

## Quick takes

### Minimum wage hike passes

Minimum wage is for a minimum skill set. It was never designed to be a living wage. This is going to kill small business.

— Tygh Campbell

When people have more money, they spend more money. Sounds like it's a win for the economy. Small businesses will have to sink or swim. Maybe the owners will have to get a minimum wage job too.

— Richard Ryan III

So all these people wanting higher wages, do they realize the more you make the more they take? Your raise won't be huge since they'll just take more in taxes.

— Stephanie Baird Lloyd

I'm waiting for someone to point out that passing this legislation in a short session is in violation of Oregon's constitution on what business is to be done in the short session.

— Matt Mann

When employees feel valued they do strive to better their workplace. Better yet, when they are allowed to buy in (or get shares as part of retirement) they take better care of the building, they work harder and they seem happier.

— Jennifer Hamlin

*One of the great lessons of the Twitter age is that much can be summed up in just a few words. Here are some of this week's takes. Tweet yours @Tim\_Trainor or email editor@eastoregonian.com, and keep them to 140 characters.*

## YOUR VIEWS

### In support of John Turner

John Turner is a worthy candidate for mayor of the city of Pendleton. John has the necessary administrative skills to lead Pendleton as we approach the third decade of the 21st century. His sense of humor, openness, and willingness to listen to all sides in a complex debate has me believing in his ability to be mayor of Pendleton.

John is committed to this region, involves himself in local issues, loves to hunt and fish, and wants to lead us to bigger and better outcomes as a city. Please join me in supporting John Turner as the next mayor of the city of Pendleton.

David Nelson  
Oregon state senator (ret.)  
Pendleton

Great news, Pendleton! John Turner has decided to run for mayor. Pendleton has been fortunate to have several hard-working mayors over the last 20+ years, and John Turner will continue that tradition. I've had the pleasure to know and work with John for a number of years and I have found John to have a unique ability to see the big picture, solve problems and bring various groups together for a common goal, based on cooperation.

John's skills are exactly what we need at this time in city government. Please support John Turner in this upcoming election.

Kevin Hale  
Pendleton

John Turner deserves your support in his bid to become mayor of Pendleton. I have worked closely with John in his former capacity as president of Blue Mountain Community College, and in his current capacity as commissioner of the Port of Umatilla.

John is always well informed on the issues before him. He is a strong leader while at the same time recognizing the importance of consensus building. He is a creative thinker. He knows how to get the public's business done in an open and thoughtful manner. Pendleton needs someone like John.

Doug Hojem  
Pendleton

## CONTACT YOUR REPRESENTATIVES

### U.S. Senators

**Ron Wyden**  
Washington office:  
221 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg.  
Washington, DC 20510  
202-224-5244  
La Grande office:  
541-962-7691

**Jeff Merkley**  
Washington office:  
313 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510  
202-224-3753  
Pendleton office:  
541-278-1129

### State Senator

**Bill Hansell, District 29**  
900 Court St. NE, S-423  
Salem, OR 97301  
503-986-1729  
Sen.BillHansell@state.or.us

### State Representatives

**Greg Barreto, District 58**  
900 Court St. NE, H-38  
Salem, OR 97301  
503-986-1458  
Rep.GregBarreto@state.or.us  
**Greg Smith, District 57**  
900 Court St. NE, H-482  
Salem, OR 97301  
503-986-1457  
Rep.GregSmith@state.or.us

# Lands managers value cooperation

As employees of federal land agencies in Oregon, we are entrusted by Congress with the responsibility to help steward and manage federal lands for all Americans. This is a tremendous honor and responsibility we take seriously.

And we can't do it alone.

As public lands belong to all Americans, managing these lands is a collective effort. It is a privilege to work alongside local communities, partners, and the public to help achieve the long-term health, productivity, and protection of public lands.

Here in the Pacific Northwest, and across the country, our best work is accomplished by working with diverse partners and stakeholders — ranchers,



JAMIE CONNELL  
Comment



JIM PEÑA  
Comment

It is crucial that we listen to each other, find common ground, and work together.

environmentalists, sportsmen, local communities, schools, and private industries.

Though our agencies have different missions, we share a common goal of managing public lands in a cooperative manner with you, the people who own them.

The future management of public lands requires cooperation over confrontation.

In Oregon and across the West, there are countless examples of collaborative groups working together to achieve positive results.

One recent shining example was the work accomplished across

agencies, states, counties and ownership lines to create and implement land-use plans that avoided a listing of the sage-grouse as endangered.

