

## Anti-nuke

Editor: Citizens who are concerned with rising electric rates and spread of nuclear power in the Northwest should be aware of three initiatives now circulating around the area. The petitions need to be signed by the required signatures by the end of the month to qualify for the ballot.

1) Construction Work in Progress (CWIP) petition seeks to stop ratepayer financing of utilities' expansion program removing CWIP from their rate base. Not only is it unfair to charge captive customers in the area for electricity, it works to the hardship on senior citizens and those on fixed incomes.

2) Nuclear Ban petition, as drafted by anti-utility activist Marbet, prohibits nuclear plants and waste storage in Oregon. Considering the re-avalanche of news reports regarding radiation hazards and overruns of new plants, citizens should be ready for a progressive step.

3) Public Power Petition, drafted by the Grange and the Farmer Power League, will amend Oregon law to make it possible to form People's Utility Districts (PUDs) to gain access to federal preference power. PUDs we have local control over energy decisions and less likely to build more expensive nuclear power plants.

Oregon's energy future will be a significant step towards a better day if voters approve these initiatives. But first we need to collect signatures to place them on the ballot. For petition more information write Citizens for Utility Reform, Box 12763, Salem, 97309.

McTeague  
12763 N. Dr. N.  
Salem, Oregon 97303

## Conspiracy

Editor: The students of CCC, we feel that free American citizens don't need the favoritism shown for certain candidates of this election were one of the candidates could be on the paper for campaigns. The editorial committee helped Mike McCarty come up with his campaign and the editor herself seemed to have been helping him.

1) She used her position in the Print to campaign for the side of her choice.

R. Jenkins  
Ed. Student of CCC

## Equal space

Editor: One might now see it, there are two outstanding candidates for the ASG presidential

position, Richard Weiss and Mike McCarty.

Vote for McCarty, why? Richard Weiss is an intelligent person "with a lot of good ideas". Unfortunately, the majority of the time these "good ideas" are not put into action. For instance:

1) Weiss is chairman of the New Projects Committee. He was to have this committee implemented in student government Winter Term 1978. This committee has not had a meeting for eight weeks, it has not set goals or even discussed dropping the committee. Weiss is responsible for this committee because he is chairman of it. This committee would have been beneficial to the students because:

a) it could have sought out student input; asking students what they felt was missing from the campus (bus benches, activities, etc.);

b) it could have put student ideas into action, by appointing new committees to cover student needs.

2) Weiss has "lost control" with the CCOSAC Newsletter Committee. When confronted with this fact, Weiss blamed another member of the committee for her apathy. But, whether that person failed to follow through or not, Weiss is chairman of the committee and has the responsibility to set some goals (even dropping the committee). Weiss was asked when action would be taken concerning the committee and he answered "some time after the elections (ASG executive officer elections)". The apathy pertaining to this committee that Weiss has shown hurts CCC students because:

a) CCOSAC is an organization of community colleges in Oregon. He is representing the CCC students statewide when he participates. It doesn't seem desirable to have a person who has shown apathy in committee work become student body president of your college.

b) this CCOSAC Newsletter could have benefited CCC students because it could have opened up communication between the community colleges in Oregon. This would have given student government "up-to-date" information on events, activities and problems of other community colleges. The result would have been new ideas for serving the Clackamas Community College students.

These are two reasons why Weiss should not be student body president, but why should Mike McCarty be re-elected?

1) Mike McCarty is a leader. No matter where he goes he is in the lead. This leadership is one that comes naturally and he always considers what's best for the CCC students rather than any one individual. Several examples are:

a) This year Mike McCarty was elected Advisor to the CCO SAC Board of Presidents. Again, CCOSAC is made up of eleven community colleges in Oregon, and the Board of Presidents consists of all the student body presidents of these community colleges. Certainly each president is a leader in his own way, so that being elected as a "leader

of leaders" is a feat in itself.

b) As a CCOSAC representative for Clackamas Community College myself, I have found that other community colleges in Oregon have respect for Clackamas Community College A.S.G. I found this was due to Mike McCarty's leadership which unified the student senate of CCC.

Most people would ask, what difference does the unity of ASG have to do with the student body? A lot. If the senate is unified it accomplishes more. What the senate accomplishes benefits the students of CCC through better planned activities, meeting of student needs, etc.

This is only the beginning of many reasons to vote for Mike McCarty.

Julia Chitty  
Student

## Rights jeopardized

To the Editor:

After reading the Print's endorsement yesterday, I felt a biased opinion was being directed toward the student body.

If this is to remain a free country, it seems to me each of us must make an effort to maintain the right for an individual to think for him or her self. As an information source for the public, the media should remain neutral in presenting the facts about all the candidates and let the people form their own opinions.

