

Editorials are written by or approved by members of the Capital Press Editorial Board.

All other commentary pieces are the opinions of the authors but not necessarily this newspaper.

# Opinion

**Editorial Board**  
**Editor & Publisher**  
 Joe Beach  
 opinions@capitalpress.com  
**Managing Editor**  
 Carl Sampson  
 Online: www.capitalpress.com/opinion

## OUR VIEW

# It's time for Trump to follow through on trade

Two national wheat groups say now that the members of the former Trans-Pacific Partnership have held talks on a new multilateral trade deal without the United States, wheat growers can expect an annual \$200 million tariff disadvantage with competitors in the region.

They rightly await action from the Trump administration. The countries remaining in the negotiations represent both major customers and competitors.

In 2008, the United States began multilateral negotiations with Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam on the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership trade pact. It was the signature trade initiative of the Obama administration.

From the get-go the deal



Port of Portland

Wheat bound for Asia is loaded into a ship at the Port of Portland. U.S. farmers are at a \$200 million annual tariff disadvantage now that the 11 remaining nations in the Trans-Pacific Partnership are continuing without the U.S.

drew fire across the board, but particularly from the left. The negotiations were said to be too secret, the concessions to big business too big, the safeguards on human rights and labor too weak, and the whole deal was said to be too complicated. Things went south from there.

By the time the 2016 presidential campaign rolled around, it was hard to find any U.S. politician besides President Obama who had anything good to say about the deal, and even he was vague about the details because of that secrecy thing. He signed the deal, then turned

it over to Congress with little hope it would be ratified before the election.

Bernie Sanders said TPP was a “global race to the bottom” to boost corporate profits.

As secretary of state, Hillary Clinton called TPP the “gold standard” of trade pacts, but candidate Clinton said that when she read the final text she couldn’t support it.

Donald Trump said the deal undercut American workers and companies.

So, no matter who won the 2016 election, the U.S. was bound to leave the deal. But, it is Trump who won on a promise he’d pull out of the pact and negotiate better bilateral deals with Pacific countries.

Trump is 1-for-2 and wheat growers and other farmers who depend on trade, particularly in the Pacific Rim, are waiting for him to fulfill the other half of

the promise.

It’s unclear what the ever mercurial and pragmatic commander-in-chief really has in mind.

Just last weekend the president said he’d be open to rejoining the TPP, now known as Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership Agreement, if the remaining countries come up with a better deal.

It’s hard to imagine the remaining partners will craft a better deal for the United States without the United States sitting at the table, but conventional wisdom doesn’t count for as much now as it once did.

U.S. farmers export \$135 billion in agricultural products each year.

They have a lot riding on trade and are understandably anxious that their interests are actively advanced.

## Readers' views

### Support renegotiating trade deals

I do not understand producers’ reluctance to have NAFTA renegotiated. One of the ways to get that done is threaten to cancel and, if you have been watching, that is what is going on.

There are those of us who trade with Canadian customers and feel that NAFTA is one-sided. Small seeds are produced in Canada and sold in the U.S. To ship to the states, they get an AOSCA (Association of Official Seed Certifying Agencies) seed test, which is what is used here in the states, and load the truck and it arrives here. It would surprise you how many loads come to the Shedd, Ore., area to be sold and used in mixes.

When we ship to Canada, we need to get a Canadian test, no issue with that, then pay a border broker \$175/truck to cross the border. Then, if paperwork isn’t cleared ahead of time, seed must go into an approved warehouse and then be released by the authorities.

Then there is the Pacific trade agreement. When we ship there it doesn’t matter how much testing we do. They have the right to sample test and reject containers. Friends out of New Zealand shipping to the same countries have never had a container rejected.

So, support our government on negotiating new trade agreements. The other countries have proved they need the U.S.

Donald Wirth  
Tangent, Ore.

### Regulate climate change hot air

Two articles in the Jan. 5 Capital Press refer to climate change. Does anyone really believe that a normally occurring cyclical event can be changed?

Scientists researching arctic ice samples discovered occurrences of climate change in past times (a revealing article on climate change research by scientists was published by the New American magazine on Sept. 14).

