

EDITORIAL & OPINION

Udall makes his case

His biggest asset? It could be his attitude

dropped by our offices the other day. I talked about his campaign for the Senate, and his visit reminded us of the Democrat's most attractive qualities: relaxed, good-natured and optimistic. Did I give him a compliment? Not at all. A compliment is important in politics. Rich-ardson is in a political grave because of his arrogance and mentality. By contrast, Ronald Reagan was able to disarm even opposition. I spent a lot of time saying, 'I'm not going to let people up and down the valley dragging the divisive wedge between us. No, I've found a way forward.'

spirited gloating was a part of his nature. His remarks while in the state should believe that he favors bipartisanship. As claimed during his congressional tenure, he tends to hew to a moderate line.

the political spectrum is a lot wider than he notes," he argued. "I also think that a partisan when it comes to assessing yourself and how you come across in public square."

his record is rife with examples of bipartisanship on Colorado. He proceeded to rattle off bipartisan efforts on national matters, too, insisting he has found a pragmatic place. "I'm not usually centrist. For many years, we must choose between a liberal and an equally clear-cut conservative. (I'll be the bedrock principle of the unions have tried to get Congress to organize a workplace. The resulting "card check" legisla-

wish Udall had been more centrist. The bedrock principle of the unions have tried to get Congress to organize a workplace. The resulting "card check" legisla-

correct employer intimidation is to enforce laws against it, not expose American workers to union intimidation.

Like many people running for Congress, Udall is not exactly brimming with brave ideas for how to trim the growing federal deficit — let alone curtail the red ink that will spill when baby boomers begin to cash Social Security checks and receive Medicare. A quicker resolution of the Iraq war would help, he rightly notes, as might a commission of experts who could offer a set of entitlement reforms, which the Congress would vote up or down.

Udall does recognize the urgency of the federal government's financial straits. "I think this is Job

One in the next year," he said. "All of our ideas about health care and energy — until we get the government's footing more sound in fiscal matters and we see the financial markets stabilize, all of these great ideas are going to have to be set aside because that's a prescription for rampant inflation."

We take him at his word when he says it would be unwise to pile extra costs on taxpayers at this time, but what if the next president and the congressional leadership disagree?

Somehow we find it difficult to imagine Udall voting against an expensive health-care initiative or major new "green jobs" measure if they reach the Senate floor. We can only hope we underestimate his concern over federal debt.

Udall does seem to have moderated his views on energy, accepting the need not only for the renewables that he has long championed but also nuclear power to combat global warming. He even supports a modest expansion of offshore drilling when the adjacent state concurs, although Republicans understandably doubt the sincerity of this latter conversion.

Udall rested his case with us by saying that if voters elect him, they'll "find that I'll do what I think is right even if it's against the prevailing conventional wisdom. To wit, the vote against the war, the vote against the Patriot Act, the vote against the bankruptcy bill."

But these votes, even if against prevailing congressional opinion, were not necessarily against the prevailing mood in Udall's liberal 2nd District — so exactly how brave they were is open to de-

Udall is not exactly brimming with brave ideas for how to trim the growing federal deficit.

A DIFFERING VIEW

Count on taxes rising if Amendment 59 passes

The *Rocky* should regret endorsing the deceptive Amendment 59 (editorial, Sept. 19).

Like other proponents, the *Rocky* claims that 59 "is not a tax hike." The *Rocky* continues, "it would eliminate rebates that taxpayers otherwise would receive whenever a [Taxpayer's Bill of Rights] surplus occurs."

How is this not a tax hike? The amendment's supporters claim the money that would otherwise go to rebates would fund "education." Yet the *Rocky* reports that it would "allow legislatures more opportunities for investing in other priorities."

That is, not education. Instead of spending your own money on your priorities, politicians would spend your money on their priorities.

Amendment 59 would force you to donate to government-run schools, regardless of your satisfaction with them. If you'd prefer to provide for your family, or donate your refund to schools or scholarships that politicians don't favor, tough. Amendment 59 forbids it.

The amendment's Web site claims to "protect our taxpayers." From what, spending our money as we please?

Brian T. Schwartz is a resident of Boulder.

■ **What do you think? Go to RockyMountainNews.com/opinion to join the conversation about this issue.**

HOT TOPIC

Manic Monday rebound; have markets hit bottom?

The most nauseating part of this debacle is that the United States government — which long ago perfected the habit of living beyond its means — was an active participant in helping some Americans shed the inhibition of fiscal prudence and embrace the notion we can afford it all — even when we know we can't.

The true irony, of course, is that because some Americans exercised their individual freedoms irresponsibly in the last decade we've now all become less free, assuming you measure such things by the . . . unprecedented expansion of the U.S. government into what was previously considered the "private sector."

TOM BEVAN, REALCLEARPOLITICS.COM

RockyMountainNews.com

Today on Rocky Opinion online, the *Rocky's* Bridget Johnson wants to hear more answers on the deepest question from last week's presidential debate: