

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

Two Republicans, one opportunity

Two Republican candidates for governor — Bud Pierce and Allen Alley — are facing off in the May primary.

Five names will actually appear on the ballot for Republican voters, but the race will undoubtedly come down to Pierce and Alley, who have both the funding and wherewithal to win the nomination.

It's a solid 1-2 punch for a party that hasn't held the governor's office since 1987. (Incidentally, Republican governors led the state for 42 of the 48 years before this recent 30-year drought.)

But only one can survive to take on Kate Brown in November, and Republican voters should consider the general election when voting in the May primary.

If Oregon is to avoid the one-party rule that has plagued other states, Republicans need to prove they can win every once in a while.

Which potential Republican nominee has the best chance this time around? We've spoken to both, and are impressed with both.

Pierce is the kind of Republican we'd have supported in the last few elections, when the GOP let social issues derail campaigns.

He doesn't have time for that kind of nonsense. He is a successful doctor and private sector businessperson, with reasonable solutions to making state government more efficient and customer friendly. He has taken a keen eye to rural issues and has pounded the pavement (and the wheat fields and the forests and the deserts) of Eastern Oregon to secure support and raise money. He may lack in pizzazz, but he's a well-informed outsider with a reasonable approach to the big state issues that Democrats have been unable to tackle — PERS, a statewide transportation package, Columbia River Crossing and rural economic struggles.

Perhaps his nice guy image carries with it some naiveté. And if Republicans can somehow claim the governor's mansion — they

sure want someone who can swing some elbows, cut some bloated departments and shake up Salem. It's difficult to picture Pierce in that role.

Alley is similar to Pierce in many regards, but he may have more political polish and the hard edge needed to step into what would be a difficult situation.

He is a latecomer to the campaign and this election cycle has not reached out to Eastern Oregon as

much as he said he would like to. But you can bet if he survives in May, he'll be drumming up votes in the reliably red side of the state.

He, too, has stayed away from the unpopular issues that have tripped up predecessors, most notably Dennis Richardson who was in a seemingly winnable race with John Kitzhaber just two years ago.

Alley told the editorial board this week that he watched the Kitzhaber debacle and resignation from afar and saw the state needed a change in party, a change in culture and a change in leadership.

He spoke mostly about Oregon's poor education system — near the bottom for K-12 graduation rates despite a recent overhaul of the entire system — and the quickly rising costs of a college degree. He's got ways to fix it, and doesn't believe another dump truck of dollars is the answer.

Perhaps it will not matter which Republican wins in May.

Perhaps Governor Kate Brown is untouchable in November — especially in a liberal state where Donald Trump may be on the ballot. Trump will cause 7 in 10 Oregonians to vote against him, and any Republican candidate is going to have to win back at least some of the anti-Trump anger.

For Oregon's sake, we hope Republicans are able to claim statewide office soon. The first step to doing so is fielding quality candidates like Bud Pierce and Allen Alley and letting the best candidate advance into the second round.

If Oregon is to avoid the one-party rule that has plagued other states, Republicans need to prove they can win every once in awhile.

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.

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. The phone number will not be published. Unsigned letters will not be published. Send letters to Managing Editor Daniel Wattenburger, 211 S.E. Byers Ave. Pendleton, OR 97801 or email editor@eastoregonian.com.

Hatcheries successful, should be supported

Over the years I have heard people complain that "nonprofit conservation organizations are an industry unto themselves." After reading your April 21 article on the lawsuit initiated by the Wild Fish Conservancy, I believe these accusations may have validity.

I too would like to see the Columbia River full of wild fish. But unfortunately the habitat suitable for their survival in historic numbers no longer exists. But we still want to eat salmon and health officials tell us we should eat fish for better health. Hatcheries still are our best answer and most hatcheries are working on those problems actually having an adverse affect on wild fish.

