

# EAST OREGONIAN

Founded October 16, 1875

**KATHRYN B. BROWN**  
Publisher

**DANIEL WATTENBURGER**  
Managing Editor

**JENNINE PERKINSON**  
Advertising Director

**TIM TRAINOR**  
Opinion Page Editor

## OUR VIEW

# Klamath deal lives, in spite of Walden

While compromise is a dirty word in Congress, it is essential in the West. This is where water intersects with agriculture, fish and hydroelectricity.

The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement of 2010 was one of the most historic water compromises of this century. But it languished in Congress for five years.

The good news is that part of the agreement will move forward. The Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement, one of the larger agreement's most controversial sections, came together last week.

This newly ratified agreement among the states of Oregon and California, Pacificorp and the federal government allows for decommissioning and removal of four dams on the Klamath River.

U.S. Rep. Greg Walden, who represents the Klamath Basin, said that the renewed hydroelectric agreement will make it easier to move the restoration agreement through Congress. But Walden fails to note an unfortunate thing. The agreement on restoration lapsed during the years of Congress' inaction. That negotiation will therefore have to start over from scratch.

Rep. Walden is something of a mystery. While he has risen in the House Republican leadership ranks, he fails to go to bat for his

district when the chips are down. It fell to Sen. Ron Wyden to move the historic 2013 Malheur Ten Year Stewardship Contract. And after supporting the Klamath agreement, Walden backed away when tea party interests in that county opposed it.

Gary Wade, an orchardist in The Dalles, has nailed Walden on his

negligence. In a letter to the *Capital Press*, Wade noticed Walden's high profile in Congress during the Malheur wildlife refuge occupation. So Wade asked, "Why, Mr. Walden, did you torpedo the Klamath Basin agreement, a perfect example of local control without federal intervention?"

Here in the Umatilla Basin, we are on the precipice of economic and population growth because of compromise, consensus-building and communication. An amalgamation of public and private interests united behind a plan to extract more water from the Columbia River while making upstream environmental benefits.

The economic chips are already starting to cash in, as expensive land deals are finalized in the Boardman and Hermiston agriculture communities. Companion industries will soon follow. Local taxing districts, including schools and municipalities, will surely benefit.

For a model, Klamath should look our way. And Walden should take note, too.

The economic chips are already starting to cash in, as expensive land deals are finalized near Boardman and Hermiston.

Unsigned editorials are the opinion of the East Oregonian editorial board of Publisher Kathryn Brown, Managing Editor Daniel Wattenburger, and Opinion Page Editor Tim Trainor. Other columns, letters and cartoons on this page express the opinions of the authors and not necessarily that of the East Oregonian.

## OTHER VIEWS

# Clinton, Kasich stand out in still-crowded primaries

The Concord Monitor (N.H.)

Tuesday's vote will mark the 100th anniversary of the New Hampshire presidential primary, which did not achieve its first-in-the-nation status until 1952. The election goes a long way toward deciding who the next president of the world's most powerful nation will be. But this time, also at stake are the future of the fragmented Republican Party and, perhaps, the fate of the primary itself. Participation is crucial.

So far, this election has been like no other, a test of whether, with anger loosed upon the nation, the center can hold. Or will the state, with its vote, send forth candidates from each extreme — candidates who probably could not win if nominated or may not be able to govern if elected.

Iowa is even less like the sum of America than New Hampshire, and its odd and only somewhat democratic caucus process is a poor measure of prospective presidents.

On Monday, its Republican voters chose Sen. Ted Cruz, the most hated man in Congress, as its nominee. Not one of Cruz's Senate colleagues support him. He is a mean-spirited conservative zealot who has earned the enmity of fellow Republicans like Sen. John McCain, twice the winner of New Hampshire's primary.

Cruz is uncompromising and so intractable that, against the wishes of his party, he caused the government to shut down for 16 days in order to make a personal statement about his loathing for the Affordable Care Act. His argument on the Senate floor famously mocked that chamber by including a reading of Dr. Seuss's "Green Eggs and Ham."

Democrats chose former senator and secretary of state Hillary Clinton, but only narrowly over Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, who would represent the left wing of his party were he really a

Democrat.

