

# EDITORIAL/OPINION

## Stevenson Case Should Be Reinvestigated

The death of Lloyd D. Stevenson should be reinvestigated by the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office. A new investigation is in order, due to new evidence against two of the officers involved in the April 20, 1985 death of Mr. Stevenson.

It was revealed recently that officer Bruce Pantley lied under oath about his educational background. Evidence from court transcripts revealed that in May and July of 1984 officer Pantley stated that he had a Master's degree in Economics from Princeton University. But after a Portland attorney checked with Princeton officials concerning Pantley's claim, records from Princeton shows no indication that he received a Master's from the university.

Pantley made the statements about having an Economic Degree from Princeton, while testifying in a suit that was brought against him and officer Gary Barbour by a black man. The man alleged that the two officers hit him on the head with a flashlight and applied the sleeper hold on him in Oct. 1983.

These new charges against the two officers raise more suspicions about the incidents which led to Stevenson's death. First is the creditability of Pantley's testimony during the grand jury procedure about Stevenson's death.

Both Pantley and Barbour stated during the inquest that the sleeper hold was applied to Stevenson by Barbour after Stevenson struck Pantley. This version was disputed by several eyewitnesses

who were present at the scene of the incident. Witnesses at the inquest hearing stated that at no time did Stevenson strike any of the officers.

If Pantley lied under oath by stating he possesses a master's degree from a prestigious Ivy League university, is it possible that he could lie about the death of an innocent man?

Secondly, during the Stevenson episode, not a single word was made public about the allegations against both Pantley and Barbour regarding the excessive use of force by the two officers. Such information should have been brought out in the open.

For it shows a pattern of the misconduct by the officers. During the inquest hearing witnesses stated they tried to tell the officers that Stevenson was a peacemaker, but they refused to listen and applied the fatal hold on him.

Those who follow the Police Internal Audit Committee (PIIAC) are aware of the fact that the committee has reported on several occasions, through it's monitor report, that a small group of officers accounts for the majority of all complaints, and that a pattern of misconduct by the officers has been documented.

Many citizens in Portland, believed Stevenson was murdered and that justice wasn't served when the grand jury did not indict any of the officers involved in the death of Stevenson. Multnomah County District Attorney Michael Schrank should reopen the case if the allegations against Pantley and Barbour are true.

## The Federal Deficit & Gramm-Rudman-Hollings

By Governor Vic Atiyeh

Several days ago, I received a flyer addressed to my home on Winter Street in Salem.

It came from a taxpayers' group in Washington, D.C., and it said the \$1.4-trillion national debt works out to \$18,600 for each of the nation's 80-million taxpayers.

Let me give you another way to look at that debt: Based on the values declared on the county assessors' tax rolls, \$1.4 trillion would be enough to buy all taxable property in Oregon 16 times.

Those are reasons both the President and Congress want to cut federal deficits, and why the names Gramm, Rudman and Hollings have become household words.

But if deficit reduction is good for the economic health of America, it is crucial to the future of Oregon.

Most states have calculated what the cuts would mean to programs but, so far as I know, only Oregon has figured what will happen if the federal budget is not balanced.

I asked state economists to project how continued \$200-billion-a-year federal deficits would affect Oregon. This is what they told me:

—Interest rates would rise in 1987, blocking business investment and home construction like William Perry blocks a quarterback.

—By early 1988, the nation would slide helplessly back into recession.

—By the end of 1989, the personal income of Oregonians would fall by \$550 million, also cutting taxes and eroding needed public services.

—Finally, Oregonians would lose 18,000 jobs, mostly in manufacturing, high technology, and lumber and wood products.

None of us wants a replay of the economic bad times we have just suffered. Therefore, cutting the deficit must be near the top of the wish lists we give to holders and seekers of federal office.

Is the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law the answer? Some say its deep cuts constitute a kind of

fiscal terrorism, sort of like putting Colonel Khadafy in charge of the federal budget office. I am among those who dislike Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, but I do support cutting the deficit — even if this is the way we must do it.

Please remember: Even if Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cuts deficit spending to zero in five years, the national debt still will grow to \$2 trillion.

I ask you to keep two things in mind.

