

A look at the Ballot

Many voters become aware of the measures presented by the Legislature for approval by the general public only when faced with the ballot on election day. It is difficult to understand the language of the measures, let alone all the issues involved, when hurrying through the ballot. The Voters' Pamphlet compiled by the Secretary of State is a help to those who wish to prepare for voting, but it takes some endurance to get through the 35 pages of detailed information.

Spilyay has attempted to condense and simplify available information about the ballot measures so that you can be ready for Election Day. The Voters' Pamphlet and the League of Women Voters provided the substance for the following summary.

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 1 - Validates Inadvertently Super-seeded Statutory Amendments

THE PROPOSAL: When two or more pieces of legislation are passed amending the same statute, both amendments would take effect unless there is a conflict in purpose. If there is a conflict, then the last act signed by the Governor would control.

THE CHANGE: Presently any amendment which fails to incorporate an earlier amendment nullifies the earlier one.

ARGUMENTS FOR: This measure would "streamline the legislative process and save tax dollars." Much valuable staff time has been spent looking up previous legislation to iron out conflicts. Passage of Ballot Measure No. 1 would save time and ensure that legislation not be "accidentally nullified" because of conflicts.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST: This could be an attempt to cover legislative errors that shouldn't be made and to circumvent earlier rulings by the Attorney General and the Supreme Court.

A YES VOTE means you are in favor of changing the constitution according to the above proposal.

A NO VOTE means you'd like the constitution to stay the way it is.

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 2 - Allows Changing City, County election Days

THE PROPOSAL: That the Legislature be allowed to set a statewide date for city and county elections, different from the existing constitutional requirement.

THE CHANGE: Presently the constitution requires that city and county officers be nominated on the statewide primary election day and general elections for city and town officers be held on statewide general election day. This requirement would be removed to allow the legislature to set a different uniform statewide date.

FOR: The legislature would be free to study the advantages and disadvantages of present dates and determine if a change in election dates would be better for voters, taxpayers and local government. More attention might be given to local races and issues and ballots might be simplified if the dates are changed.

AGAINST: This would add confusion because not all county officers would be elected at the same time. There might be a poorer voter turnout at special elections. Such a change would involve unnecessary additional costs.

A YES VOTE means you feel the legislature should be allowed to examine the existing dates. A yes vote does not necessarily change the dates.

A NO VOTE means you feel the constitution should continue to require that the dates for state, national and local primaries and elections be the same.

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 3 - "Lowers Minimum Age for Legislative Service"

THE PROPOSAL: That the minimum age for membership in the legislature be lowered to 18 and that a Senator or Representative be a registered voter of this state.

THE CHANGE: Present minimum age is 21.

FOR: The voting age has been lowered to 18 so it is appropriate that the age for eligibility of service be lowered. Eighteen year-olds pay taxes, vote and serve in the military so they should be able to serve in office, too.

AGAINST: Eighteen to twenty-one year-olds often don't have the maturity or everyday experience of older people. The average person in this age bracket doesn't own property or pay property taxes.

A YES VOTE means you would like to see the minimum age be lowered to 18.

A NO VOTE means you feel 21 should be the minimum age for serving in office.

ABSENTEE BALLOT
available at the
County Court House
8:30-5

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 4 - "Repeals Emergency Succession Provision"

THE PROPOSAL: To repeal a section of the Oregon Constitution that requires the legislature to provide by law for temporary succession to vacated public offices in the event of enemy attack.

THE CHANGE: Existing law provides for a number of procedures that would ensure the smooth continuation of state and local government in case the "enemy" attacks. Measure No. 4 would repeal this law and re-activate constitutional provisions for succession.

FOR: The existing law is felt to be out-dated and bulky as it was a response to the Cold War and requires an unnecessary amount of paperwork as preparation for a possible need for succession.

AGAINST: A means for orderly succession is just as important now as it was when the law was passed.

A YES VOTE would mean you favor repealing the present section of the constitution and returning to previous provisions.

A NO VOTE means you are in favor of the existing law.

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 5 - "Permits Legislature to Call Special Session"

THE PROPOSAL: That the legislature be allowed to convene itself whenever a majority of the members deem it necessary because of emergency.

THE CHANGE: This would not be a change, but an addition. Measure No. 5 would add a third method of convening to the existing two methods: 1. a required "regular session" every two years. 2. "special sessions" called by the Governor's proclamation on "extraordinary occasions".

