



We see the world
through Black eyes

Vote yes for schools

The people of Oregon have once again soundly defeated a school finance measure - the "safety net". Although the measure had tremendous financial and political support, the voters were not sold.

The defeat of the "safety net" as well as repeated defeats of school levies across the state should signal the legislators and the school administrators that something is wrong.

Of the small group of voters polled by The Observer, people were not as concerned with ever increasing taxes as they were with what they feel is indifference on the part of the school administrators. Some of the local concerns expressed were the involuntary transfer of upper graders out of the Albina district, one-way busing, the building of the new educational center without voter approval, the decrease in teaching staff without comparable decrease in administration, and, most of all, lack of open two-way communication between the administration and board and the people.

Unfortunately, many people have come to believe that the only way to have their voices heard is to turn down school levies. They feel there is no middle ground - no way to make concerns about the budget heard or to intervene in school policies.

One school district that has found a way to involve the public is the Parkrose District, where citizens task forces are involved in formulating the budget. This not only gives the district citizen input but forms a base of citizen support. Contrast this with the Portland district's practice of having the budget presented to the board by the administration.

The Portland School District faces an operating levy election next Tuesday. This levy is necessary to provide the same level of service now offered. Failure of the levy would bring about drastic cuts in the educational programs. And whose children are hurt most by the failure of the educational system?

We recommend a yes vote on the School District #1 levy next week. Then, if you are dissatisfied with the functioning of the schools, talk to the school board.

Invest in youth

An interesting program has developed in Portland in the last two years, which involves businesses in the education and inspiration of minority students.

PIMEG (Program to Increase Minority Engineering Graduates) was initiated on the east coast by General Electric and other technology companies and universities. The program attempts to reach 8th, 9th and 10th grade minority students and interest them in engineering.

Last year the program was introduced into

Jefferson and Grant High Schools. This year the program hopes to provide summer employment in an engineering environment for approximately ten students who have expressed an interest in engineering.

Among the activities planned are Junior Engineering Clubs, visits with professionals, arrangements for tutoring, and identifying ways in which interested students can be assisted.

Portland companies that are working with the program are: Bonneville Power Administration, Corps of Engineers, Chevron, FMC Corp., General Electric, Pacific Northwest Bell, Sandwell International, Pacific Power and Light, Portland General Electric and Tektronix.

We commend these companies for their efforts on behalf of the future of minority youth.

Emanuel site best

All evidence still points to the Emanuel Hospital site as the best place for the new Veteran's Hospital. Congress has postponed building until it can make its own investigation of the Marquam Hill and the Emanuel sites.

In the meantime, the City of Portland's Bureau of Planning has endorsed the Emanuel site, agreeing with the majority of the city commissioners.

Although the federal government is not bound by city decisions, it would seem beneficial for it to listen to those who will have to provide access and public services.

The Planning Bureau's decision is based largely on the traffic impact the Marquam Hill site would have on southwest Portland.

The only reason the proponents of the Marquam Hill site can give in its defense is the proximity to the University of Oregon Health Science Center and the resulting exchange of doctors and programs. In light of the tremendous disadvantages, this seems a small matter when the Emanuel site is only five minutes away.

The west hills site is a scenic, residential area with difficult access. The hospital could in no way enhance the area but would probably prove detrimental. On the other hand, location of the hospital near Emanuel would provide an important economic boost to the lower Albina area - where the residential areas have already been removed by government programs.

We cannot help but believe that the veterans using the hospital and their friends and relatives would find the Emanuel site more accessible to stores, churches, entertainment and hotel facilities and that this end to their isolation on the hill would be beneficial.

From the Legislature

by Rep. Gretchen Kaloupek

Proponents of the "safety net" plan have greatly increased their activities in support of that measure these last few days. Ballot Measure #1 will be voted on in Tuesday's special election, which also features two measures relating to Oregon's Department of Veteran's Affairs.

The school measure - Ballot Measure #1 - amends the Oregon Constitution by providing "that after two levy failures, a school district board could levy a limited amount for the purpose of operating the schools. Such levy is limited to the previous year's operating levy of the district plus no more than six percent."