First, if Uncle Sam provides less money, we also must insist he also loosen up on costly federal restrictions. Also, in cutting the budget, federal officials should review all budget items; sparing defense spending from which Oregon receives little benefit, will result in deeper cuts in such items as forestry research and local block grants that do help Oregon.

Second, although Congress is only now getting around to cutting, you need look no further than Salem and other state capitals to find budget-balancing solutions.

Last year, 17 states were forced to rebalance their budgets. Since 1980, I have called four legislative special sessions to rebalance Oregon's state budget.

In 1982, I wrote a six-page letter to federal budget Director David Stockman detailing how Oregon had sopped up its own budgetary red ink. I suggested our solutions could be used in Washington.

Among these solutions were establishing user fees, increasing earnings by managing money better, using more volunteers, delaying the "desirable" to preserve the "necessary."

Meanwhile, I will keep that flyer from the taxpayers' group and hope the next time I receive one, it will report progress in cutting the deficit.

A \$1.4-trillion national debt, far from being used to buy, develop or expand Oregon, can only jeopardize the security of Oregonians' jobs and threaten the prosperity of Oregon's communities.



## Healthwatch

by Steven Bailey N.D.

As candidates begin their primary campaigns for state house and senate positions I've been meeting with many of our future legislators. While the sales tax will once again be a major issue, I hear that insurance reform will be one of this session's biggest concerns. The major debate thus far is in the area of medical mal-practice insurance.

The problems with the current insurance practices are numerous and the exact concerns vary depending on whose subjective argument you listen to. To the Oregon Medical Association, the problem lies in the tort-court awards and the O.M.A. will seek to limit "pain and suffering" awards and decrease the percentage of awards that lawyers may claim. To the Rainbow Health Task Force the problem is not the award size, but the basic structure of insurance practices. The Task Force feels that changes in the insurance industry are more appropriate legislative objectives.

It is clear that we need change. We cannot let outrageous liability premiums force doctors out of their field of practice, nor can we tolerate a future where doctors and hospitals go without insurance. But are the above two solutions the only way to ease the crisis?

The liability issue is not a problem that will go away with one or two simple changes. We have a litigious society, eager to sue at the drop-of-a-hat. We may never return to a society that is free of this eager to sue attitude, and the large awards and shared profits by lawyers adds to the problem. But patients need the right to redress gross mal-practice. Limitations on awards must not prohibit fair settlements, and decreased incentive for lawyers may act primarily as a deterrent of the ability for the indigent to be protected.

One of the major issues that has arisen in recent years is the subject of "informed consent". It is

difficult for lay persons to be fully informed in matters of medicine, and the courts are being forced to decide what information must be told to patients. We see major controversy in the area of adverse effects from medications. With 30,000 Americans dying yearly from the adverse reactions to medications we see a major area of liability concern. What is the responsibility of the physician to inform the patient of common reactions to medications?

Years ago federal law began requiring that all prescription drugs be accompanied with a fact sheet on the medication and its actions. This is the only information required and is often the only information given. Is this enough? Can most lay persons understand the medical terminology of these fact sheets? (i.e. tennis is ringing of the ears, dysphagia is disturbed appetite etc.) It is clear that most people consume their prescription without full knowledge of their potential and regular side effects.

Possibly one solution to mal-practice concerns would be requiring physicians to verbally counsel their patients as to the major side effects (i.e. with an incidence of 5% or greater). Most legislators are surprised that this doesn't already happen. We can expect as great a resistance to this idea as there was to the federal law requiring that written information be included in prescription medicine. But we as consumers deserve to know the risks of the drugs we are told to consume. Shouldn't we know if 1 in 15 people get a more serious condition from the drug than the condition they are being treated for?

Clearly it is not just a court and insurance problem that is raising malpractice rates. Maybe our lawmakers need to concentrate on making medicine safer, not limiting the recourse of the consumer.

## Whose Peace: Reagan's or Contadora's

by Phillip Berryman

In arguing for sending \$100 million in weapons and other aid to the Nicaraguan contras, President Reagan and his supporters claim that nothing less than the security of the hemisphere is at stake. His opponents are afraid that backing the president will lead to direct American military intervention. They advocate giving negotiation one last chance.

But who should negotiate and over what? The U.S. position, echoed by many in Congress and the media is that the Nicaraguan government must negotiate directly with the contras for power-sharing and new elections. The \$100 million serves as both stick and carrot to get them to agree to accept that formula.

