

ENDORSEMENTS

Friday, November 1, 2002

Candidates

State Senate — Tony Corcoran

Students can find a friend in the state Senate race by electing Tony Corcoran to represent District 4.

District 4 represents rural areas around Eugene and the University area. Corcoran is an incumbent, he has experience representing diverse populations, and he served in the state House for two years before moving to the Senate. Corcoran has maintained a self-described good relationship with the Oregon Students Association and with the current ASUO Executive, giving students a voice in the state Legislature.

We urge students in the University community to vote for Tony Corcoran — he will best represent District 4.

State House — Floyd Prozanski

Floyd Prozanski is the best choice for District 8. Prozanski can boast seven years in the Oregon Legislature as a member of the House of Representatives. His oppo-

nent, Greg McNeill, while a student, can claim only a failed run for ASUO Executive.

While we feel that a student's viewpoint would be welcome in the House, Greg McNeill has no experience in office, and his ideas sound unformed. Prozanski is a committed environmentalist and has solid ideas to keep education affordable.

Elected representatives must be answerable to the people they serve, and we heartily endorse a candidate that has concrete ideas that represent students — not just a candidate who is a student.

U.S. Senate — Bill Bradbury

Voters can send back the garbage U.S. Sen. Gordon Smith has been shoveling and elect a senator who genuinely supports what students want and need — Oregon Secretary of State Bill Bradbury.

Smith's campaign portrays him as a moderate, but voting records tell a different story. Smith has been moderate for as long as his campaign has been running.

Bradbury has voted in support of a woman's right to choose, actively supported

equal rights for minorities and homosexuals, and voted repeatedly for environmental protection in the state Senate.

Bradbury is the best choice for students — his understanding and support of issues extends beyond a TV commercial.

U.S. House — Peter DeFazio

The Emerald heartily supports Peter DeFazio for the U.S. House of Representatives. He has represented this area for 20 years, 16 of those in the Congress, as a committed environmentalist and a principled lawmaker.

DeFazio has tried to increase Pell Grants and has said that he favors federal loans and scholarships over bank loans. He has even helped students out of his own pocket. Years ago, he refused to accept a pay raise while the budget wasn't balanced. Ever since, he has used that extra pay to fund nine scholarships annually. To date, he has paid out nearly \$182,000 in scholarships.

It's simple: Re-elect Peter DeFazio.

Governor

We wanted to endorse write-in candidate Gary Alan Spanovich. A majority of the edito-

rial board believes Spanovich would be the best candidate — he offers enlightened leadership and a change in the way Oregon does politics. But there's a lot at stake in this race.

In an interview with the Emerald, Spanovich said Oregon politics is mired the status quo, which means money and influence in leadership, instead of vision and values. We wholeheartedly agree.

We want a different, better vision for Oregon than is represented by our current two-party choices. Nevertheless, there are stark differences between the two leading candidates — Ted Kulongoski and Kevin Mannix — that are important to us and that we believe are important to students.

So then we could have endorsed Kulongoski. But we cannot overlook the fact that we believe a better candidate exists.

For some people, democracy means everyone votes for what they believe is best. Others pick from a pre-determined set of choices. We don't know which is right.

But our conscience tells us the only endorsement we can make is for University community members to vote *their* conscience.

City measures

Measure 20-67—Yes

It's time that legislators started doing their job and finding money for schools. Measure 20-67 may circumvent that job and increase local taxes to fund schools, but it's the right decision. It's likely to be a while before the Legislature starts putting schools first, and kids need these programs.

Measure 20-68—Yes

This city charter amendment would make minor changes to the current charter to modernize it and provide better readability. There is no hidden agenda here — they really are housekeeping changes.

Measure 20-69—No

This ethics and city councilor conflict of interest code is unnecessary. There are already conflict of interest provisions in place, and the language of this code is too vague. We're unsure what type of conflicts would be prohibited and which would not, so we urge a no vote.

Measure 20-70—No

The city manager should not have to report to the City Council every time they make a change in department heads or accept a resignation. The City Council should be setting policies, not micromanaging. When controversial decisions have been made in the past, the Council made sure to find out what happened. We don't need this process made into a schedule-hampering law.

Measure 20-71—Yes

The potential for conflict of interest in the city's use of a private attorney is simply too large to be ignored. Any large organization should have an attorney that works only for them, and it is especially true for the city, which on occasion may need to be involved in litigation against private law firms.

Measure 20-72—Yes

This measure would fill elected city official positions at the next possible election opportunity. Sounds reasonable.

Measure 20-73—No

City officials need to know that they can be held responsible for their subordinates' actions. With power comes responsibility. If they

know that they can be held culpable, they may be more scrupulous managers.

Measure 20-74—Yes

Currently, citizens have to be informed of the adoption of ordinances, unless the City Council unanimously agrees. In Eugene, the likelihood of unanimity is slim, but nonetheless, it's important for the public to be advised of hearings and adoption of ordinances.

Measure 20-74—Yes

This would allow city voters to put an initiative on the ballot which would be protected from change, unless by another vote of the voters or a unanimous vote of the City Council. This is a smart way to stop elected officials from undoing the will of the voters.

