

All signed letters to the editor should be 500 words or less and considered for publication if submitted by 1 pm the Friday publication. Letters to the Editor are subject to editing. We reserve the right to not publish any letter.

Major differences in presidential election

"Republicans buy Nader TV ads" was one headline on the front page of *The Oregonian* last Saturday. If there is any doubt in your mind that a vote for Nader is a vote for Bush, these ads, produced by the Republican Leadership Council, might cause you to re-think your choice of Nader, who acknowledges he cannot win the 2000 presidential election. The race in Oregon is too close to call.

The headline to continue the story was "Ads show attack on Gore while omitting (Nader's) criticisms of Bush," such as Nader's statement that Bush is "a big corporation running for president disguised as a person."

Give *The Oregonian* credit for its straightforward headlines that reveal the open, unapologetic distortion of truth by the Republican campaign. Last week, Oregon's largest daily newspaper gave Bush its nod. I reacted as did Carl Ehrman, of Lincoln City, who said, "So....we should vote for George W. because he wasn't as bad as expected, right?"

I believe *The Oregonian* has chosen style over substance. I believe George W. is a good old boy like other Republicans already in Washington, D.C., the ones who have kept out of sight during the campaign and at the Republican convention, lest the public be re-

minded that these are the national leaders who were totally against a Patients' Bill of Rights six months ago; lest the public be reminded that these are the men who wish, like George W., to continue the practice of trickle-down economics, which have widened the gap between the rich and the poor, leaving most of the people behind.

Business and the rich are well protected from contrib-

waste of interest on debt? Bush would bestow a \$1.3 trillion tax cut that would benefit the wealthiest Americans. With all the tax benefits and loopholes available to the rich, I just don't buy that they pay, proportionate to their real income, the most taxes.

During such unequalled prosperity in America, is this not the time to catch up with social services, especially education, that have been stalled and sacrificed to get the boom going? Even business is now paying the price for all the cuts to education.

Bush's environmental record in Texas has been abysmal, and Houston has become the smoggiest large city in America during Bush's leadership. Gore exposed that Bush "appointed a lobbyist from the chemical industry to enforce the environmental laws in Texas." Isn't that the proverbial fox in the henhouse? Global warming was stage center again this week, when a scientists' report out of the United Nations concluded the Earth would get hotter than predicted, with man-made pollution a major factor.

Bush tries to frame his differences with Gore merely as a difference in philosophy. Indeed, Bush is for the rich getting richer, while the poor get poorer. Bush declares the

presidential race is a matter of values. Indeed, I value that Gore has spent 25 years in public service, while Bush has spent five. I value that Gore has studied long and hard to know the issues while Bush relies on scripted answers to any question. With so little knowledge and experience, I fear Bush will be just a pawn of the narrow minded, cold-hearted special interest Republican congress. If I must choose between the insufferable and the insufficient give me insufferable knowledge, please, over insufficient diligence. I value that Gore has been on the forefront of environmental and technology issues. If Bush has increased business productivity in Texas, it has been at the cost of fairness to the people and responsibility to the Earth. His record there on education, health care and a woman's choice has been disgraceful.

I value that Gore would protect a women's right to choose. Like the right to have money of their own rather than be property, as they once were in America; like the right to vote, which finally gave women a voice in this country; like the right to birth control, which slowed the

deaths of women forced to child after child, or to turn to abort a child who would otherwise be born into poverty or a and even prevented some love marriages and abandonment the right to equal pay for work; the right to choice over own bodies was a *hard-won* of women in this country, and against any law that disad tages an entire class of people not an entire class, I guess—women would still have the pas to choose. The next presidential appointment to the US Supreme Court will determine social progress for decades to come. I pray we do not choose Bush's regression. Live, and choose by your own light, but read, listen, think, please vote.

Read. Listen. Think. Write.



Sandy Lupo
Opinion Editor

ing too much of their income to the country, with tax loopholes and special interest lobbying and pork barrel spending in Congress. It is the middle class that needs some breaks. The parents struggling to send their kids to college would receive tax credits under Gore's budget plan. The parents who cannot afford private schools for their children would benefit from Gore's plan to spend \$115 billion on education, as opposed to Bush's \$48 billion. Families who cannot afford health insurance, or care for their children and aging parents would get help under Gore's plan. Gore would eliminate the national debt by 2012. Is there anyone who has not felt the insidiousness and

Halloween's not over yet; Measures 8 and 93, trick or treat

TAM OLIVER
Feature Co-Editor

Two more Constitutional amendments might also come back to haunt us.

Measure 8 has a unique way of delivering its knockout punch, as can be expected from the people who, in 1990, gave us Ballot Measure 5. This is the measure that created a lot of work for our legislators after it passed. It's also the one that spent a lot of our tax dollars because it was so poorly written that no one could figure out how to implement it. This is the one that had to be "fixed" several times over the years to get it to work. Since it was a Constitutional amendment, every fix had to be voted on.