The likelihood of such negotiations, however, is nil. In his testimony to the World Court in the Hague, Edgar Chamorro, who worked with the Nicaraguan Democratic Forces, the largest contra group, for almost four years, said that the organization was "created by the C.I.A., it was supplied equipped, armed and trained by the C.I.A. and its activities — both political and military — were directed and controlled by the C.I.A." Contra terror against civilians is well documented. The Nicaraguan government has made it clear that it will not negotiate with the contras.

The Contadora countries, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama, have a different idea of negotiation. Their peace plan aims to eliminate any extra-regional military presence and any support for subversion from one country to another. If Contadora were put into effect the five Central American countries (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica) would be bound to 1. limit their troops and arms to agreed-upon levels; 2. prohibit foreign military advisors, training, bases, maneuvers, or arms shipments; 3. refrain from supporting subversion or terrorism in other countries. They would also agree to allow a multi-nation monitoring commission access to sites of alleged violations. These provisions dealing with security measures form the heart of Contadora.

The Contadora plan has been crafted expressly to meet U.S. concerns about a Soviet or Cuban military presence in the region and alleged Nicaraguan support for insurgencies in other countries.

Although the Reagan administration gives lip service to Contadora, in practice it has blocked it. In October 1984, an

internal memo of the National Security Council gloated, "We have effectively blocked Contadora group efforts to impose the second draft of the Revised Contadora Act," after Nicaragua had accepted it. In his Sunday March 16, 1986 address on Central America, the president did not even mention Contadora.

The reason for the administration's rejection of Contadora is no mystery: its provisions would apply not only to the Soviet Union, Cuba and Nicaragua, but to the United States as well. A Contadora agreement would prohibit the U.S. from holding maneuvers, having military bases, and sending advisors, arms or ammunition to the region. Nor could any contras operate out of Honduras, backed and supplied by the U.S. If implemented, Contadora would spell the end of present U.S. policy. The U.S. would satisfy its security concerns, but it could not use military might to impose its will over the region. In other words, it could not use military force to "restructure" the Sandinista government.

On February 7, the foreign ministers of the Contadora countries, plus the ministers of the Contadora support group (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Peru), came to Washington to meet with Secretary of State Shultz to urge that the U.S. not send aid to the contras and that it negotiate seriously with Nicaragua. Other Latin American and West European governments are virtually unanimous in their support for the Contadora approach.

Why is the Contadora proposal so different from what the U.S. is pursuing? The greatest fear of Latin American governments is not a potential Soviet threat. What they fear most is ever-growing U.S. involvement in a region-wide war, bringing death, destruction, and instability to their doorsteps.

President Reagan ended his March 16 televised speech with an ominous warning that he had only "three more years to work for peace." He then asked whether there could be "any greater tragedy for us than to sit back and permit this cancer (Nicaragua) to spread...?" If the contras cannot bring such a "peace" — and all serious observers agree they cannot — then President Reagan's logic points toward a direct U.S. war against Nicaragua.

Which peace will it be: Ronald Reagan's or Contadora's?

Phillip Berryman, a consultant with the American Friends Service Committee, has worked in Central America and has written two books on the region.

**PORTLAND OBSERVER** \$15 for one year \$25 for two years

Box 3137, Portland OR 97208

Mr. Mrs. Ms. Miss

Street Apt.

CITY STATE ZIP

**CLIP IT** TO START THE PORTLAND OBSERVER COMING EVERY WEEK

**Portland Observer**

The Portland Observer (USPS 959-680) is published every Thursday by Erie Publishing Company, Inc., 1463 N.E. Killingsworth, Portland, Oregon 97211, Post Office Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208. Second class postage paid at Portland, Oregon.

The Portland Observer was established in 1970.

Subscriptions: \$15.00 per year in the Tri-County area. Postmaster: Send address changes to the Portland Observer, P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208.

MEMBER NATIONAL NEWSPAPER Association - Founded 1885

Alfred L. Henderson, Editor/Publisher  
Al Williams, General Manager

National Advertising Representative Amalgamated Publishers, Inc. New York

288-0033

**POWELL**  
Guest Cartoonist