

EDITORIAL

Yes on Measure 6, recycling initiative

Oregon again has the chance to lead the nation in progressive recycling. We urge a yes vote on Measure 6.

Measure 6 sets guidelines, to be phased in gradually, for the packaging of products sold at retail or wholesale outlets in the state.

While many consumers have incorporated recycling into their daily lives, industries have yet to get on the bandwagon. They won't until they have to.



Almost \$1 out of every \$10 that Americans spend on food pays for packaging. We not only pay for it when we buy it, but we pay to have it hauled away.

Packaging accounts for 50 percent of solid wastes. Recycling saves landfill space and actually will create new jobs. A study by the New York State Recycling Forum showed that recycling 10,000 tons of waste creates 36 jobs, while dumping the same amount in a landfill creates only six.

Industries will benefit from Measure 6. They will save money because it costs more to manufacture new packaging than to recycle the old stuff.

Also, recycling reduces pollution by reducing waste. Using recycled materials reduces air pollution by as much as 95 percent in some cases.

The bottle bill, passed in Oregon in 1971, wasn't supposed to work either. Aluminum companies claimed the bottle bill would cripple them, and they spent millions of dollars to defeat the measure.

It's 20 years later and the bottle bill worked so well in Oregon that more than a dozen other states have similar laws. And aluminum companies haven't suffered a bit.

Only companies that manufacture throwaway packaging oppose Measure 6. About 85 percent of the \$1.4 million contributed to defeat Measure 6 comes from corporations outside of Oregon. Chevron Chemical, Occidental Chemical, Proctor & Gamble, Dow Chemical and Exxon have all contributed more than \$50,000 each to defeat it.

Measure 6 does not ban any products. It exempts packaging necessary to comply with health and safety laws. Measure 6 will not clog the courts with lawsuits.

Adjustments and reviews will have to be made about Measure 6. But the important, initial step is to pass it. And watch Oregon lead the nation into the 21st century.



Ichabod Bush and the Legend of Budget Hollow

Return Kerans, Hill to Salem, but not Jolin

Three races for state Senate seats could have a large impact on University students.

In the race for Senate District 20, Democratic incumbent Grattan Kerans is facing Republican challenger Peter Swan.

Kerans has served five terms in the Oregon House and was elected to the Senate in 1986. He is the obvious choice for the job.



While Swan, a University law professor, has strong legal skills and a good grasp of the issues, Kerans has experience and a good record in Salem.

Kerans worked for the new Oregon minimum wage law, which will increase hourly pay again in January. In environment-conscious Eugene, Kerans has a stellar record as an environmental advocate. He co-sponsored the log export ban bill and has worked to develop new jobs for timber workers.

In District 21, Democratic incumbent Larry Hill is the type of grass-roots people's politician the state needs.

In a time when there is a need for state lawmakers who are knowledgeable about the timber industry, Hill is well qualified. Hill was a forest products millworker for 14 years before going into politics.

Hill's eight years of governing experience give him an advantage over his challenger, Ralf Walters, a union representative and former advertising director for *The Register-Guard*, who has no prior governmental experience.

In District 22, Democratic incumbent Peg Jolin is facing Republican challenger Paul Holbo. In this race voters should ignore experience and oust the incumbent.

Jolin, who has strong connections to the timber industry, is a conservative in Democrat's clothing. She has consistently favored timber industry positions and has jokingly made anti-spotted owl statements.

Holbo, a University vice provost, has little governmental experience, but he is committed to higher education funding and public school reform, and he would be a strong voice for students in Salem.

LETTERS

Garbage lies

Opponents of Ballot Measure 6 have gone too far.

As if their decision to misleadingly call themselves the "Oregon Committee for Recycling" weren't enough, they have now launched a deceitful, multimillion dollar ad campaign to try and topple the most innovative piece of legislation in Oregon's history. As responsible, freethinking Oregonians, we must not let this happen.

While they call themselves an "Oregon" committee, they are almost entirely funded by giant, out-of-state organizations, including Dow Chemical, Chevron Chemical, The Society of Plastics, and the Polystyrene Packaging Council.

Their advertisements (including those in the voter's pamphlet) are composed of several blatant lies:

Lie No. 1: Food safety is at risk.

Truth: A state ballot measure cannot override federal law. The FDA has clear, well-established standards for food safety.

Lie No. 2: If Measure 6 passes, thousands of everyday products will no longer be available in Oregon.

Truth: With Oregon's population of 2,690,000 consumers, out-of-state manufacturers will not withdraw from the market. They'll change their packaging.

Lie No. 3: Measure 6 does nothing to improve recycling.

Truth: Until manufacturers are forced to start using recycled materials, the "recycling" we do at the curbside will be an exercise in futility.

For years industry has been the missing link in the cycle. Measure 6 at last will bridge this gap by creating markets for recyclables.

Check the facts yourself, and please ... don't buy their garbage. Vote yes on 6.

Craig Hamilton
Psychology

Ironic choice

Daily I am offended by the

disgusting liberal bias of the *Emerald*. With measures 8 and 10 going to the vote, the bias has become more and more apparent. Particularly offensive was the full-page ad devoted to the "pro-choice" for women's lives rally.

Bit of an ironic name, isn't it? Let's not gloss over what we really mean. How can one use the words "life" and "death" when we are really referring to death as a way out? The issue at hand is convenience abortion. "Pro-choice" is the option to terminate an innocent life that has no choice.

I am nauseated that such a matter is even debatable. Women have the right to the control of their bodies, and they have a choice.

Your choice is made at the point of conception — you choose to become pregnant and give birth, or not get pregnant in the first place. (Measure 8 gives exception for the cases of rape and incest.)

Make a responsible decision.

Use pre-conception birth control if you do not wish to have children. Do not end an innocent human life because it is inconvenient. Exercise your true right to choose.

Don't cloud the issue. Fight for the right to choose, not the right to kill.

Eric Lea
Physics

Media bias

We are writing in response to the editorial "Say No to Restrictive Abortion Issues" (*ODE*, Oct. 23).

We are offended at the colored journalism reflected in this editorial. The portion speaking about Measure 10 is either fully lacking understanding of the measure or just plain biased.

The *Emerald* is quoted as saying, "The varying family situations are not taken into account by Measure 10 ... There are no legal alternatives in

Measure 10 for girls wanting to avoid telling the parents ... Oregon's version would allow 'no exceptions.' ... Those involved with abusive or incestuous family situations are not the only people who would be left out in the cold."

Measure 10, section 3, subsections 2 and 3 provide protection for those who have been subjected to rape or incestuous family relations. It also gives exceptions in section 3, subsections 1 and 4 to those whose pregnancies may result in physical harm or death and to those who are legally emancipated.

Measure 10 is a well-thought-out and researched piece of legislation, which is more than we can say for the *Emerald's* editorial.

Read your voter's manual to vote, and disregard media propaganda.

Debbie Buckles
Trudy Clark
Lydia Shaffer
Students