Esther Johnson  
CCC student

## Groggy

To the Editor:

This letter is directed at the so-called "authors" of the McCarty endorsement which appeared in the April 26 issue of The Print. Although I am admittedly apathetic, that article provoked me into submitting my own views, not on who(m) should be president, but rather, on how one candidate is promoted over others. In the article "Vote McCarty" it was stated that Mr. Weiss's "aggressive style of leadership" might hinder rather than help him. I am curious as to just what an "aggressive style" is. Does it possibly mean that he manhandles senators, or does it mean that he physically abuses co-workers? Or can it possibly mean that, compared to prior ASG cabinets, a hibernating bear would appear aggressive?

Which brings up to a second point, which is, where, if not college, can one expect to gain the leadership experience you feel is so important. If, through our school years, we elected solely the experienced, then there would be no election, for Jerry Smith (first grade hall monitor) would be president. Added to this is the fact that, it is my understanding that Mr. Weiss held a leadership position in Vietnam

(of course that does not qualify him to handle the vital affairs of the ASG). It was further stated that we should all "play by the rules" like Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman. That statement really bothered me. Who's rules? If everyone always "played by the rules" there would be no innovation and we'd all be on tea breaks instead of coffee breaks.

Furthermore, if you, the author, consider Abbie Hoffman's present situation, (he is presently a fugitive from federal narcotics agents, somewhere underground in N.Y. having undergone plastic surgery), "playing by the rules," then you are in no position to opionate on presidential candidates.

I will not contemplate the reference to McCarty's "smooth and polished way" only the author knows what that means. You, the author, claimed noble intentions for the article stating you wished to make "voting easier..." "create an informed student body" which to me, reads "persuade" and "manipulate" those few groggy students (I will not be among them) who will bother to vote, with biased information especially when you the author is obviously uninformed. And why is there this "little chance to know the candidates?" Possibly the ASG needs a little "aggressive style" to some involvement?

The article, on a whole, was an unprofessional reflection of a don't make waves attitude, and reeked of the final digestive stages of hay.

Not planning to vote,  
Rick Ingram  
127 Valleyview Dr.,  
Oregon City, 97045

## Influenced

To the Editor:

This writer realizes that there is a freedom of the press, but a newspaper, whether a college or a city paper, has a duty to the public to be informative. The Print has been a very informative paper until now.

For the elections, the Print endorsed a candidate "for the first time", according to the Print, which they had every right to do. However, in this writer's opinion, the way the endorsement was written has possibly influenced the students to vote for the Prints' candidate.

Also the Print gave their candidate more space in the newspaper article, "Candidates voice views on next years ASG," than the other two candidates were given. The candidates should be given equal space no matter which candidate the paper supports.

Students should be given an informative and complete report on all the candidates. This way the students may choose for themselves which candidate they may want to vote for. After all, this is a democratic society we live in.

B.M. Southwick

Editor's note: As we stated in last week's editorial, the endorsements for candidates for office were reached after interviews with all the candidates and are a consensus of the editorial board, not the opinion of any one person on the staff.

Readers should note that the opinion page is just that. A page reserved for the editorial board's opinions on any subject, be it administrative policy, abortion or candidates for ASG office.

The news stories about the candidates that appeared in this week's and last week's papers were written by a staff member and were as unbiased and objective as possible.

## Re-election

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter in regard to the re-election of Mike McCarty for the office of president of ASG.

I have worked closely with Mike McCarty for a year and a half and have found him to be an involved and effective man with good functional ideas and implementation. Mike is experienced, capable and concerned with the betterment of this college and its students.

Should Mike McCarty be re-elected? It is my reasoning that he should be. Why do I believe this? I believe this because he has had one year to perform in office and perform he has. Mike has begun several vital programs for students here at Clackamas.

Mike is the State Advisor for Community College of Oregon Student Associations and Commissions. Mike is active in developing a collective bargaining program here on campus. Mike knows his way around Clackamas Community College and the County of Clackamas. Mike is familiar to community leaders and is liked and respected by them. Mike has over this last year and a half began much that is good. However, he needs next year to develop fully that which he has begun. I urge you to give him this chance. Vote for Mike McCarty.

Mitch Newton  
Student

## Letters policy

The Print welcomes all letters to the editor. In fact, we encourage them. Consider the feedback column a place not only for comment on the newspaper, but also a place to air views on school policy, instructors, classes, the administration or any other topic pertaining to the College community.

We ask only that letters be typewritten, double-spaced or carefully printed in ink, and signed by the person submitting them. The editorial board requires that at the bottom of the letter the person or persons writing the letter attach his or her full name, address and phone number where that person can be reached for verification.