As to the hatchery fish competing for resources, the Wild Fish Conservancy may have a point. But, if the carrying capacity of the main stem of the Columbia is a concern, I believe the historic

millions of downstream smolts would indicate that this should not be a concern. As a biologist I was taught that salmon were some of the most adaptable species on the face of the earth.

This adaptability was the result of many thousands of generations spawning with straying fish. As a fisheries major we were taught that, if a fish mated with a stray and the offspring survived to subsequently mate, that was a good thing. We were also taught, if a fish mated with a stray and the offspring died, that was also a good thing. In view of this, a case could be made that preserving specific genetics in a changing environment might not be the best science. Think climate change.

In the natural life cycle of salmon there are two major weak links. In the wild, only a few of the salmon's eggs are fertilized, hatch and become able to survive on their own. Probably less than 10 percent. Hatcheries usually have a record of more than 90 percent. The other

weak link is on their return to the Columbia and their place of origin. Recent research has shown that an unaccounted 45 percent of the fish entering the mouth of the river never reach Bonneville. This record includes wild as well as hatchery fish. In the Columbia River seals and sea lions number in the thousands. Historically there were very few seals or sea lions in the Columbia. Most thinking people would conclude that the seals and sea lions ate them. What do we hear from the Wild Fish Conservancy about this? Nothing.

Carlisle Harrison
Hermiston

Drugs harm Oregon, not bloated budgets

In recent days we have heard TV ads for Allen Alley for governor and how he'll cut wasteful spending. I've got news for Mr. Alley: His friends at Cascade Policy Institute made sure when they got Ballot Measure 5

passed that there would not be any money for wasteful spending. And just to insure that there wasn't any money for anything, let alone wasteful spending, his friend Bill Sizemore got Ballot Measure 50 passed. Now we don't have the money necessary to patch streets, buy new police and fire equipment or upgrade the sewer and wastewater plant.

Mr. Alley, I have no idea where you got the idea that Oregon had money for wasteful spending, but it doesn't. Instead of hollering about wasteful spending, why not holler about the problems we are having with gangs and drugs and get Ballot Measure 50 repealed so that we could put some money into drug and gang enforcement and for infrastructure upgrades? Ridding Oregon of drugs and gangs will bring business and so will upgrading outdated infrastructure. That's where your priorities should be, Mr. Alley, not cutting the budget more.

Barbara Wright, Pendleton

Primmer for council

I am writing this letter today to urge you to cast your vote to elect Dale Primmer to represent Ward 3 as city councilor in Pendleton. I have known Dale for roughly eight years, getting to know him as an active participant in his children's activities. Dale is a devoted dad, husband, homeowner and active volunteer in our community.

Because of his employment with Umatilla County as director of the community justice system, Dale has a working knowledge of budgets — both in good economic times and bad. He listens to other ideas and evaluates the best way to proceed, always keeping in mind the good of the entire community. Our next city council will face some difficult decisions, but I am sure that given Dale's common sense approach and willingness to work with others to reach equitable solutions, he is the best suited for election to represent Ward 3.

Susan Wood, Pendleton

OTHER VIEWS



What Trump will change — and what he won't

Donald Trump's presidential campaign is in the middle of a much-discussed reworking. There's a lot of reworking to do. But Trump, who now has the advice of several political professionals recently brought into the campaign, faces a risk of doing too much. He has to walk a fine line to fix his problems without changing the essential character of a campaign style that made him the front-runner in the Republican race.

A lot of the Trump comments that set off firestorms in the last nine months weren't really big, lasting problems for the campaign. A few examples: Trump's diss of John McCain, his feud with Megyn Kelly, his allegations concerning Mexican immigrant crime, his mocking a *New York Times* reporter's disability, his claim that Muslims in the New York area celebrated Sept. 11, his boast that he could shoot someone on Fifth Avenue and his supporters would remain loyal, his charge that George W. Bush lied about the Iraq war — it's a very long list. One could argue that they had a cumulative negative effect on Trump's image, but one could also argue that they were a net plus in terms of cementing loyalty among his supporters.