Proponents argue that the measure will effectively deal with the problem of school closures by ensuring funding for schools, while opponents view the measure as a "short term" solution, which does not deal with the school finance reform issue. House Bill 3209, which addresses school finance reform and the basic school support formula, is pending in the Oregon Senate after passing the House by a vote of 51 to 8 on April 20th.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES PROBLEMS

Speaker Lang has appointed a special committee on water resources problems, which has been meeting four times a

week since late April. The committee is looking into the short-term problems "that have been created by the drought and some of the longer-term problems" as they relate to water resource policy and questions.

Committee members have heard comprehensive testimony dealing with the drought. The following is a partial list of the committee's concerns:

*Extremely dry conditions in Oregon's forests;

*Drought-related problems which threaten Oregon's agricultural community including wheat crops, livestock, waterhauling, and hay and forage shortages;

*Low stream flow and snow pack, with the subsequent impact on fisheries, recreation, tourism, and the environment;

*And, economic and financial impact both for government and the individual, including "drought aid, feed and water subsidy, property tax relief, livestock subsidy for forced sale due to adverse feed conditions, deferred mortgage and/or operating capital expenses by lending institutions and subsidy for herd reestablishment."

The committee hopes to deal with more than twenty measures currently being considered this session relating to the drought-related problems and to make

recommendations to the assembly for enactment.

DEMOCRATS CONSIDER ENERGY LEGISLATION

A comprehensive package of energy related bills was discussed by Democratic House members last week. The summary of over fifty measures includes the State

of Oregon's response to President Carter's recent energy speech to the Congress. Specific measures being considered by the Oregon Legislature include loans and tax credits for residential weatherization; tax credits, exemptions and loans for alternative energy sources; State conservation standards including building and lighting standards, conservation standards and appliance standards; energy planning and development, including resource development and planning; utility organization and rate structures; transportation; solid waste; and, information, education and awards in energy conservation and weatherization.

The Oregon House hopes to provide leadership in a set of actions to deal with energy problems and shortages. The measures being considered this session represent a commitment to solve energy problems and plan for the future.

Spokesman for Freedom

by Vernon Jordan

To listen to the howls of some editorialists, you'd think Andrew Young has been making awful diplomatic gaffes. Actually, he's only been telling the truth. The truth often hurts, and that accounts for all the heat America's spokesman for freedom has been getting.

When Young accepted the post of US Ambassador to the U.N., he said he wanted to be the Administrator's "Point Man" - to occupy the most advanced and dangerous positions. In fulfilling that role he has said some things that are not popular in some circles, or are more usually said with so much caution that nobody gets the message.

By gutting the doubletalk that usually infects public comments of officials, and by telling some home truths in a refreshingly open style, Ambassador Young is serving his Administration, the country, and the people, who ought to become involved in foreign policy discussions to a far greater degree.

But what exactly is it that Ambassador Young has said that gets so many people upset? The most recent statement to unleash criticism was that the South African government is "illegitimate."

Now who can argue with that? What is morally legitimate about a white minority government that rules over a large Black minority denied any semblance of a stake in that society. The South African situation is simply not comparable to any other. There may be countries ruled by

dictators which deny democratic rights, but such governments reflect the society they rule.

In South Africa a minority white population rules over a majority Black population, which is compelled to be a cheap labor source, denied basic civil rights, forbidden the right to own property or to live in sections of the country, and even denied citizenship.

South Africans who are Black are presumed to be citizens of arbitrarily defined "homelands" and are treated as foreign contact laborers in their own land. In the eyes of the white government, they are not "South Africans" at all.

So how can a government representing 2.3 million people in a country of 26 million be considered legitimate? Why should an American newly concerned about human rights go along with the fiction of South Africa's supposed legitimacy? Ambassador Young was right on target in his definition of that country's government.

Another statement that drew criticism was that Britain is "a little chicken" on race. Well, the language may be a bit more colorful than that of most diplomats but again, it's true. Britain, from the heyday of its empire to the present, has always exhibited a casual racism. Of course it is not alone in this; our own country along with many others shares this disease.