The self-described democratic socialist has spent most of his Senate career as an independent whose proposals for radical change earned more smiles than votes. As we said in an earlier editorial, we largely agree with Sanders's pursuit of greater economic equality and universal health care, but he would fare no better in achieving them as president than he has as a senator.

It's time for New Hampshire voters to put the path to the presidency back on course.

Ohio Gov. John Kasich is best suited, by temperament, knowledge and experience, to carry the Republican standard. There's a reason seven of the eight New Hampshire newspapers endorsed him. He answers questions with facts and past accomplishments, not bluster. He can get things done.

Similarly, of the New Hampshire newspapers who've endorsed in the Democratic primary, all, including the *Keene Sentinel* on New Hampshire's border with Vermont, have endorsed Clinton. She is far and away the most qualified Democrat in the race. No one has her experience, not just in foreign policy but in putting the wheels of Washington in gear again.

The electorate, including many New Hampshire voters, is justifiably angry, but the answer doesn't lie with candidates who want to shrink government beyond recognition or expand it with plans for financial reforms that have about the same odds of passage that a lottery ticket has of winning.

With wars in two nations, ISIS on the attack, the global economy shaky, climate change threatening and the nation still divided by race and class, this is not time to put an amateur in the Oval Office.

New Hampshire voters should say that on Tuesday.

## LETTERS POLICY

The East Oregonian welcomes original letters of 400 words or less on public issues and public policies for publication in the newspaper and on our website. The newspaper reserves the right to withhold letters that address concerns about individual services and products or letters that infringe on the rights of private citizens. Submitted letters must be signed by the author and include the city of residence and a daytime phone number. Send letters to 211 S.E. Byers Ave. Pendleton, OR 97801 or email editor@eastoregonian.com.

## America's NATIONAL PASTIME...

Then



Now



## OTHER VIEWS

# The last of the Bushes

George H.W. Bush was the first politician I ever disliked. I was 12, my parents were loyal Democrats, and every night we'd watch the news, cheer for whatever Bill Clinton was saying on the trail, and then glower at the screen when Peter Jennings went to Brit Hume, then the White House correspondent, for an update on what the incumbent president was up to.

For a kid new to politics, in a family that regarded Republicans as stuffed shirts and black hats, the fact that the elder Bush had been elected president was simply baffling. His voice, his affect, his malapropisms, his endless forehead — they reminded me of a stiff in one of the black-and-white films my parents watched, or the Token Clueless Grown-up in a kids' adventure movie. Watching him nightly, I kept thinking: How could anyone like this guy?

One answer, I learned later, was that relatively few people really did. Not that Bush hadn't earned his share of admirers across his distinguished career.

But by the standards of modern presidents he lacked a truly passionate fan base. The conservative movement was perpetually disappointed in him; liberals gave him no credit for his moderation; the press never swooned for him; and few voters bonded with him the way they did with the beloved Reagan, the charismatic Clinton — or even, eventually, with a more populist and swaggering President George W. Bush.

So my 12-year-old self's political instincts weren't all wrong. The elder Bush had many gifts, but he was not a particularly appealing politician.

Neither, it turns out, is his second son. We've reached the last stand of the Jeb Bush campaign, the make-or-break moment, and unless New Hampshire delivers a dramatic surprise, his \$100 million juggernaut is just days or weeks away from breaking down. And in many ways, the Jeb! campaign has recapitulated his father's struggle to play the modern presidential part.

The father had "the wimp factor," his second son has "low energy." The father struggled to deal with a billionaire populist; so too has the son. (Ross Perot then, Donald Trump now.) The father's inspirational gestures ("a thousand points of light") were less memorable than his crime-and-culture assault on Michael Dukakis; the son's promise to run a "joyful" campaign has collapsed into a wave of negative ads. The father famously told a New Hampshire audience, "message: I care." The son finished a recent town-hall peroration with the instantly immortal "please clap."