County measures

Measure 20-59 — Yes

While we would rather see money going to crime prevention than to jails, this measure serves to expand the intake center and medical services space, not the jail's general housing. An improvement to the intake center would allow arrested persons to be processed more quickly, increase efficiency in delivering medical services and enhance security for staff and inmates.

Measure 20-69 — Yes

The current sheriff radios are extremely

outdated and provide limited-to-nonexistent two-way communication in significant parts of Lane County. Law enforcement, emergency services and public works agencies are not able to connect. This measure would improve emergency response in rural and wilderness areas, which is a basic right.

Measure 20-61 — Yes

This measure, to improve disabled access to the courthouse, should have been approved a long time ago. As is, the courthouse is not directly accessible to many seniors or people with disabilities, medical conditions or strollers. Approving the measure allows for a

single-level entry and faster access to public records and licensing procedures.

Measure 20-62 — No

While we like parks and do see the need for improvement, this measure has too many flaws. It costs nearly \$30 million to build boat, RV and horse facilities that would benefit few taxpayers. And we want to see money for acquiring and protecting new natural areas.

Measure 20-63 — Yes

We need to support our community's public health and social services. The current public health building is 50 years old, and listen to all

it houses: communicable disease control, bioterrorism planning, HIV counseling and testing, prenatal care and family planning. This measure would build a new facility to house these essential services.

Measure 20-65 — Yes

With WISTEC still on shaky ground, a new planetarium and learning center are essential to local science education. This measure would buy that, and a privately funded endowment will be raised to cover any operating deficits, so it won't fall on taxpayers. A new planetarium would be a great attraction and help supplement our underfunded schools.

State measures

Measure 14 — Yes

Although part of history, the language in the state Constitution that excluded free blacks from the state hasn't been in force since 1868. The sections themselves were repealed in 1925. It's time to take the final step and remove this offensive language.

Measures 15 and 16 — Yes

Although people may not realize it, Oregon is at as much risk as California for earthquakes. Yet many of the city's public education and emergency buildings are not designed to withstand a major earthquake — including University buildings. Geologists say that a massive earthquake actually will happen. It's time we were ready. These two bills would allow the state to float general obligation bonds to pay for retrofitting schools, fire stations and hospitals.

Measure 17 — Yes

This measure would allow people age 18 or over to run for state legislator. We can't endorse this measure highly enough. An 18-year-old can legally drive, smoke, be drafted and — most importantly — vote. So why shouldn't 18-year-old adults be able to vote for their peers?

Measure 18 — Yes, or No

Truth to tell, this measure confuses us. It

adds a section to a very dense article of the state Constitution dealing with tax rates. It is unclear what impact, if any, allowing for the division of a taxing district into zones and being able to vary the rates between the divisions would have. The state says there would be no financial impact from this measure, but it's about taxes, so maybe they don't know what it does, either.

Measure 21 — No

This measure would allow a "None of the above" choice when voting for judges. While we understand the sentiment, hat happens if "None of the Above" wins, and continues to win in a particular race, or worse, in a number of races? We worry that the measure could be a recipe for gridlock in our courts system.

Measure 22 — No

Oregon Supreme Court justices and appeals court judges should be representative of the entire state of Oregon, not just individual districts. Judges should make rulings based on law, not on the sympathies of a particular region of the state.

Measure 23 — Yes

Health care is needed for all. We need a safety net for necessary medical services in Oregon. It does cost money, but in the long run it saves money by providing services in an expeditious manner. Any lost jobs would be replaced by new jobs in the new system.

Measure 24 — Yes

This measure allows licensed denturists to install partial dentures or replacement teeth. Denturists are trained and knowledgeable, and this measure should be a no-brainer. The only argument is from dentists, who worry that all treatment options won't be presented by denturists who stand to make money by suggesting dentures. That's funny; don't all medical professionals potentially profit by suggesting certain treatments, like prescription drugs?

Measure 25 — Yes

The cost of living has steadily increased since 1996, but minimum wage workers haven't seen a raise in six years. Measure 25 raises the minimum wage from \$6.50 to \$6.90 in January, but even better, it ties annual raises to the cost of living, beginning in 2005. People earning minimum wage are barely sliding by; these few workers deserve to earn enough to pay for the increasing cost of food, rent and electricity. Vote yes.

Measure 26 — Yes

This measure would bring a new level of credibility to Oregon's much-touted initiative system by prohibiting signature gatherers from being paid per signature. Paying by the signature encourages fraud; with this measure, groups will still be able to pay signature gatherers by the hour. This is a

smart measure that encourages citizen participation.

Measure 27 — Yes

Consumers already have the right to know what's in the food they buy. This measure would simply give consumers the ability to know how that food is made. Right or wrong, many consumers are nervous about genetically engineered food. In fighting so hard against this measure, it really seems that food producers have something scary to hide when it comes to GE foods. As with all labeling laws, the food industry has fought this tooth and nail. Why is it hard to understand that people want to know what's in their food? Vote yes.

Editorial board

These editorials represent the opinion of the Emerald editorial board. Responses can be sent to letters@dailyemerald.com.

Michael J. Kleckner
Editor in chief

Salena De La Cruz
Editorial editor

Jessica Richelderfer
Managing editor

Pat Payne
Editorial editor

Jenna Cunningham
Student representative