

TAYLOR EASILY WINS - Oregonian, The (Portland, OR) - May 23, 2002 - page D02

May 23, 2002 | Oregonian, The (Portland, OR) | CHERYL MARTINIS - Correspondent, The Oregonian | Oregon | Page D02

Summary: Janet **Taylor**, who defeats her predecessor's choice, promises to include everyone in decision-making

Salem voters handily approved a stringent ethics reform proposal Tuesday, although debate on the measure, a first of its type in Oregon, was overshadowed by the **mayor's** race.

Business owner Janet **Taylor**, with 62 percent of the vote, beat former weatherman Bill Isabell in the race to replace three-term **Mayor** Mike Swaim. Swaim, a Democrat, ran unopposed in the primary for a legislative seat.

The activist Swaim, who fended off business opponents the past two times he ran for **mayor**, supported Isabell.

Another of Swaim's City Council allies, Willamette University professor Bill Smaldone, was replaced by Jim Randall, a former fund-raiser for **Salem** Hospital.

Taylor said repeatedly during the campaign that if elected **mayor**, she would include everyone in the decision-making process, an apparent reference to the clash in recent years between the council and the business-development community.

During the recent campaign, Swaim often loomed larger than either candidate. In April, for example, Swaim told a weekly Eugene publication that **Salem** has a Chamber of Commerce "with a lot of good people run by a bunch of Neanderthals." The comment touched off a letter-writing campaign in which Swaim critics demanded a public apology.

However, it's hard to paint Tuesday's vote as solely a referendum on Swaim's leadership. The **mayor** initiated the ethics reform proposal, which voters approved with a 65 percent "yes" vote.

The charter amendment would require elected and appointed city officials to disclose at public hearings whether they have family or business ties to any participant or have received contributions exceeding \$500 from anyone. If a disclosure is necessary, the public official would abstain from voting. The rule applies to hearings in which the applicants have a financial stake.

Opponents said it would violate free speech rights, predicted that the council would get bogged down trying to figure out who can vote on a particular issue and anticipated legal challenges to the measure. But Swaim said it would take the big money out of local politics and should survive any constitutional challenge because it doesn't limit the amount of money that may be contributed to a candidate.

You can reach Cheryl Martinis at 503-399-8540 or by e-mail at cheryl@open.org.

Copyright (c) 2002 Oregonian Publishing Co.