Just who benefits from promoting the notion of compliance with regulations? How can we, the people, be the cause of climate change because of our factories, the use of fossil fuels, etc.? According to research, climate change occurred in prehistoric times when vehicles and cars did not exist. Has common sense disappeared from humanity?

In reading the article on regulating emissions of cattle and other animals, maybe we should call for the regulation of the hot air emitting from promoters of these regulations — don’t you think?

Mrs. M. Novak  
Yamhill, Ore.

### And along came the Spurred Owl

This stuff on Spotted Owls and Barred Owls is sure causing confusion in my recollection about bird species.

In 1962, while studying for my master’s degree at the University of New Mexico, I took a class in ornithology from the renown biologist Dr. James S. Finley. In our study on bird speciation we discovered that birds, when isolated for many generations, may evolve characteristics that upon observation appear to be unique. When the isolating factor has been removed, think glaciers during the ice age, the birds may again come in contact with each other. If they do, and they breed freely producing viable offspring they are of the same species. If they do not breed, they are a distinct species and are recognized as such. What is not mentioned in this article is the Barred Owl and the Spotted Owl do breed and they do produce viable offspring called Spurred Owls.

We learned that variation in species is an important part of biodiversity and is important for the species to be able to adapt to evolutionary pressures. Hybridization in birds was not universally regarded in the field of ornithology. As near as I can figure these definitions still are accepted knowledge.

At the time Dr. Finley stated there were four species we might want to watch because they were starting to move. The Yellow-shafted Flicker, found east of the Rocky Mountains, was moving westward into the territory of the Red-shafted Flicker, found west of the Rocky Mountains. When this happened it was found that they did breed and they did produce viable offspring. Scientists now recognize these birds should be identified as a single species called Northern Flicker.

He stated the other birds we should watch were the Barred Owl, found east of the Rocky Mountains and the Spotted Owl, found west of the Rocky Mountains. It took the Barred Owl a little longer to get to the West Coast because they took a route through Canada before arriving on the West Coast. When they did arrive they were pretty aggressive, part of that diversity thing. And they did breed freely, producing viable offspring called Spurred Owl.

Now we see the government spending millions of dollars to keep those darn birds apart and where they have not been successful they are starting to refer to the Spurred Owls as hybrids. Next thing you know Ancestry.com will be calling the matches between the Irish and the English hybrids.

Carlisle Harrison  
Hermiston, Ore.

### Logging-environment debate shifting

I wish to compliment both Mark Turner and the Capital Press for the Jan. 19 Guest Comment article: “Public deserves an honest debate over logging and wildfire.”

I sense a paradigm shift in the Loggers versus the Environmentalists battle. As long as I can recall, the timber industry and environmental groups have been at “loggerheads,” and that dispute will likely continue ad infinitum if the environmental groups ignore the new aspects of reality presented by the change in conditions that we have all witnessed in the increasing number, size and devastation of Northwest wildfires.

Mark Turner clearly points out these new aspects of reality in his article. These changes have the potential to transcend the age-old debate and to bring the two sides together in a manner that has heretofore been unthinkable.

The climate change debate: Mr. Turner neither affirmed nor denied climate change, yet most environmental groups are avid in their affirmation. The timber industry does not have to hold an adversarial position, it can remain neutral. If climate change is what is causing these record wildfires in the Northwest and forest practices can help mitigate the impact, then logging becomes a tool to prevent the wholesale assault of wildfire on the very environment that environmentalists so dearly wish to protect.

Loggers get to work and the environmentalists get to preserve what they have fought to preserve instead of watching it go up in smoke. That’s win/win.

Smoke. That’s carbon, as Mr. Turner points out. If Washington and Oregon enact proposed legislation that caps carbon and taxes carbon polluters, the public forests could potentially be the biggest offender.

Not only do these massive wildfires produce vast, wasteful carbon, just as importantly they destroy the forest that is the best natural source of carbon sequestration. That is a lose/lose situation.

If the Forest Service fails to put into place practices that prevent such carbon pollution and mitigate against the destruction of natural sequestration, will they not be potentially liable under such new carbon tax laws? If not legally, certainly in the public’s perception.

Mr. Turner points to how privately managed forest lands do not suffer the same extreme losses, not remotely.

