

# Save our schools; yes on Measure 7

Ballot Measure 7 isn't a final answer to Oregon's tax dilemma. But given the Oregon Legislature's reluctance to introduce a sales tax before the voters, Measure 7 is essential for keeping Oregon public schools well-funded.

Measure 7 would create a "split-roll tax" to fund Oregon schools. Non-owner occupied residential property, which includes businesses and rental property, would be charged \$20 per \$1,000 in property taxes. Owner-occupied residences would continue at the post-Measure 5 property tax limits of \$10 in 1993-94, down to \$5 in 1995-96.

The purpose of the measure is to balance some of the effects of 1990's Measure 5. And although it's not enough, at least it's something.

Oregon public schools are in a damaged state. According to some reports, state funding for schools could be reduced by more than 40 percent in the next three years. That, in addition to cuts already levied against schools and other social services, is difficult to swallow.

Measure 7 at least addresses the problems our schools are facing. It recognizes that schools need money and provides a large chunk of that funding. Optimistic groups say the measure will recapture anywhere from 50 percent to 70 percent of the revenue lost by 1990's Measure 5. Even if it only returned 20 percent or 30 percent, it would be worth it if schools could regain some of what they've lost.

What Oregon really needs is to restructure its tax system. A sales tax would aid all state programs and put Oregon back on sound financial footing. But until a sales tax is implemented, which could take years, voters should enact Measure 7.

The battle should not stop there. Voters will need to continue to pressure the Legislature for a permanent solution. Neither the voters nor the Legislature should be let off the hook. Measure 7 is short term; passing it only plugs a hole.

Another concern is the effect Measure 7 will have on small businesses. This is a legitimate concern because the health of small businesses goes hand in hand with the recovery of Oregon's economy.

While it's true that small businesses may have a harder time under Measure 7, it may be a necessary sacrifice for our public schools. If anything, it could inspire business leaders to pressure the Legislature for tax reform. The Legislature has already proved itself incapable of coming up with a tax plan on its own. Maybe business leaders could make a difference.

And even if Measure 7 is passed, businesses would still pay less property taxes than they did before Measure 5. Businesses survived fine before 1990, and they will survive after Measure 7.

Oregon has a quality public school system. We need to make sure it has the money to continue that tradition. Vote yes on Measure 7.

## Oregon Daily Emerald

P.O. BOX 3159 EUGENE OREGON 97403

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published daily Monday through Friday during the school year and Tuesday and Thursday during the summer by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. Inc., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices at Suite 300 of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

<b>Editor:</b> Pat Malach			
<b>News Editor</b>	Jake Berg	<b>Freelance Editor</b>	Hope Neilson
<b>Editorial Editor</b>	Martin Fisher	<b>Editorial Editor</b>	Rivers Jansson
<b>Graphics Editor</b>	Jeff Pasley	<b>Sports Editor</b>	Dave Charbonneau
<b>Entertainment Editor</b>	Frya Horn	<b>Supplements Editor</b>	Calley Anderson
<b>Night Editor:</b> Jake Berg			

**Associate Editors:** Tammy Batey, Student Government/Activities; Daralyn Trappe, Community; Colleen Pohlig, Higher Education/Administration

**News Staff:** Chester Allen, Mandy Baucum, Matt Bender, Justin Brown, Sarah Clark, Amy Deavenport, Meg Dedolph, Amanda Fernie, Alicia Ferrari, Lisa Haggerty, Teresa Hunsinger, Lisa Knoefel, Damian McLean, Steve Mims, Tiffini Mueller, Kim Nguyen, Trista Noel, Ellen Shaw, Michael Shindler, Erick Studenicka, Marion Sultor, Michele Thompson-Aguilar, Amy Van Tuyt, Todd Williams, Jacqueline Woge, Heather Zilbauer

**General Manager:** Judy Hiedi

**Advertising Director:** Bryan R. Coppedge    **Production Manager:** Michele Ross

**Advertising:** Shawn Barven, Scott Dana, Jennifer Huckins, Jane Irola, Chris Kanoff, Tom Leach, Jeremy Mason, Gillian Oh, Dustin Stadel, Sharon Vaz, Angie Windheim

**Classified:** Peggy McGinn, Manager; Barry Logan, Sharon Sauve, Susan Updegraff

**Distribution:** Rebecca Brooks, Anthony Wynn

**Business:** Kathy Carbone, Supervisor; Judy Connolly

**Production:** Ingrid White, Production Coordinator; Kristina Granger, Dee McCobb, Stacy Mitchell, Jennifer Roland, Jennifer Smith, Anne Stephenson, Daralyn Trappe

<b>Newsroom</b>	346-5511	<b>Display Advertising</b>	346-3712
<b>Business Office</b>	346-5512	<b>Classified Advertising</b>	346-4343



OUR TWENTY-YEAR EVOLUTIONARY STUDY SHOWS WE GOT IT ALL BACKWARDS, DR DARWIN - APPARENTLY WHAT WE HAVE HERE IS SURVIVAL OF THE UNFITTEST!