Anyway, Measure 8 works by restricting the amount of money the state can spend in its entire biennial budget to 15 percent of the income Oregonians made in the last two years. In other words, no matter what the rate of inflation is, the state of Oregon is not going to keep up with it.

And the insidious part of the measure is that even though the amount the state government spends in-

cludes money from the federal government, money from the upcoming tobacco settlement, federal university grants for research, state fees and investments, Measure 8 figures the amount of all state spending on the income of Oregonians. So what might look like a small cut in the budget is much larger. It would cut state funding by almost 20%, about 4.8 billion dollars in the 2001-2003 biennium.

Additionally, it doesn't spell out which services will receive the deepest cuts. It doesn't cut income taxes. It does, however, put Oregon in the position of having to turn away hundreds of millions of federal dollars without reducing federal taxes.

There is already a law in place that limits the amount of growth of appropriations for the General Fund to the income of Oregonians in the preceding biennium. Measure 8 isn't necessary, and it isn't good for Oregonians. Vote no on 8.

Measure 93, yet another Constitutional amendment, requires voter approval for most new or raised tax fees on both state and local levels.

If it passes, it is estimated that the general election November 2002 will cost the state an additional

8.6 million dollars. After that, the cost of additional general elections is estimated to be an additional 26.4 million dollars after adjusting for inflation. In addition, total costs to local governments for the general elections are estimated to be 26.4 million dollars. Each year after that it's estimated that local governments will spend a total sum of 13.2 million after adjusting for inflation.

For all this money, Oregonians will be given the privilege of voting on fees for dog obedience classes, quilting classes and using the local swimming pool. Oregonians will be able to determine how much to charge to be a ginseng dealer, to dispose of a dead animal and to slaughter poultry and rabbits. If you think your Voter Pamphlet was big this year, just wait.

But there's even more, as there should be for so much money. Oregonians can also look forward to having to vote again on already approved school and library levies if they were approved after Dec. 6, 1998. Taxes and fee increases greater than 3% that occurred after Dec. 6, 1998 will also have to go before the voters. If they don't pass, everyone that paid them is entitled to a refund.

There's no mention of where the money will come from to carry this out.

Legislation like this will do little to encourage voter turnout. It's going to be rough enough this election for those who believe in understanding what they are voting on. This measure will spend your money on elections and your time on issues that you either don't care about or issues of which you have no knowledge.

Finally, the really scary part of this issue is that it eliminates majority rule. Even if the rest of the measure were peachy-keen, which it isn't, this one aspect is enough to make you vote no. If it passes, all measures to be voted on under this measure will have to have the same

percentage of votes as Measure 8 wins by to be passed. For example, if 75 percent of the voters in the Nov. 7 election next week vote for Measure 93, then all measures in that measure (and the ones within that two years that are in question) to raise taxes, fees or charges more than three percent, will have to receive 75 percent of the vote to pass.

Essentially, this can produce a situation where 25 percent of voters can tell the other 75 percent what to do. By eliminating majority rule, the playing field will be wide-open for special interest groups to take over the decision making. Oregonians simply cannot allow this to happen. Please vote on Measure 93.

Letter to the Editor

To the Print,
That was a nice article that you wrote on the cooking class. I have one tiny problem: you commented that I said that the girls in our program (YPOP), "didn't fit" in a traditional high school. Actually they fit in a traditional high school, but most of them have CHOSEN NOT to continue in a traditional high school setting and they sought out alternative program like ours to fit their needs.

Toni Krummenacker,
YPOP Instructor



19600 S. Molalla Ave. Oregon City, Oregon 97045
(503) 657-6938 ext 2909
ccprint@clackamas.or.us

Editor-in-Chief: Diana Scrivner (x2447)
Feature Co-Editor: Maggie Jirasek
Feature Co-Editor: Tam Oliver
A & E Editor: Mandy Good
Copy/Opinion Editor: Sandy Lupo
Sports Editor: Jason Lingel
News Editor: Steve Nielsen
Photo Editor: Mike Pollock
Business Manager: Scott Creson (x2578)

Web Master: Jim Spickelmier
Staff: Amanda Gosser
Chris Lundgren
Corinne Rupp
Dana Palmer
Elena Boryska
Jenny Chavez
Liesel Muggli
Matt Shempert
Michael Choe
Shannon Recabaren
Wes Fawcett
Secretary: JoAnne Gale
Advisor: Linda Vogt (x2310)

The Clackamas Print aims to report the news in an honest, unbiased, professional manner. The opinions expressed in *The Clackamas Print* do not necessarily reflect those of the student body, college administration, its faculty, or *The Clackamas Print* advertisers. Products and services advertised in *The Clackamas Print* are not necessarily endorsed by anyone associated with *The Clackamas Print*. The advertising rate is \$4.75 per column inch. *The Clackamas Print* is a weekly publication and is distributed every Wednesday except during Finals week. *The Clackamas Print* Copyright 2000