

Recycling measure won't make state any greener

Oregon is the most beautiful, unspoiled land that I have ever experienced. It is evident that environmental issues are at the core of our concerns. We pass laws and amendments that reflect a deep appreciation for the welfare of our natural resources.

Sometimes, however, the desire to do "the right thing" is orchestrated in such a way as to accomplish the exact opposite. Measure 6 is clearly an example of such an instance.

OSPIRG, the Oregon Public Interest Research Group, has sponsored a measure that is being touted as the best solution to our difficulties with non-recyclable wastes. It is a regulatory measure. It is also a punitive and unjustifiably expensive measure.

As part of their promotional propaganda, OSPIRG is reminding us all of their success with the "Bottle Bill." What they are purposefully omitting is the fact that the "Bottle Bill," a regulatory measure, also included substantial monetary incentives. When you hear someone extol the virtues of Measure 6 and proclaim that "Regulation Works!," ask him who is paying for it.

Bill Hanneman, author of Oregon's "Bottle Bill," has sent out letters to his voters asking them to defeat this bill. In his letter he explains that "The bureaucracy required to enforce Measure 6 will be substantial. Yet Measure 6 provides not one dime to pay for [itself]. . . and administer hearings and appeals on exemptions for thousands of products annually."

The DEQ has estimated that 1 million dollars is needed to establish and enforce the bill -- including the first year's salaries

for seven staff members needed to perform regulatory functions. OSPIRG estimates 1/2 million dollars would be required and only 2 - 3 staff members.

Regardless of the cost, if we vote this measure into law our legislative assembly will be constrained to find a way to fund it -- although it is you and I that will actually pay for it. Before we buy it let's take a closer look at the merchandise. . .

Measure 6 lacks any form of positive reinforcement. What it lacks in incentives it makes up for in penalties of up to \$10,000 per day for violations. In order to escape the punitive actions built into Measure 6, a package manufactured or distributed and then sold in Oregon must fit into one of the following categories:

(1) It must be usable a minimum of 5 times. This doesn't sound too bad but consider the most likely material to conform with this requirement; glass. The costs of transport, loss due to breakage, industrial re-fit, sterilization, and civil liabilities in dollars and energy make this condition ridiculously impractical.

Currently glass and other materials are broken down and reformed at a considerable savings in energy alone. Reusing products like lumber and appliances makes a lot of sense, but Measure 6 has targeted (wrongly) packaging alone.

(2) The product must be recyclable within existing systems. This is the most insidiously deceptive requirement in the

bill. On the surface the meaning reads that packaging manufacturers are not to complicate the process of resource recovery; however, the actual net result may be the death of recycling as an industry!

Recycling and resource recovery are currently not economical in either their administration or their mechanics. The marketplace has become flooded with materials that the industry has no capacity to turn into usable, saleable commodities that can turn a reasonable profit.

We need to develop new technologies like those that introduced plastic lumber. The reverberations from that one innovation alone may soon help breathe life into Oregon's distressed lumber industry. Where is the incentive for (or even the smallest consideration of) advancement in the INDUSTRY of resource recovery in Measure 6? Nowhere.

(3) If conditions 1 and 2 cannot be met, the packaging must be constructed of 50% recycled materials. A trip to your local grocery will reveal that a large percentage of packaging is already made from recovered materials -- "If it's GREY it's OKAY!"

Admittedly there is much room for improvement -- and there are packages that are purposefully sly in the way their "recyclable" claim is made. Paper packaging, from an industry viewpoint, is the lowest grade of recovered material; for the most part it already contains recycled fibers and technically cannot be recovered due to the shortness of their fiber length.

There are two likely consequences to this criterion; products will be over-packaged to compensate for a lack of structural integrity (who pays for that?), or the fibers will end up in pulp mill sludge ponds and

accumulate. Does it really make sense to divert this low grade material into a market that is already glutted on recoverable and useful paper products?

The ideology behind this measure simple; Regulation works -- stricter standards will initialize recycling. Well there a certain logic to this idea . . . the same kind of logic that led Joseph McCarthy to persecute and terrorize a nation that unwittingly gave him not only the permission but the power to do it! McCarthy believed that persecuting popular public figures, communists would reveal them as communists.

A seemingly strange analogy until you read Measure 6 and discover that any citizen can file suit (at the expense of the State whether they prevail or not) against a company for selling/distributing/manufacturing a package that doesn't conform to the above criteria as long as the suit "advancing the cause" of the bill. The group that is likely to profit from this kind of legislation is the legal community.

