The

University's size will prove to be an advantage in the future."

I agree with this but think an important point is left out.

If the University is going to maintain its current size, it cannot be done at the expense of the students. We should not have to bear the cost in the form of an archaic registration process, overcrowded classes, signing up for classes we don't want just to get credit and ever-increasing student fees.

I realize that these problems exist all over the country and that there are no easy answers.

However, just acknowledging these problems exist is too little, too late.

As a student I want to know what is going to be done about these problems and when something is going to be done.

Mark S. Richards
Economics

LETTERS POLICY

The *Oregon Daily Emerald* will attempt to print all letters containing comments on topics of interest to the University community. Comments must be factually accurate and refrain from personal attacks on the character of others.