Managing public lands is sometimes

challenging. There are a variety of uses, interests, and opinions on how these lands should be managed, and finding balance is not without challenges.

That is why it is crucial that we listen to each other, find common ground, and work together to find common-sense solutions.

Individually and collectively, we are committed to these principles of listening, talking, and working together to achieve the greatest good. We strive for these things in good faith every day.

Public lands belong to all Americans — they are yours to enjoy and participate in their management. That's one of the reasons public lands are so special.

We look forward to continuing our work with local citizens, communities and partners to manage public lands so we can ensure the special places we love can meet the needs of today and remain available for future generations to enjoy.

Jamie Connell is the acting State Director, Bureau of Land Management Oregon/Washington. Jim Peña is the Regional Forester for the U.S. Forest Service's Pacific Northwest Region.

## Nonviolent protest: A lesson for the occupiers at Malheur

By SETH MICHAEL WHITE

Writers on the Range

On a cold Tuesday in January, when the Malheur occupation was in full swing, I marched alongside demonstrators in Portland to support the ousting of the Bundys and their armed militia. We were pretty much a hodgepodge group of birders, conservationists and nature-loving pacifists. There were no guns in sight; instead, demonstrators held signs high, telling the story of why we were there.

"Bundy go home now."

"I (heart) Harney County."

"Public lands are America's refuge."

"Keep it public, keep it wild."

My motivation for showing up was partly based on my personal history with the refuge. In the late 1990s, I received my early training as a biologist along the Blitzen River and its tributaries, which flow from glacier-carved valleys in the Steens Mountains.

Malheur's ecosystem depends on the Blitzen and its streams, for they are the source of the area's icy water. That clean water also means that the condition of the fragile riverbank — its willow, cottonwood, alder and aspen — is crucial.

On and around the refuge, I recall driving with biologists over seemingly endless highways through the sagebrush sea, jackrabbits darting into the road at night, and chatting with locals over berry pie at the Frenchglen Hotel. We met a retired wildland firefighter who'd come to a frank but uncomfortable conclusion: He believed that the forests he'd spent much of his life protecting would have been much healthier if they'd been allowed to burn.

"I wasted my whole life fighting fires," he told us. Whether he was right or wrong, we knew he cared deeply about the fate of the forests and the land. We met other locals who loved the refuge's trout streams,

its abundant game and thriving bird communities.

In the decades since then, I've worked alongside federal and state employees, tribal members and ranchers who share a common interest in protecting the West's rangelands.

In Wyoming, another hotbed of confrontational range politics, I knew a cattle rancher who proudly hung an award for sustainable grazing practices on his living room wall. All the Malheur takeover tells us is that some ranchers (and some wannabe ranchers) and their anti-government supporters have never understood the concept of publicly owned land.

This pattern has a deep history. In a turn-of-the-century letter to *The Oregonian*, the secretary of Crook County's Sheep Shooter Association of Eastern Oregon said: "If we want more range we simply fence it in. ... These mild and peaceful means are usually effective, but in cases where they are not, our executive committee takes the matter in hand, and being men of high ideals as well as good shots by moonlight, they promptly enforce the edicts of the association. ..."

At the Portland rally last month, Sean Stevens of Oregon Wild warmed up the crowd with some protest songs. He added, "We can show the gang that's out there at the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge how you really make a public statement in support of something." He meant: Let's keep it peaceful, folks, and that is how we tried to get our message across to the hundreds of people who were willing to listen to us.

Other speakers included Bob Sallinger of the Portland Audubon Society, who

said he wanted the refuge's invaders prosecuted. Jarvis Kennedy of the Burns Paiute Tribe asked: "Would the authorities have been so patient if the occupiers had been Natives?"

On Jan. 20, the day after

demonstrations against the occupiers took place across Oregon in Portland, Eugene, La Grande and elsewhere, Gov. Kate Brown broke her long silence by speaking out against the Bundys and their allies.

On Jan. 21, the FBI began intensive negotiations with the occupiers, leading to a chain of events that put some of the occupiers in jail, turned one into a martyr,

and herded the remaining few into a small huddle, shivering around a dying campfire.

When I think back on the 41 days of a refuge under siege, what I like to recall is that cold day in Portland, when my fellow demonstrators and I marched from Holladay Park to the federal building in the Lloyd District. We formed a tight-knit group and swarmed into the courtyard as perplexed bureaucrats gazed down on us from behind their closed windows. Unarmed and unprotected, we chanted our demand: "Public lands in public hands, public lands in public hands. ..."