This nation has a long history of rewarding the extraction of virgin material for production. It is now time that we reorient ourselves and become resource recovery minded. I believe in recycling and I believe in God; but neither one should be force fed through legislation. Measure 6 was perhaps a good idea, it just needs to spend a little more time on the blackboard. We must continue to recover and recycle our resources; however, a poorly defined punitive piece of legislation that offers no incentives, no advancement, and no support is not going to help. On Nov. 5, send Measure 6 back to be recycled; Vote No and Kill the Bill!

NEXT: THE EXISTING ANSWER

Elimination Game Room solution

Dear Editor:

I would like to take a stand on the Game Room relocation proposal. On page 5, of *The Clackamas Print*, Oct. 17, 1990, where several faculty/staff contacted for response "were undecided or would not respond to the question" a blank spot was printed. I found the blank spot symbolically revealing. Indeed, the faculty are a "blank spot," for we have not been heavily involved in the latest round of rapidly shifting scenarios of where to place the Game Room, yet this allows the institution to offer students vital academic services at a time when campus space is a scarce commodity.

I tested my "blankspot" assumption at the Oct. 25 Faculty Senate Meeting where I found more kindred spirits. My proposal is simple-that we add to the list of Game Room solutions the elimination of the Game Room. I submit the following rational:

1. Access to game room activities abound along McLoughlin Blvd., Molalla Ave., and Beaver Creek Rd. for like minded students.
2. This is a commuter, not a residential college.
3. The "business of instruction is instruction" and there appears to be no intrinsic instructional value in the Game Room (See also, "The Music Man" for reference).
4. The Student Government Budget is primarily funded by mandatory student fees paid through tuition and other revenue sources, not the Game Room revenues.
5. If Randall 101 were a reasonable solution, this concept might have been implemented years ago ("Read my lips-no simple solutions").

In conclusion, I urge you to choose a value system which gives priority to instructional programs over pool tables (See again the "Music Man" or "If you don't stand for something, you'll fall for anything.") I am for student space, more study zones and study carrels, more tutorial sta-

tions, lounge space for staff, faculty and students. These are long time needs which may be rectified with new building completion. However, no contest should exist between a Game Room and instructional programs. I won't enter!

Judith Peabody
Tutorial Coordinator

The Clackamas Print

Editor-in-Chief: Angela Wilson
 Feature Editor: Jennifer Soper
 Sports Editor: Aaron Brown
 Photo Editor: Lane Scheideman
 Rhapody Editor: Ron Jagodnik, Jr.
 Business Manager: Gregg Mayes
 Staff Writers: Carie Gradener
 Heatherle Himes
 Brenda Hoden
 Heidle Hoffman
 Frank Jordan
 Nolan Kidwell
 Jennifer Lessard
 Richard Marx
 Jane Wilcox
 Photographers: Kyle Moe
 Darby Pereira
 David VanKeiren
 Eva Worley
 Production Staff: Anthony Porter
 Jillian Porter
 Tricia Schneider
 Computer Tech: Scott Johnson
 Ad Salesman: Dan Champie
 Darkroom Tech: Debbie Felix
 Advisor: Linda Vogt

The Clackamas Print aims to be a fair and impartial newspaper covering the college community. Opinions expressed in *The Clackamas Print* do not necessarily reflect those of the college administration, faculty or Advertisers. The Clackamas Print is a weekly publication distributed every Wednesday except for finals week. The open advertising rate is \$3.75 per column inch. Clackamas Community College, 19600 S. Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, Oregon 97045. Trailer B. Telephone: 657-6958, ext. 309 (office), ext. 578 (production) and ext. 577 (advertising).

Editorial Policy

The views expressed in *The Clackamas Print* are those of *The Clackamas Print* staff, and do not necessarily reflect those of Clackamas Community College.

The Clackamas Print welcomes letters to the Editor. Such letters must be signed and have a telephone number or they will not be printed. The author's name will not be printed if requested, but the original letter must be signed. Letters must not exceed 300 words and should be typewritten or neatly printed. Letters can be turned into *The Clackamas Print* offices in Trailer B.

The Clackamas Print reserves the right to edit Letters to the Editor for grammar, obscenities and libelous materials. Letters to the Editor must be received by Monday before publication to be printed in Wednesday's edition.