Ambassador Young was referring to

the Rhodesian situation when he said that. Can anyone deny that if a Black colony declared unilateral independence and proceeded to defy legality and to subjugate whites, as Rhodesia oppressed its Black majority, that the British would have acted differently? And it could be healthy for the British to hear such truths from a Black American diplomat, since racial discrimination against Black and Asian Britons is a very serious problem.

What are some of the other supposedly awful things Ambassador Young has said? That the Cubans in Angola are a stabilizing force? The President himself has agreed with that. That America is often too concerned with communism in Africa? Well, perhaps we are. It seems absurd to have a policy of detente with Russia, to have high officials visit China, to trade with the Soviet bloc, and then to panic and cut off all relations with African countries that espouse Marxism.

The real test should be whether such countries honor their agreements with us and to all appearances, Angola, for one, is protecting American oil interests on its soil. So why pick a fight over ideology with Africans, when we don't with Europeans?

Ambassador Young has been outspoken. He's angered some and gratified others. But most important, he has told truths that needed telling, and he has brought foreign policy issues out in the open where they ought to have been all along.

MHR Commission

(Continued from page 1 col. 2)

Barnett is quick to emphasize that now is the time to aggressively seek to eliminate the misunderstanding and the prejudice in our community. In the heat of the late 1960's when the reaction to racism and discrimination reached a feverish pitch, the Commission was created. Now, as the violent eruptions of that period have subsided, the real work of the Commission begins. In the more tranquil atmosphere of the next decade, the MHR Commission must continue to forge ahead, with an intensity equal to that of the

1960's. If the problem of the twentieth century, as W.E.B. DuBois once said, is in fact the problem of the color line, then the work of the Commission cannot be stopped.

This is why Nick Barnett's leadership is so important now - not when times are turbulent and uncertainty clouds our dedication to fairness and equal opportunity. But now - when we can think together, and work together, and argue together, and make progress together.

Nick Barnett's leadership is important - right now!

Holloman

(Continued from page 1 col. 6)

posed of labor, civil rights, and political leaders who support the Kennedy-Corman bill.

Dr. Holloman is also past president of the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, which operates the 17 municipal hospitals and other health care facilities in New York City.

He is the former national chairman of the Medical Committee for Human Rights and former national chairman of the

Physicians Forum.

Tickets for the National Health Security Banquet can be obtained by contacting the Oregon Coalition for National Health Security, 307 Dekum Building, 519 S.W. Third Avenue, Portland, OR 97204. The telephone number is 224-2836. Tickets are \$20 per person. Proceeds will help the Coalition's efforts for the passage of national health security legislation to make quality health care available to all Americans.

Letters

Worthy of mention

To the Editor:

I enjoy The Observer and feel it has done much to benefit our community. I have written several times to commend you and your accomplishments. This time I have a question: Under your caption "Congratulations" you mention three very worthy young ladies - Brenda Knapper, Lucretia Fuller and Karen Mathis - what happened to La Verne Davis? Mrs. Davis has worked almost from the inception of the Pageant. Previously I have felt a bit hurt that she received little recognition. I was delighted this year when she was asked to serve as Mistress of Ceremonies. Her name was mentioned under Kimberly Chosen but I missed it under the Special "Congratulations" note.

Sincerely,
Evelyn Collins

Open letter to Mrs. McCready

Dear Ms. McCready:

Your recent letters to the Portland news media and to me certainly came as a surprise, especially in light of your past favorable support toward the problems of Portland's poor. I can readily appreciate your concerns about the Thirteenth Banquet of the Portland Metropolitan Steering Committee; however, I do feel that it was unfair and unnecessary to forward notification of your concerns to the news media prior to (or concurrent with) your notifying me. Regardless of my disappointment at your choice of tactics, let me assure you that I am astute enough to understand the political dynamics involved, especially when a situation concerns Cleveland Gilcrease, Executive Director of PMSC.

