

THE DAILY ASTORIAN

Founded in 1873



STEPHEN A. FORRESTER, *Editor & Publisher*
 LAURA SELLERS, *Managing Editor*
 BETTY SMITH, *Advertising Manager*
 CARL EARL, *Systems Manager*
 JOHN D. BRUIJN, *Production Manager*
 DEBRA BLOOM, *Business Manager*
 HEATHER RAMSDELL, *Circulation Manager*

Some progress on affordable housing

Lack of affordable housing has become one of the pivotal social and political issues in northwest Oregon, so it is good to see the state Legislature and Gov. Kate Brown begin to deal with some aspects of the problem.

In Clatsop County, the availability of rentals is severely constrained at every price point and the supply of affordable homes to purchase by first-time buyers is a small fraction of what it once was. The overall picture is one not conducive to continuing economic growth and a diverse society.

Even years ago, most service-industry workers found it difficult to live in towns like Cannon Beach. But they could find housing within commuting distance in places like Warrenton and Astoria. Nowadays, even though property prices haven't reached Cannon Beach's astronomical level, housing bargains are few and far between throughout the area. Nearby towns in Pacific County, Washington, also see diminishing availability and escalating prices.

In Oregon as a whole, there are an estimated 131,000 households classified as "extremely low income" but only 28,500 housing units available in their price range.

Most legislative concern focuses on Portland and its suburbs, which have many more housing units but also many more residents on the hunt for affordable housing. But the rest of the state may stand to benefit from at least some of the solutions devel-

Providence rescues home health patients

Home health is one of those things we don't appreciate until we need it, for ourselves or for a loved one. With the imperative of shorter hospital stays, patients are being sent home with a variety of needs — including dressing changes, post-stroke follow-up, coping with changes brought on by injury and disease and other things. We associate home health patients with the Medicare population, but that's not always the case.

It was an earthquake when Columbia Memorial Hospital last Thursday announced that it was shutting down its home health department, which it has operated for 20 years. The typical patient population of CMH's home health service is over 65.

The good news is that Providence Seaside Hospital's

opened for the state's largest city.

Likely to be helpful are some tweaks to state land-use laws that will relax the annexation process and permit two as-yet unspecified Oregon communities to modestly expand urban growth boundaries in return for creating affordable housing. Oregon obviously should tread lightly in order to avoid urban sprawl, but some flexibility in addressing housing needs may help avoid a wholesale retreat from the laudable goals of growth management.

Other aspects of recently passed legislation are likely to make it less helpful outside the urban setting. One bill defines affordable as catering to families making 80 percent of their region's median income. In Clatsop County, this would translate to \$44,700 for a family of four, leaving out many who make less than this.

Much was left undone in this year's short legislative session. Efforts to shield tenants from no-cause evictions and rapid rent hikes were stripped away after intense industry lobbying.

There is a dire need in the next legislative session for a full examination of housing issues and how to address them. In the meantime, local agencies must work within existing constraints to find answers to this critical dilemma.

home health service will make up for CMH's absence. As Edward Stratton's Thursday story indicates, Providence is taking steps to make this a seamless transition.

The momentous national shift in health care is largely about insurance and how it is allocated. But our national transition also includes larger significance for home health and hospice. While CMH is discarding its home health mission, the hospital's hospice program remains robust. That is good news. Oregon's debate over death with dignity gave new visibility to hospice programs and the palliative care they provide.

Meanwhile, the best way to cast our home health needs is to realize the necessity for the community to have the option for complete healing and restoration.

No, not Trump, not ever

By DAVID BROOKS
New York Times News Service

The voters have spoken. In convincing fashion, Republican voters seem to be selecting Donald Trump as their nominee.

And in a democracy, victory has legitimacy to it. Voters are rarely wise but are usually sensible. They understand their own problems. And so deference is generally paid to the candidate who wins.

And deference is being paid. Gov. Rick Scott of Florida is urging Republicans to coalesce around Trump. Pundits are coming out with their "What We Can Learn" commentaries. Those commentaries are built on a hidden respect for the outcome, that this is a rejection of a Republicanism that wasn't working and it points in some better direction.

The question is: Should deference be paid to this victor? Should we bow down to the judgment of these voters?

Well, some respect is in order. Trump voters are a coalition of the dispossessed. They have suffered lost jobs, lost wages, lost dreams. The American system is not working for them, so naturally they are looking for something else.

Moreover, many in the media, especially me, did not understand how they would express their alienation. We expected Trump to fizzle because we were not socially intermingled with his supporters and did not listen carefully enough. For me, it's a lesson that I have to change the way I do my job if I'm going to report accurately on this country.

And yet reality is reality. Donald Trump is epically unprepared to be president. He has no realistic policies, no advisers, no capacity to learn. His vast narcissism makes him a closed fortress. He doesn't know what he doesn't know and he's uninterested in finding out. He insults the office Abraham Lincoln once occupied by running for it with less preparation that most of us would undertake to buy a sofa.

Trump is perhaps the most dishonest person to run for high office in our lifetimes. All politicians stretch the truth, but Trump has a steady obliviousness to accuracy.

This week, the Politico reporters Daniel Lippman, Darren Samuelsohn and Isaac Arnsdorf fact-checked 4.6



David Brooks



Mark Lennihan/AP Photo

Protesters, organized by The Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, stage a "die-in" in front of Trump Tower, the residence of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump, last Wednesday in New York.

hours of Trump speeches and news conferences. They found more than five dozen untrue statements, or one every five minutes.

"His remarks represent an extraordinary mix of inaccurate claims about domestic and foreign policy and personal and professional boasts that rarely measure up when checked against primary sources," they wrote.

