

# The INDEPENDENT

Serving the upper Nehalem River valley. Published twice monthly, on the first and third Wednesdays of each month, by Public Opinion Laboratory Ltd., 725 Bridge Street, Vernonia, OR 97064, as a free newspaper. Editors and Publishers, Dirk & Noni Andersen. Sports Editor, Caren McLaugh. Phone/Fax: (503) 429-9410.

## Opinion

### State Measure 57

Prison construction is already a growth industry in Oregon, though school construction is on the decline. So, why would we want to make criminals of people who possess less than an ounce of marijuana? Arguments in favor of recriminalization tend to emphasize protection of children, but there is something missing from those arguments: It is already illegal for children to have marijuana; it is illegal to provide marijuana to minors; it is illegal to drive under the influence of marijuana.

Proponents also fail to mention the impact of recriminalization on people who aren't users: More jail space will be needed and more police will be needed...that will increase taxes while decreasing resources for other services such as prevention and treatment.

This sends the wrong message to youth. It says we are willing to spend money on prisons, but we're not willing to spend money on education, prevention and treatment. Do we really want to create 6,000 more criminals this year by passing an expensive, punitive and unworkable measure?

Vote No on Measure 57.

### State Measure 58

Should adoptees be able to obtain a true copy of their birth certificate, instead of a phony one that was substituted when they were adopted? There is possible invasion of privacy of the birth mother (or father), who may have very good reasons for not revealing themselves. There is also a legitimate need to know one's genetic heritage, especially in case of certain medical conditions.

It's a balancing act, but a Yes vote is recommended.

### Measure 59

Here we go again. Measure 59 is so badly written that it would have unintended results. It intends to prohibit public employee unions from being able to use payroll deductions because the unions also have political action committees. Unintentionally, it would also prohibit "using public funds (public employees, etc.) to collect political funds" thereby eliminating the Voters' Pamphlet that so many people find indispensable.

This lacks intelligence; vote No on 59.

### Measure 60

The only question to answer about this measure is: Do you or don't you want to vote by mail in all elections? At this time, all elections in Oregon are by mail except the Primary and General Elections, when people have the option of going to the polls. This hybrid system has resulted in a lot of confusion, with some people waiting for a mail ballot when there isn't going to be one.

Even if you prefer going to the polling place, there are some compelling reasons for unifying behind voting by mail. One reason is that more people vote when they can do so by mail than if they have to go to the polls. Another important reason has to do with fiscal conservatism: Voting by mail is cheaper than using polling places. More than 50 percent of Oregon voters already use absentee ballots so polling places are used by fewer than 50 percent of voters.

Let's expand vote by mail. Vote Yes on Measure 60.

### Measure 61

At this time, it appears that votes either for or against Measure 61 won't be counted because, according to the court, it lacked enough valid signatures to qualify for the ballot. If that holds, the question is moot. In case that decision changes, let's look at it anyway.

This is another attempt to reduce crime by increasing punishment, which is how we got on the prison-building track in the first place. The people it would punish, however, are the taxpayers. It is estimated that passage of this measure would require an additional 4,300 prison beds by the year 2006. In addition to that cost, up to \$470 million, there would be additional court costs in the tens of thousands.

Why don't we spend tax money intelligently. Crime prevention costs that punishment. Vote No on 59, just in case it's counted.

**Please vote on November 3rd**

WHAT YOU GATHERING UP ALL THEM ROCKS FOR?

WELL, I VOTED FOR #64 AND NOW THAT THERE AINT TOILET PAPER ANYMORE I'M COLLECTING ALL I CAN GET, THEY GO IN MY BATHROOM SO I CAN WIPE MY WITH 'EM!

NOW THATS EXTREME!



BE SURE AND READ AND STUDY YOUR VOTER'S GUIDE BEFORE YOU VOTE!

### Measure 62

This constitutional amendment would require more frequent disclosure of political campaign contributions, would allow the legislature to prohibit paying people to gather signatures on petitions and controls how individuals may make political contributions. Since constitutional amendments are supposed to cover only one subject, it's anybody's guess how this would fare in state court. If it goes to the U.S. Supreme Court, it's unlikely to be allowed, if recent rulings are any measure.

No matter how much we may want campaign finance reform, when in doubt about the legality of any measure, it is probably a good idea to vote No.

### Measure 63

When the measure requiring a "super majority" passed a couple of years ago, it was approved by a simple majority of the voters casting a ballot. This is the measure that defeated the 9-1-1 election in September, because it voids election results on money measures unless more than 50 percent of registered voters cast ballots.

Measure 63 offers a "quid pro quo" for this tactic by requiring that any future ballot measures trying to impose a super majority can be approved only if they receive the same super majority being required in the measure.

The only opposition to this comes from Oregon Taxpayers United, the same people who think that the efforts of active voters should be cancelled by people who don't vote.

Vote Yes on Measure 63.

### Measure 64

Measure 64 would ban clearcutting, which many people think that is an excellent idea. The measure also calls for banning the use of pesticides and herbicides on forestlands in order to prevent contamination of water, soil and air; certainly a legitimate concern. Other elements would prohibit cutting any tree over 30 inches in diameter and would allow any citizen of the United States to sue in state court to enforce the requirements of this measure.

Those last two elements are, in many ways, more distressing than banning clearcutting.

Trees that have grown to 30 inches in diameter, or greater, are found not just on federal lands. Many responsible small tree farmers have nurtured their stands over long periods of time, cutting selectively and letting some trees grow very large. Those trees are their retirement, or their grandchildren's college tuition, or money to

blow. Should they be prohibited from using them?

Why should any U.S. citizen be able to sue Oregon tree growers to enforce Oregon law? If it is state law, enforcement should follow the same requirements as enforcement of any state law. There are already too many people who think "I'll sue," when they are upset about something.

The ban on herbicides and pesticides is an excellent idea in many ways, but it doesn't go far enough. Any such ban must also apply to farmers, landscapers, gardeners, etc., in order to be effective.

The way trees are grown on industrial lands has developed from the best forestry of the time and is always undergoing modification. As more people inhabit the earth, more are going to question the process and some will be extreme. This measure should not pass, but it should serve as a wake up call to industrial forestry. A better job can be done, but vote No on 64.

### Measure 65

This measure is a great way to make the state legislature just as ineffective as Congress. Any time any one is upset about an administrative rule, just petition your legislature. They can then spend their time looking over the shoulders of state employees to find what the petitioner is objecting to.

Sorry, folks, this is just plain stupid, could take up far too much of the legislature's time and resources, and bring operations to a halt. Vote No on 65.

### Measure 66

Oregonians love salmon and parks, sort of, just not enough to pay for them. But if they're paid for out of lottery funds, it doesn't cost anything, does it? Yes, it does.

We are becoming more addicted to gambling every day and think that all funding problems can be solved by more gambling. We need to fund parks and save salmon, but not this way.

Vote No on 66.

### Measure 67

The medical use of marijuana isn't a hare-brained idea. Marijuana works well for certain medical conditions and in some cases is a good substitute for heavy opiates. The reason there has been so little research on marijuana is the refusal of the federal government to provide it to legitimate researchers. This is one way to put pressure on so research can be done.

Vote Yes on Measure 67.

ALUMNIUM THINK COMMUNITY  
86120  
RUBINOS  
# INDEPENDENT