Habitat loss. In public lands set apart for old growth habitat or specific areas designated for the protection of certain plant or animal species, logging the margins or even strips within the designated areas can act as firebreaks

to preserve and protect what has been set aside as that which needs to be protected. Huge contiguous areas without wildfire breaks simply put all the eggs in one big basket and put the preserve and the flora and fauna contained within that basket at greater risk of loss.

This is a pivotal moment in our local history and a chance to move forward from a beleaguered conflict to a partnership that would serve the public interests. One need simply imagine 10 years down the road based upon what we have seen over the past 5 years in terms of Northwest wildfires to judge that our present course will not sustain us and a change in tactics and alliances is going to be required.

Brian Quigley  
Camano Island, Wash.

### Agricultural census is too much

We recently completed the 2017 Census of Agriculture. Like most of you, we are obligated by law to fill this out.

It seems this census has become both needlessly complex and needlessly intrusive. The sheer length is daunting. It asks 24 pages of questions. Some require a review of the farm records. Some it seems could have legal implications.

Why do they want to know about my irrigation practices, water rights and what I’ve used within 5 years (Sec 4)? Who else has to provide the government an estimated market value of his home property (Sec 31)? As a farm it might be worth one amount but as a subdivision or as a vacation/retirement home, quite another. As the farm is not for sale it is irrelevant, and any answer I give is only a guess.

Do I need an accountant, an attorney and an appraiser to fill out the ag census? Is the detailed personal information required something that can be used against me, or to market to me? Is the benefit worth the cost?

This is more census than the founders envisioned.

Jonathan Spero  
Grants Pass, Ore.

### Washington’s Hirst case and false science

The Hirst court fish ruling reminded me of the court ruling on the darter fish to stop a dam.

It turned out to be false science and gullible lawyer judges.

After the dam was stopped it was discovered there were all kinds of darter fish all over the place.

That’s called false science. The same goes for wells affecting fish being false science — and very gullible lawyer judges.

The U.S. Supreme Court has warned judges about false science, but some of them just don’t get it.

William J. Purcell  
Lebanon, Ore.

Guest  
comment  
Barry Bushue



## Cap and trade will hurt, not bolster, the ag community

By BARRY BUSHUE  
For the Capital Press

The agriculture community has been a vital part of our region’s economy for over a century, employing over 300,000 people across our great state and generating billions in revenue each year. As business leaders, we invest heavily in sustainability and resource stewardship to reduce our footprint. It’s paid off. Oregon’s share of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions is less than 1 percent and is on a clear downward trend — emissions are down 13 percent in the last 15 years.

Our state has been a leader in building one of the cleanest economies in the country. Yet, legislators have introduced a proposal that would apply California’s costly and unnecessary carbon pricing program to Oregon. More than anyone else, farm and ranch families depend on a healthy environment, so we share legislators’ goal of protecting it. However, we fundamentally differ on the proposal being considered this session.

The proposal being considered will not decrease global greenhouse gas emissions. However, it will reduce the viability of Oregon’s homegrown businesses and levy downstream financial impacts on farm families. The cap and trade bill will drive up the cost of resources we need to support investments in carbon reduction and grow valuable jobs across our state. By adopting California’s unsuccessful cap and trade program and creating an economy-wide price on carbon we would immediately drive up the cost of electricity, increase fuel by a minimum of 16 cents per gallon and drive thousands of jobs away from Oregon.

Furthermore, with 80 percent of our ag production leaving the state, it’s imperative we maintain a competitive edge in the global marketplace. As price-takers, farmers have a limited ability to recoup added production costs. Cap and trade will reduce our competitiveness by levying a new layer of costs onto Oregon producers that our counterparts in other states and parts of the world do not have.

Oregon is responsible for .1 percent of global carbon emissions, meaning you could eliminate our economy entirely and not make a dent in global emissions. Our state is one of the cleanest in the nation, and we’ve made tremendous strides to make it even cleaner. It makes no sense to increase the cost of living for Oregon families and jeopardize thousands of agriculture jobs to meet a goal we’re already advancing toward. Oregonians should reject calls to adopt California’s cap and trade law. Instead, let’s come together and continue the great progress we’re making together in reducing GHG emissions.

Barry Bushue is president of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation.