

EDITORIAL

Give LCC new tax base, yes on 20-01

A vote for Lane Community College is a vote for education.

The *Emerald* endorses Measure 20-01, which would boost LCC's tax base by more than \$3 million a year.

LCC plays a vital role in our community. The Dislocated Workers Program has drawn rave reviews from people who have lost their jobs in the timber industry. People making career changes receive training and instruction, not only in specific occupations, but also in submitting job applications.

A community college's mission is to adapt to the community. It responds to student and employer needs.

Lane had to turn students away this fall as it experienced record enrollment. Lane simply does not have the money or resources to serve all the students who want to attend. With University admission standards toughening and tuition skyrocketing, LCC remains a haven where students can complete two years of school at about half the price.

Classes at LCC are small enough that instructors actually learn your name. They believe students are more important than research projects. Individual attention can mean the difference in determining whether an older, non-traditional student continues after his or her first term back in school.

LCC is able to serve older and returning students easily because there are no grade requirements. In fact, many University students who encounter academic probation attend LCC to bring their GPAs up.

But LCC has not had a tax base raise in 10 years. It cannot afford to meet the rising needs of the community without establishing a new tax base.

Education is supposed to be a right, not a privilege. However, when the local economy falls, more people attend school. It is incomprehensible to turn away students, especially at a community college.

Lane's night and weekend college courses show that LCC will bend over backward to accommodate students. But without an updated tax base, Lane will have trouble continuing its current level of programs.

Vote for Lane Community College's new tax base. Remember, some day your children or parents might want to enroll for training and classes. Someday you might have to enroll there yourself.



Buckling-up decision should be your own

The police just don't have enough reasons to stop people in automobiles, so supporters of Ballot Measure 9, the mandatory seat-belt law, want to give them another one.

By making the non-use of seat belts an infraction, officers will be able to pull over anyone who they suspect is not wearing a seat belt. This means if they don't like your car, the color of your skin, the length of your hair or the stickers on your bumper, they can pull you over with the "probable cause" that they didn't think you were wearing a seat belt.

Many voters who favor the law may simply believe that citations for not wearing seat belts will be given out only if you are stopped for an unrelated infraction. This is not the case. Measure 9 is a staunch encroachment on personal liberty that would allow police to pull people over for almost any reason.

People should wear seat belts because they do save lives. But it is not the role of

the government to make decisions for adults. Without Measure 9, Oregonians are free to use seat belts and to remind loved ones to wear them as well. In fact, Oregon's seat belt compliance rate is already above the national average. Automobile occupant deaths in the state are lower in 1989 than in 1988 — without a mandatory seat-belt law.

Giving up the right to make your own decision about seat belts may seem trivial at the moment, but the long-term result of taking these kinds of decisions from the individual is a government that becomes oppressive and out of control.

As Benjamin Franklin once said, "They that can give up the essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

When you consider that more people suffer from heart disease than from automobile accidents, it would follow that the government should be working harder to institute mandatory diets rather than seat belts.

LETTERS

Once again

I am writing to clarify some points in my first letter which were obviously ill-taken by some.

In regard to Todd Helton's letter (*ODE*, Oct. 19), the issue is *not* my friendships and relationships with men I know or have known. Some of the friendships which I value most highly are those I have with men. I did not write about people who ask me "for the time of day," "how I did on a test" or what I think of a particular subject. (And yes, I do appreciate compliments from people.)

To quote myself, I wrote "to the men on campus who invade my own and other women's personal space...I write this in respect to several incidents in which you approach me — especially when I am alone — and speak to me as if I know you intimately, make suggestive catcalls and/or look at me as an object."

To define these people further, I refer to those who follow me, who approach me when I have no idea who they are and

ask me to go out or do other things with them, those who direct very sexually implicit gestures at me, who make catcalls ... the list goes on.

I thought that the difference between the time of day and these things which I just described should be understood without my explanation. What does it take to validate my point?

As for the letters from Renando Long and R.J. Christiano, both of you should ask your female friends what does offend them. And, what exactly is a "happy gal?"

Enna M. Dole
Student

Real terrorists?

According to a recent article (*ODE*, Oct. 18), Dr. Vanderlip, director of the University office of Veterinary Services and Animal Care, stated the two Rhesus monkeys on campus are "happy."

I find it insulting to hear how doctors of the animal research community can consider a

monkey that is being held against its will, poked, prodded, deprived of socialization and denied any "real" exercise as "happy."

Furthermore, Vanderlip states because of acts of terrorism more money was spent on security rather than exercise cages. If the research community is undertaking this project, all measures of well-being should be addressed regardless of any extraneous factors.

Vanderlip goes on to portray all animal rights activists as vandals and terrorists and that they achieve their ends through violence. But I ask who is really committing the violence when electrodes and coils are implanted in an involuntary subject's body, and then disposed of?

Monica Semeria
SETA

Not violent

In the recent article about the University lab monkeys, I feel Dr. Vanderlip made some comments directed toward the ani-

mal rights community that were very unfair.

Regarding animal rights activists and their attempts to halt the monkey research he said, "If they want to change this then they have to do it by means other than violence and vandalism."

This statement implies that the only approach animal rights activists have taken to stop research is "violence and vandalism."

It may surprise Vanderlip to learn that many animal rights activists don't support violence and vandalism and that only a very small percentage take part in these acts.

In fact, we have used many means to try and stop the return of non-human primates to

campus. We have gathered signatures on a petition to stop the research and held informational tables and non-violent protest. We have written letters objecting to the research and speak with those in charge of research including President Brand, John Mosley and Vanderlip.

We have also raised our concerns to the IACUC, the people who are supposed to be in charge of the monkey's welfare. Unfortunately, all of our efforts have met with little or no response.

There is one approach we haven't tried, and certainly are not going to try, and that is violence and vandalism.

Kathy Yonker
Political Science

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.