We walked away after a while, and after drinking some hot coffee, we all went back to our working lives or on to daycare, to pick up the kids. We'd said our piece, and we hoped that people were listening.

Seth Michael White is a contributor to *Writers on the Range*, an opinion service of *High Country News*. He is a biologist in Portland who works on issues related to river conservation.

All the takeover tells us is that some ranchers and their supporters have never understood the concept of publicly owned land.

## A little reality on immigration

Donald Trump built his campaign on the promise to build a wall along the Mexican border. The idea is attention-grabbing (and unworkable). But the striking thing is that it's not too far away from the current Republican orthodoxy.

Not long ago you could be a movement conservative and be for reasonably open immigration policies. Ronald Reagan, Jack Kemp, Steve Forbes and George W. Bush all took open positions on immigration.

But times have changed. Now you prove your conservative credentials by saying you want to deport undocumented aliens. Now you prove it by opposing higher immigration flows. Now Donald Trump brings Republican crowds to their feet by bashing the supposed criminal hordes sneaking up from Mexico.

The problem with this new orthodoxy is that it is completely obsolete. It's based on a view of migration that may have reflected 1980s realities, but that has little to do with reality today.

The number of immigrants flowing into this country illegally is dropping, not rising. The flow of total immigrants peaked in 2005 and has been dropping since. The share of immigrants coming from Latin America is falling sharply. Since 2008, more immigrants have come from Asia than Latin America, and the disparity is growing.

There are more Mexicans leaving the United States that coming in. According to the Pew Research Center, there was a net outflow of 140,000 from 2009 to 2014. If Trump builds his wall, he'll lock more Mexican immigrants in than he'll keep out.

Trump plays up the alleged threat of crime committed by immigrants. But the overall evidence is clear. Immigrants make American streets safer. Roughly 1.6

percent of immigrant males between ages 18 and 39 wind up incarcerated, compared with 3.3 percent of native-born American men of the same age. Among native-born men without a high school diploma, about 11 percent are incarcerated. Among similarly educated Mexican, Guatemalan and Salvadoran men here, only 2 or 3 percent get incarcerated.

One study of 103 cities between 1994 and 2004 found that violent crime rates decreased as the concentration of immigrants increased. Numerous studies have shown that a big share of the drop in crime rates in the 1990s is a result of the surge in immigration.

Trump plays up the threat of terrorism. But the real threat is that our border agencies spend so much time tracking down people who want to be gardeners that they don't have the resources to track down the people who want to be suicide bombers. Fighting terrorism by going after the whole swath of immigration policy is like fighting germs with a sledgehammer.

There's a reason Republicans from Reagan to Bush supported reasonably open immigration policies. They are and have always been good for America.

A new summary of the research from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine found that immigrants are integrating into society as well as ever. The bulk of the evidence shows that immigrants have a hugely positive effect on total American GDP while having little effect on overall wages. The surge in Asian immigration will bring a gigantic number of highly skilled people, who end up with higher education levels than the American average, higher productivity levels and higher incomes.

So why is the Trump message selling? Well, economic growth has been slow and wages have been stagnant (mostly

because technology is displacing workers). Government is dysfunctional and the immigration issue has become a symbol for how elites are out of touch with the mainstream.

But mostly it's the clash of two trends: the graying of the GOP and the browning of America. The Republican primary base is more and more made up of older people, who have significantly more negative views about immigration. Second, by 2044, America will be a majority-minority country. This is a very different America than the one people who grew up in the 1960s were used to. It's a historical transformation that is bound to raise very legitimate concerns.

The way for Republicans to address these concerns, though, is not to build a wall and treat immigrants as suspicious alien invaders. It's to work on our legal immigration system — make the system ample and streamlined enough so that most people come here in the right way, in a way they can be vetted.

Admit more skilled immigrants and fewer unskilled ones. This would be a giant boon to the economy overall. It would make our immigration policies less geared to serving the elites — giving them ample supplies of nannies and nail polishers. Reducing the supply of unskilled immigrants may do something to raise the wages of unskilled natives and ease their legitimate concerns.

Donald Trump's GOP is a rear-window party pining for a white America that is never coming back. Ronald Reagan's GOP, and maybe some future GOP, will fix the immigration system and attract the people who will make the country innovative, dynamic and interesting for decades to come.

David Brooks became a *New York Times* Op-Ed columnist in September 2003.