As to your stated primary concern, you obviously have been misinformed or are uninformed as to the purpose each year of PMSC's annual banquet. The banquet is not and does not purport to be for the poor, per se; it is in honor of the PMSC Board of Directors who serve as representatives of the public, private and low-income sectors of Portland and who never receive any salary or pay for the services they render on behalf of the poor.

For informational purposes, allow me to provide some comparative data related to the Twelfth and Thirteenth Annual Banquets. First, you received an invitation to our banquet at the Sheraton last year, just as you did this year. The ticket price then was \$10 and, since you were not prompted at that time to register any complaints, I must assume that your present irritation is due to the \$2 increase in ticket price. As a public official who is keenly aware of the latest salary increases for the Mayor and Commissioners (justifiable salary increases, I might add, in view of current inflationary trends), you should also be aware that the same inflationary factors caused our ticket prices to be increased by \$2 over the prior year. The cost of the dinner this year was \$9.75 per plate, without gratuities. The balance of \$2.25 (\$12 per ticket, less \$9.75 direct expense) was used as it was last year - to defray the additional costs of the banquet, such as printing,

plaques, invitations, programs (one is attached for your review; see Exhibit A), flowers, certificates, frames, etc. Last year, we had a profit of \$9.36 which was deposited into the PMSC corporate account to be used at the discretion of the PMSC Board of Directors.

I might add that in the past eight years, the PMSC staff and I have made certain that a large segment of our truly poor are well represented at the banquet, with their dinner tickets sponsored through donations from staff and other kind individuals who sincerely believe, as I do, that the poor should be (and deserve to be) exposed to the luxuries of our society. For many, the banquet marks an evening of gratification and satisfaction, if for no other reason that it provides contact with people who are well-known. For others, the joy comes from something so simple as a good meal or a chance to hear thoughtful remarks from a variety of speakers. Yes, I do believe that the poor deserve at least this much.

Please note here that I referred to the truly poor and not the "self-made poor" who came to the banquet under the leadership of Mr. Kent Ford and who used what appear to be approximately fifty fraudulent tickets which were discovered on the morning after the banquet. Mr. Ford and his many "comrades" did not hesitate to share in the dinner and, after eating and speaking a few

words to the audience, exit with the same weary cliché that poor people don't belong in elaborate facilities like the Sheraton and shouldn't even share in a meal sponsored by someone else (see Exhibit B). To those who can consciously and sincerely believe in this philosophy, I extend my tolerance and, mostly, my pity. I am convinced that each of us has a right to our personal opinions, but we also have an obligation to respect the personal opinions of others. Unfortunately, there are many people who demand the right but are unwilling to fulfill the related obligation.

In closing, may I say that I would be more than pleased to meet with you, at your convenience, to share your thoughts and input as to how we might better approach the planning of PMSC's Fourteenth Annual Banquet. Perhaps we can discuss at the same time some of the seemingly underlying motives/reasons for the profoundly negative comments that you have made during the past year with regard to my judgment, administrative ability, honesty, etc.

My appreciation is offered for the time and attention that you have given to the contents of this letter. I hope to be hearing from you again in the near future and, hopefully, on a more positive and constructive note.

Most sincerely,
Cleveland Gilcrease
Executive Director
PMSC



ALFRED L. HENDERSON
Editor/Publisher

Portland Observer

Published every Thursday by Exie Publishing Company, 2201 North Killingsworth, Portland, Oregon 97217. Mailing address: P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208. Telephone 283-2486.

Subscriptions: \$7.50 per year in the Tri-County area, \$8.00 per year outside Portland.

Second Class Postage Paid at Portland, Oregon

The Portland Observer's official position is expressed only in its Publisher's column (We See The World Through Black Eyes). Any other material throughout the paper is the opinion of the individual writer or submitter and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Portland Observer.

National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.
New York

1st Place
Community Service
ONPA 1973

1st Place
Best Ad Results
ONPA 1973

5th Place
Best Editorial
NNPA 1973

Honorable Mention
Herrick Editorial Award
NNA 1973

2nd Place
Best Editorial
3rd Place
Community Leadership
ONPA 1975



Subscribe to The Portland Observer

Tri-County area \$7.50

other areas \$8.00

Address

City