

**Your Carpet Best Cleaning Choice** 

# **Martin Cleaning Service**

**Carpet & Upholstery Cleaning Residential & Commercial Services Minimum Service CHG.** 

\$45.00

A small distance/travel charge may be applied

#### **CARPET CLEANING**

2 Cleaning Areas or more \$30.00 Each Area

**Pre-Spray Traffic Areas** 

(Includes: 1 small Hallway)

1 Cleaning Area (only) \$40.00

Includes Pre-Spray Traffic Area (Hallway Extra)

Stairs (12-16 stairs - With Other Services): \$25.00

**Area/Oriental Rugs**: \$25.00 Minimum

Area/Oriental Rugs (Wool): \$40.00 Minimum

#### **Heavily Soiled Area**:

Additional \$10.00 each area (Requiring Extensive Pre-Spraying)

### **UPHOLSTERY CLEANING**

Sofa: \$69.00 Loveseat: \$49.00 Sectional: \$109 - \$139 Chair or Recliner:

\$25 - \$49

Throw Pillows (Wim Other Services): \$5.00

#### <u>ADDITIONAL</u> **SERVICES**

- Area & Oriental Rug Cleaning
- Auto/Boat/RV Cleaning
- Deodorizing & Pet **Odor Treatment**
- Spot & Stain Removal Service
- Scotchguard Protection
- Minor Water Damage Services

SEE CURRENT FLYER FOR ADDITIONAL **PRICES & SERVICES Call for Appointment** (503) 281-3949



## When Polluters Lose and the Rest of Us Win

### The good thing about regulations

BY JILL RICHARDSON

As the Trump regime's anti-environment onslaught begins, there are several terms used by men (and in the case of Trump's cabinet,

it's nearly all men) attempting to turn us against protecting the air we breathe and water we drink.

"job creators," and the policies that allow them to pollute are "pragmatic," "balanced," and "common sense." Meanwhile, the rules put in place to keep Americans safe and our environment clean become "government abuse" or "overreach."

These are buzzwords, developed by polluting industries and their political allies, to convince planet.

Agency, Scott Pruitt, is "picking mercury into the atmosphere. winners and losers." Any time the

government attempts to rollback sion could be said to "pick win- der to save money for themselves pollution, fossil-friendly politi- ners and losers." cians trot this phrase out.

Generously speaking, they

costly renovations or even the dead-weight supplier. shut down (the "losers").

Sounds unfair, right?

Suppose the military drops a supplier making expensive, faulty mean this: New environmental weapons and instead gives its rules allow some corporations to business to a company making keep doing business profit- equipment the military actually ably (the "winners"), while needs. Most of us wouldn't critirequiring others to make cize the government for dropping

Why should we apply different standards to environmental safe-Only, the "winners" are ty? Do we, the American people, the responsible companies have a responsibility to breathe

while sickening us.

Let's re-frame the idea of picking winners and losers.

When the government allows companies to profit by polluting, they're also picking winners and losers. The winners are companies that don't have to invest in cleaner technologies, and the losers are the American people, who get sick from breathing dirty air.

No matter what the government does, whether it regulates or not, somebody wins and somebody loses. The only important question is who comes out on which side.

Oh, and a word about "job creators," too. Drug cartels employ all kinds of people. That doesn't mean what they're doing is good for the rest of us.

Do we want policies that allow irresponsible corporations to win while the American people lose? Instead, I'd propose an ultimatum for dirty industries: Clean up your act or go out of business.

For ordinary Americans and responsible businesses, that sounds like a win-win to me.

OtherWords columnist Jill Of course not. Especially when Richardson is the author of Recipe the industry in question could for America: Why Our Food Syshave upgraded to cleaner equip- tem Is Broken and What We Can

Suppose the military drops a Polluting industries become supplier making expensive, faulty weapons and instead gives its business to a company making equipment the military actually needs. Most of us wouldn't criticize the government for dropping the dead-weight supplier.

us to let them keep trashing our with cleaner business practices, polluted air and suffer the result-Another favorite, already ut- that profit by making Americans tered by Trump's new head of sick. Say, for example, an old the Environmental Protection coal-fired power plant spewing

and the "losers" are companies ing illnesses in order to keep a polluting industry in business?

In fact, any government deci- ment but refused to do so, in or- Do to Fix It.