He is a childish man running for a job that requires maturity. He is an insecure boasting little boy whose desires were somehow arrested at age 12. He surrounds himself with sycophants. "You can always tell when the king is here," Trump's butler told Jason Horowitz in a recent Times profile. He brags incessantly about his alleged prowess, like how far he can hit a golf ball. "Do I hit it long? Is Trump strong?" he asks.

In some rare cases, political victors do not deserve our respect. George Wallace won elections, but to endorse those outcomes would be a moral failure.

And so it is with Trump. History is a long record of men like him temporarily rising, stretching back to biblical times. Psalm 73 describes them: "Therefore pride is their necklaces; they clothe themselves with violence. ... They scoff, and speak with malice; with arrogance they threaten oppression. Their mouths lay claim to heaven, and their tongues take possession of the earth. Therefore their people turn to them and drink up waters in abundance."

And yet their success is fragile: "Surely you place them on slippery

ground; you cast them down to ruin. How suddenly they are destroyed."

The psalmist reminds us that the proper thing to do in the face of demagoguery is to go the other way — to make an extra effort to put on decency, graciousness, patience and humility, to seek a purity of heart that is stable and everlasting.

The Republicans who coalesce around Trump are making a political error. They are selling their integrity for a candidacy who will probably lose. About 60 percent of Americans disapprove of him, and that number has been steady since he began his campaign.

Worse, there are certain standards more important than one year's election. There are certain codes that if you betray them, you suffer something much worse than a political defeat.

Donald Trump is an affront to basic standards of honesty, virtue and citizenship. He pollutes the atmosphere in which our children are raised. He has already shredded the unspoken rules of political civility that make conversation possible. In his savage regime, public life is just a dog-eat-dog war of all against all.

As the founders would have understood, he is a threat to the long and glorious experiment of American self-government. He is precisely the kind of scapegoating, promise-making, fear-driving and deceiving demagogue they feared.

Trump's supporters deserve respect. They are left out of this economy. But Trump himself? No, not Trump, not ever.

Donald Trump is epically unprepared to be president.

An air of menace about this campaign

By CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER
Washington Post Writers Group

WASHINGTON — By international and historical standards, political violence is exceedingly rare in the United States. The last serious outburst was 1968 with its bloody Democratic-convention riots. By that standard, 2016 is, as yet, tame. It may not remain so.

The political thuggery that shut down a Donald Trump rally in Chicago last week may just be a harbinger. It would be nice, therefore, if we could think straight about cause and effect.

The immediate conventional wisdom was to blame the disturbance on the "toxic climate" created by Trump. Nonsense. This was an act of deliberate sabotage created by a totalitarian left that specializes in the intimidation and silencing of political opponents.

Its pedigree goes back to early 20th-century fascism and communism. Its more recent incarnation has been developed on college campuses, where for years leftists have been taunting, disrupting and ultimately shutting down and shutting out conservative speakers of every stripe — long before Donald Trump.

The Chicago shutdown was a planned act on free speech and free assembly. Hence the exultant chant of the protesters upon the announcement of the rally's cancellation: "We stopped Trump." It had all of the spontaneity of a beer-hall putsch.

Given the people, the money

and the groups (including MoveOn.org) behind Chicago, it is likely to be replicated, constituting a serious threat to a civilized politics. But there's a second, quite separate form of thuggery threatening the 2016 campaign — a leading candidate who, with a wink and a nod (and sometimes less subtlety), is stoking anger and encouraging violence.

This must be distinguished from what happened in Chicago, where Trump was the victim and for which he is not responsible. But he is responsible for saying of a protester at his rally in Las Vegas that "I love the old days. You know what they used to do to guys like that ...? They'd be carried out on a stretcher, folks."

He told another rally that if they see any protesters preparing to throw a tomato, to "knock the crap out of them ... I promise you I will pay for the legal fees." Referring in an interview to yet another protester, Trump said "maybe he should have been roughed up."

At the Vegas event, Trump had said, "I'd like to punch him in the face." Well, in Fayetteville, North Carolina, one of his supporters did exactly that for him — sucker-punching in the face a protester being led away. The attacker is being charged with assault.

Trump is not responsible for the assault. But he is responsible for refusing to condemn it. Asked about it, he dodged and weaved, searching for extenuation. "The man got carried away." So what? If people who get carried away are allowed to sucker-punch others, we'd be living in a jungle.



Charles Krauthammer

Trump said that it was obvious that the cold-cocker "obviously loves his country." What is it about punching a demonstrator in the face that makes evident one's patriotism? Particularly when the attacker said on television, "Next time we see him, we might have to kill him."

Whoa! That's lynch talk. And rather than condemn that man, Trump said he would be instructing his people to look into paying his legal fees.

This from the leader of the now strongest faction in the Republican Party, the man most likely to be the GOP nominee for president. And who, when asked on Wednesday about the possibility of being denied the nomination at the convention if he's way ahead in delegates but just short of a majority, said: "I think you'd have riots," adding "I wouldn't lead it but I think bad things would happen."

Is that incitement to riot? Legally, no. But you'd have to be a fool to miss the underlying implication.

There's an air of division in the country. Fine. It's happened often in our history. Indeed, the whole point of politics is to identify, highlight, argue and ultimately adjudicate and accommodate such divisions. Politics is the civilized substitute for settling things the old-fashioned way — laying your opponent out on a stretcher.

What is so disturbing today is that suffusing our politics is not just an air of division but an air of menace. It's being fueled on both sides: one side through organized anti-free-speech agitation using Bolshevik tactics; the other side by verbal encouragement and threats of varying degrees of subtlety.

They may feed off each other but they are of independent origin. And both are repugnant, both dangerous and both deserving of the most unreserved condemnation.

Is that incitement to riot? Legally, no. But you'd have to be a fool to miss the underlying implication.