

Vote yes on 1, no on 2

## Use bonds, not fuel taxes, for Oregon parks

Oregon's parks, our parks, are some of the country's most scenic, historic and natural landscapes for everyone to enjoy.

Fortunately, many people feel the same and do take advantage of our recreational facilities. Unfortunately, money to upgrade our parks has not kept up with the demand for use of the parks.

That is why on Nov. 3, Oregonians will vote on two measures to determine if our parks are worthy of more money. The answer is yes and no.

Measure 1 amends the Oregon Constitution to allow the state

to incur debt by selling general obligation bonds for up to \$250 million for a State Parks and Recreation Development Fund.

The Joint Legislative Committee, appointed to provide support for this measure, had this to say in favor of the measure: "We have a chance to reinvest in Oregon's heritage -- our parks. Let's continue the vision, protect our future and create a livable atmosphere for our children."

Yes, it is a good idea for the state to sell bonds to raise money to maintain our parks. Vote yes on 1. Living in the beautiful Pacific Northwest should be an honor for Oregonians, an honor worth supporting ...

... unless supporting our parks means a raise in gas taxes. Measure 2 amends the Oregon Constitution so that some future fuel taxes may go to state parks.

Although it does not impose a tax, it does the legislature the flexibility to increase future motor fuel taxes, at a maximum of

**Measure 2**  
 Shall Oregon's Constitution be amended to allow legislature to dedicate future motor vehicle fuel tax increases for state park purposes?

two cents per gallon every two years.

To raise the gas tax in our trying times is bad enough, but then to raise them for something other than our roads is absurd. Any money raised from fuel taxes should go directly where they go now -- highway construction, reconstruction, improvement and maintenance. To take away from that allotted money would mean more dangerous roads.

Keep our gas taxes working for better roads, not for parks. Vote no on 2.

**Measure 1**  
 Shall Oregon's Constitution allow state to issue up to \$250 million in general obligation bonds for state parks, recreation facilities?

## Vote no on 3 Term limits will hurt Oregon on National level

Term limits. Two words that mean so much, don't they? It seems everybody wants them so politicians, the ones who are supposed to serve us, don't "cash in" with the office they hold and stay in the job for decades.

It sounds so easy to just limit their terms. Get new ideas and fresh faces. But if Measure 3 passes, not only will it limit terms for Oregon legislatures and state-wide elected officers, but also it would limit our U.S. Congressmen. Oregon cannot afford that.

Oregon members of the U.S. Congress would be limited to 6 years in the House of Representatives and 12 years of work in the Senate. Although the thought may be appealing to voters, they should take into consideration that this is a state measure, not a national one. If Oregon and a select few other states create term limits for their congressmen, then each time a new congressman is elected, he will begin at the bottom of the totem pole, with no

seniority. Other states without term limits would have their ideas heard first, and will have more clout

**Measure 3**  
 Shall Oregon's Constitution be amended to limit terms for Oregon legislators, statewide elected officers, and Oregon's U.S. Congress members?

when the ideas are turned into bills.

Technically, each office already has a term limit. It is called end of the term. After each term, we, the voters, have the right to "limit" our politicians by voting them out of office. We don't even have to wait for the end of a term. If we feel "cheated" by our elected official, we can recall him. In fact, Oregon is one of only 15

states that have the power to recall an elected official.

Political "experts" say incumbents have an advantage because their names are known. Whose fault is that? The congressmen or the people who vote for them only because of a name? Passing this law is like saying we, as Oregonians, don't care enough about issues to look into the background of each candidate. That doesn't sound like a state full of educated voters.

If this was a national amendment to the Constitution, and each state had the same term limits, the idea may be welcome. But being only one state, it doesn't make much sense. You want term limits? Vote the candidate out. Join **The Clackamas Print Staff** in voting no on Measure 3.

## Vote no on 8 Fishing restrictions will cripple economy

Measure 8, which is intended to help conserve and protect salmon and steelhead on the lower Columbia river, does not address the problems that cause the greatest damage to our native fish.

The single largest killer of salmon and steelhead on the Columbia river and its tributaries, is the network of dams run by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The dams kill millions of young fish (smolts) each year when they are sucked into the turbines of the dams as they migrate to the Pacific.

Another problem not addressed by this ballot measure is the Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers regularly dredge and alter the flow of the Columbia river, destroying the breeding grounds of the fish and slowing down their journey to the sea.

Although many groups agree that we do need new fishing regulations for the salmon and steel-



## Vote no on 4 Banning triples will increase accidents, congestion, pollution

In an election year when so many vital decisions are to be made, a few small but very important ballot measures can be swept under the table: one being Measure 4. Because of the race for The White House, Measure 9, and Measures 5 and 6 are getting a lot more attention from the media, the question of amending Oregon law to ban the granting of permits for triple truck-trailer combinations on Oregon highways is a very important one.

The majority of the members of **The Clackamas Print** agree that a potential "yes" vote on Measure 4 would mean bad news for Oregon. The fact of the matter is that by banning triples we would be putting more doubles on the road in their places, which would result in MORE accidents. According to the Oregon Department of Transportation, in the last 25 years that triples have been on Oregon highways, they have proven to be four times safer than any other trucks.

Along with more trucks and more accidents to Oregon roads, Measure 4 would bring more traffic congestion, pollution (5

million pounds more exhaust emissions per year), road damage and higher consumer prices.

**Measure 4**  
 Shall Oregon law be amended to ban the granting of permits for triple truck-trailer combinations on Oregon highways?

The economic impact of banning triples would be the equivalent of a 4 percent sales tax. Those elevated prices would result in higher consumer prices, job losses, or both. In addition, shipping the same amount of goods on more trucks means loftier costs for recyclables, who depend on low costs chiefly to stay in business.

A 'no' vote on Measure 4 would make driving MORE DANGEROUS, NOT SAFER. We hope you'll join us and vote no on Measure 4 on Nov. 3.

head on the Columbia, any action that is taken needs to be a cooperative measure involving both Washington and Oregon.

The economies of many

**Measure 8**  
 Shall state law restrict lower Columbia River fishing to most selective means available, to allow release of non-targeted fish unharmed?

The opinions on this page were arrived at by a vote of **The Clackamas Print Staff**. The editorials were compiled by Jeff Kemp, Scott Morris and Paul Valencia. These opinions do not necessarily represent views of all staff members, they were decided by a majority vote.

Only ballot measures 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8 are represented here. The staff could not reach a clear majority on the remaining measures.

**The Clackamas Print** staff encourages every registered voter to vote on Nov. 3.

Oregon cities, such as Astoria and Warrenton, depend greatly on the commercial and sports fishing industries. If Measure 8 passes it could cripple the economies of these communities and put thousands of charter boat operators, fishing guides, commercial fisherman and fish processors out of work.

Once again we are faced with the difficult task of balancing a healthy economy with the welfare of our planet. This can be accomplished if Oregon and Washington WORK TOGETHER AS A TEAM not as separate entities.