## COMMENTARY

# Editorial not clear on concept

By Jonathan Schell

Your editorial on Oct. 23 shows either an alarming naivete or an outright bias about local Democratic politics.

The assumption that a local volunteer staff's inability to foresee a huge rally turnout reflects Bill Clinton's ability to "organize the country" is absurd. Although I certainly understand the disappointment of Clinton supporters who were turned away at the unusually large rally, the necessity of setting blame on OPS, EPD, volunteer event coordinators, the entire Democratic Party and Bill Clinton is ridiculous.

To make voting a decision based on being turned away at a pep rally illustrates an embarrassing lack of judgment.

As for the Emerald's and others' moral indignation at allowing ignorant non-voting school children — the nerve — to participate in this "civics lesson" ... please. The Emerald assumes that undecided voters started lining up before 10:30 a.m. so that they may, once and for all, decide whether to vote for Clinton based on what they were going to hear at the rally.

This assumption is uneducated and unqualified. The children had to wait in line and came like everyone else, on a first-come, first-served basis. Also, many parents and grandparents (I interviewed them inside) took children out of school so that they could see the next president of the United States. This exhibited a refreshing enthusiasm that has been missing from politics for many years.

As for not putting the event in Autzen Stadium: There was no RSVP from the state of Oregon as to how many people were going to show up. I interviewed people from all over Oregon, as well as other western states, who drove and flew great distances to come to this rally, taking time off from work and school.

They came early and waited in line. Sure, it would have been nice if everyone who

### The Emerald's personal editorial shows an obvious lack of objectivity.

came to see Clinton got in, got good seats and was personally greeted by him or his staff. However, I don't think it is realistic or appropriate for such indignation.

As for "security not being a deciding factor": I assume the staff at the Emerald exercised its high quality investigative skills to research this question by calling up the local FBI office or the Secret Service in Washington, D.C. The flippant tone would indicate otherwise. My mother stood in front of two fraternity men who insulted officers' judgment in holding back the crowd, made macho remarks threatening the police officer and bragged they could "get a good shot at him" (how clever). Although the Secret Service is not known for having a sense of humor in such trivial matters, they undoubtedly make an exception in this case.

As for the "mob outside" — my mother was part of that "mob," and it is an outrage that you would challenge her character in such a thoughtless manner. She told me that it would have been a good idea to have a speaker system outside. But all in all, she was very delighted to see such a high turnout and an enthusiastic body politic. The Emerald wanted "Slick Willie" (gee, could this be going a little too far? Unless you are stumping for Republicans?) to get out of his car and work the crowd. Again, the Emerald knows more about security than the Secret Service. If editors on the Emerald staff were old enough to remember the tragedy of the assassinations of the 1960s, studied a little security policy or worked on the street as a law enforcement officer, then they would understand why the Secret Service is cautious.

The Emerald wrote that "nearly 10,000 voters were given the impression that they

didn't count and left the scene feeling dejected ... questioning their alliance to the Democratic candidate." Did the Emerald take a poll? Was there a sudden change at the University toward Bush or Perot? Because, obviously, they would have had the judgment to have the event at Autzen Stadium; or they would have prohibited schoolchildren from the rally; or they would have had the decency to put speakers outside?

The Oregonian and The Register-Guard reporters interviewed people in the overflow crowd. People were disappointed, but there was no likely radical political change of support.

Perhaps some people were outraged because they were "treated like cattle" and suspected that Clinton was part of an insidious plot to treat them poorly. This illustrates a naivete that would be remedied by political involvement. They would then see the enormous amount of work that is done by an all-volunteer staff to put on a hastily organized event like this.

This isn't a rock concert with a bunch of disappointed ticketholders who pay \$35 and expect a good show. This is national politics. If citizens (including editors and journalists) don't care enough to volunteer any of their time to a cause, then it would not be a surprise that they feel left out of the process. Yes, there was a herd feeling to the event — there were 10,000-plus inside and 6,000 outside. There was mayhem, vigilant Secret Service agents, high-strung volunteers, rowdy school children, relieved union representatives, awe-struck moms, raucous college students and excited professors and GTFs. It was a big, big, thrilling circus.

The Emerald's personal editorial shows an obvious lack of objectivity. If the editors at the Emerald want to vote for and endorse Bush, they should do it up front. Don't cloud your editorial judgment with an obvious lack of journalistic integrity.

Jonathan Schell is a student majoring in music at the University.