The fact is, Trump's supporters — and he has more than any other Republican this cycle — are attracted to him because of his shoot-from-the-hip style. Go to his rallies around the country, and they'll say they support Trump because he tells it like it is — that he says things they and others would like to say but can't. That's a hugely valuable asset for Trump. If those supporters think Trump is trimming his sails to win approval from the Republican establishment, that would not help.

At the same time, some Trump errors have done grave damage to his campaign. Each resulted from Trump's own judgment, and preventing future repeats will require that Trump not only listen to (good) advice but that he restrain his own impulses going forward. Three of the mistakes that badly hurt Trump in the last few months:

1) Early hubris. In late February, after victories in New Hampshire, South Carolina, Nevada, and predictions of a big night on Super Tuesday, Trump thought he had won the race. That led him to conclude he did not need to do the intensive, time-consuming, ground-level delegate-courting work that other campaigns had to do. The mistake had huge consequences down the road.

2) Duke/KKK. In a Feb. 28 television appearance, Trump refused to disavow David Duke and the Ku Klux Klan. That single moment terrified many Republicans. They have had the race card played against them many, many times by Democrats — and now they're looking at a nominee who won't condemn Duke and the KKK? Sensing disaster ahead, some came together in what would become the #NeverTrump movement. They oppose Trump for many reasons, but they were galvanized by the Duke/KKK statement. And it didn't matter that Trump had disavowed earlier and would do so again, in a general election, the Sunday show moment will live on in web videos and attack ads.



BYRON YORK
Comment

3) Going off the rails in Wisconsin. The GOP primary in Wisconsin was a potential turning point in the race. If Trump won, he would have done perhaps fatal damage to the #NeverTrump effort, which could have splintered and lost momentum. But with two weeks before the vote, Trump made two enormous mistakes: 1) attacking Heidi Cruz in a couple of late-night tweets, and 2) revealing that he knew little or nothing about Republican thinking on

abortion. Those mistakes, along with Trump's attack on popular-with-Republicans Gov. Scott Walker, sank Trump in Wisconsin. And they weren't just controversial; they showed a significant lapse in judgment on Trump's part.

Trump can blame aides for error No. 1, but the fact is, it was his decision. And errors Nos. 2 and 3 came out of his own mouth. So how to prevent such mistakes while keeping Trump's essential public character?

Error No. 1, Trump is working on, with the hiring of Paul Manafort, Rick Wiley and others. It remains to be seen whether that is a success.

Fixing error No. 3 would — or should — be easy. Don't attack your opponent's wife, stop tweeting late at night, and learn about basic Republican doctrine. Look for Trump to actually accomplish those minimal goals.

As the Trump team works on the inside, there appears to be some confusion about what Trump's reworking will actually mean on the outside.

Some commentators seem to believe a true Trump reworking would mean that he no longer does things like, for example, calling Ted Cruz "Lyn" Ted." That's not it. In fact, Trump hasn't changed his stump speech noticeably — just look at the speech he delivered Thursday night in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Pretty much the same as always.

Manafort tried to explain the change in a talk with Republican National Committee members meeting Thursday in Hollywood, Florida. "The part he's been playing is evolving," Manafort said. Though he didn't say it outright, Manafort seemed to suggest that Trump could sand down a few rough edges of his style and remain himself, while Hillary Clinton could not change the public's view that she is dishonest and lacking in character.

"Clinton's negatives are character negatives," Manafort said. "People don't trust her ... they think she's a liar."

"Trump's negatives are negatives that deal with his personality," Manafort continued. "Fixing personality negatives is a lot easier than fixing character negatives ... You can't change somebody's character, but you can change the way a person presents himself."

Manafort's message — and he didn't elaborate — seemed to be that Trump would pull back on some excesses, and also appear in different contexts, like next week's foreign-policy address, while not changing Trump's essential public style. The bottom line: Look for Trump to change but not change.

Byron York is chief political correspondent for *The Washington Examiner*.