The difference is that the father had better fortune before his '92 defeat. The father got to run for Ronald Reagan's third term in 1988,



ROSS DOUTHAT  
Comment

whereas Jeb has the anchor of his brother's unsuccessful administration. The father faced Bob Dole and Dukakis; his son has more politically effective rivals. (There's more than a hint of Clinton in Marco Rubio.) And the elder Bush was better served by his hatchet men, Lee Atwater and James Baker, than Jeb has been by Mike Murphy's super PAC, whose most memorable attack ad involved Rubio's ... boots.

So unless something dramatic changes, Bush family history will have repeated itself — the first time as a rise and fall, the second time just as a flop.

After he was ejected from the White House, people realized that George H.W. Bush had been a pretty good president.

But before it does, it's worth recalling that after he was ejected from the White House, people realized that actually George H.W. Bush had been a pretty good president.

Not a transformative one, to be sure; not an ideological hero in the mold of Reagan or Franklin Roosevelt. But precisely because the elder Bush lacked certain politicians' gifts, he also lacked certain characteristic politicians' weaknesses — the appetitive indiscipline of

his successor, the headstrong utopianism of his son, the polarizing arrogance of our present chief executive.

Which meant that while his presidency left no major domestic policy legacy, it also bequeathed few disasters, and left the economy in good shape for its 1990s boom. His foreign policy built on Reagan's achievements, but Bush presided successfully over an extraordinarily fraught four years (the Berlin Wall, the invasion of Kuwait, the fall of the Soviet Union) and left office with U.S. interests arguably stronger than at any point in modern history.

As a case for his son, this is not the stuff of 30-second ads: I share my dad's weaknesses as a politician, so maybe I'd actually be a pretty good president. I'm Jeb Bush and I approve this message.

But the funny thing is, it might be true. Jeb has proven, over many painful months, that he lacks the gifts required to win a primary campaign. But the democratic process is hardly infallible, and a great deal of damage can be done by presidents rich in political charisma — and with it zeal, self-righteousness and certainty.

Between Ted Cruz, Rubio, Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders — to say nothing of Trump — there's a lot of those qualities to go around. Which makes me fear that we could do a lot worse than John Ellis Bush. And that we probably will.

Now, before he goes — please clap.

Ross Douthat joined *The New York Times* as an Op-Ed columnist in April 2009. Previously, he was a senior editor at the *Atlantic* and a blogger for *theatlantic.com*.

## YOUR VIEWS

### To save salmon, manage fish-eating predators

I was pleased to see your recent editorials advocating for salmon. I grew up on salmon hatcheries in the Columbia Gorge. My dad worked there from 1927-70 and an uncle from 1945-90. If there had been a fisheries biologist job available in 1957 I would have used my biology degree there also.

I have retained an interest in fish and recently served on the mid-Columbia steelhead recovery sounding board. In so many ways "wild" seems to trump all things science. Unfortunately, many thousands of miles of salmon rearing habitat are no longer available for "wild fish" because they are behind dams, above culverts and cities have limited important waters. Other limiting factors caused by man have presented problems. Many improvements have been made, but hatcheries have been and will continue to be the best option for the production of salmon for our benefit.

But, there are other problems. When I was a biology student in the 1950s we made several field trips to the north Oregon coast and mouth of the Columbia River. Predators we did not see then but see them in abundance today include sea lions, seals, pelicans, Caspian terns and an occasional cormorant.

All of these predators are gluttonous fish eaters. When "wild" advocates promoted laws protecting these predators the laws were scientifically justified. Now that they are found in abundance and taking fish that are in danger of going extinct, they need to be managed. If the general public knew they are eating fish that electric ratepayers are spending a half a billion dollars per year to enhance, they might agree.

In the 1950s it was believed there were fewer than 10,000 sea lions on the West Coast. Now there are believed to be over 240,000. From 2010 to 2014, NOAA fisheries scientists have conducted studies in the Columbia between the mouth of the river and Bonneville. These were on salmon destined for the upper reaches of the river. In 2010 they determined that 90 percent of the tagged fish had made it to Bonneville. The survival rate dropped yearly until only 55 percent of the fish reached Bonneville in 2014. During that period of time there was a marked increase in sea lions in the lower river.

During most of the river's history, sea lions were kept out of the river, but now they are protected. All of the birds listed are also protected. Please continue to advocate for the management of our natural resources based on science and common sense.

Carlisle Harrison, Hermiston