FOR: The legislature should be allowed to "respond quickly and flexibly" in the case of unanticipated problems or situations. It is not truly democratic for the Governor to have sole right to convene the legislature for special sessions.

AGAINST: The Governor is the chief executive and should be solely responsible for declaring emergencies and activating machinery to deal with the problems. This measure would increase the possibility of the operation of party politics and is an opening wedge for annual sessions.

A YES VOTE would provide a third way for the legislature to convene.

A NO VOTE would maintain the current system of convening legislature.

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 6 - "Allows Charitable, Fraternal, Religious Organizations Bingo"

THE PROPOSAL: That the constitution be changed so that the legislature can enact laws to allow charitable, fraternal or religious organizations to operate games of bingo or lotto.

THE CHANGE: The constitution presently prohibits lotteries. Measure No. 6 would remove this ban to allow the legislature to determine appropriate limits. This measure would not provide for the establishment of such lottery operations, but would allow the legislature to enact laws providing for them.

FOR: Bingo can be used to raise funds for valuable services offered to state residents. It is an acceptable form of social recreation and is permitted in many other states. Local control might be possible under legislation resulting from this constitutional amendment.

AGAINST: Legalization of any lottery takes Oregon in the wrong direction. Enforcement of regulations concerning such lotteries might be expensive. Allowing tax-exempt organizations to hold lotteries is discriminatory.

A YES VOTE means you favor the legislature being enabled to enact laws providing for bingo and Loto in certain situations.

A NO VOTE means you feel that no gambling should be legalized.

NATIONAL AND STATE ELECTIONS

VOTE! AT THE TEEN CENTER November 2 8 A.M. - 8 P.M.

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 7 - "Partial Public Funding of Election Campaigns"

THE PROPOSAL: That a public fund be established to provide financing for the campaigns of candidates for state office. Funds to be provided by individual taxpayers through a voluntary check-off on their tax returns and will only pay for expenses related to public communications. Candidates nominated in the primary will be eligible to participate in the public fund; otherwise eligibility is based on receipt of a percentage of total votes cast in the election and amount of private funds spent.

THE CHANGE: Presently an individual can make private donations which are tax deductible. No governmental mechanism exists for the public support of political campaigns.

FOR: Measure No. 7 would make public office more accessible to all, wealthy or not, and would discourage the misuse of private funds and the inordinate amount of time spent in fund-raising. Sufficient guidelines ensure that the individual's voluntary tax check-off would be used fairly and not benefit candidates personally.

AGAINST: This measure would reduce the amount of tax money in the general fund. It would add another governmental function that might require additional appropriations for administering. Tax credits

and deductions already exist for those individuals who wish to donate to political campaigns.

A YES VOTE would establish the voluntary Fair Elections Fund.

A NO VOTE means opposition to the fund as proposed.

BALLOT MEASURE NO. 8 - "Increases Motor Fuel, Ton-mile Taxes"

THE PROPOSAL: To increase motor fuel tax from 7 to 8 cents per gallon and increase by 26 per cent the taxes and fees on commercial carriers. This money would be spent on highway maintenance and reconstruction only.

FOR: At a slight cost to the individual a large amount of funds will be available for improvement and repair of existing roads. Other highway funds could be freed up for parks, recreational, scenic and historic purposes.

AGAINST: Passenger cars are already paying more than their share of road taxes. Too much money is being spent on bike paths and greenways and on highways, and not enough on mass transportation.

A YES VOTE would increase the taxes and fees mentioned above.

A NO VOTE would maintain current levels of fees and taxes.

Voting . . .

It hasn't been all that long since the Indian people received the right to vote, along with other citizenship rights.

Under the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887, citizenship for Indians was first considered. This act encouraged individual ownership of reservation lands by dividing reservations into allotments to be taken over by families or individuals. Full title to the land could be obtained after 25 years if the Indian was adjudged "competent." Along with this would come full citizenship.

As it turned out, before the 25 years were up the Burke Act (1906) permitted those In-

dians adjudged competent to take over their allotments (and become citizens) immediately.

"Competency" was determined for years by "competency commissions" which issued "certification of competency." This was seen as a step toward "discontinuing guardianship over all competent Indians" as started in the 1917 "Declaration of Policy" of the Indian Bureau.

Since a growing number of Indians were obtaining citizenship through allotment, a push for full citizenship for Indians was launched by the Indian Bureau in the twenties. There was also more than a bit of