

EAST OREGONIAN

Founded October 16, 1875

KATHRYN B. BROWN
Publisher

DANIEL WATTENBURGER
Managing Editor

JENNINE PERKINSON
Advertising Director

TIM TRAINOR
Opinion Page Editor

OUR VIEW

Pendleton air service is essential

Commercial air service at Pendleton's Eastern Oregon Regional Airport is essential to the economy, infrastructure and future of Eastern Oregon.

We think the U.S. Department of Transportation should see it that way too.

Right now, the airport's federal subsidy is in danger of being axed and along with it commercial flights between Pendleton and Portland.

SeaPort Airlines currently operates the flights and has had a difficult year, declaring bankruptcy while cutting nearly all of their other routes nationwide. The disruptions to the company, and wider disruptions caused by a nationwide pilot shortage, impacted local passengers.

Employees of this newspaper got stuck once in Portland thanks to a canceled flight, and were wary to count on SeaPort for some time until the company downsized and then rightsized its staff.

That single anecdote makes clear that one of the DOT's reasons for eliminating the subsidy — that too few passengers use the service — would most likely be moot with more dependable service.

The second reason to overturn the decision is that the cap on cost per passenger might be moot in and of itself.

The cap wouldn't be in play if Pendleton was more than 210 miles from Portland, and depending on your measurement technique, it just may be.

The transportation department pegs it at about 203 miles, but

that's measuring from the center of Pendleton to PDX airport property. If you measure from Pendleton terminal to Portland terminal, however, the distance edges just past the 210-mile mark.

But we shouldn't be arguing over inches when the real issues are much bigger.

Pendleton needs federal help to keep the service, and to continue to keep connections between rural and urban Oregon. There are also private sector possibilities for strengthening those connections, and strengthening the bottom line for taxpayers.

Wildhorse Casino and SeaPort should become stronger marketing partners. The trip to PDX needs to be financially competitive and competitive from an ease-of-use standpoint as well. SeaPort and the airport must keep up with changing travel habits and have an increased online presence.

We have been skeptical of continuing to funnel city money to the airport, which has provided Pendleton a low return on investment for decades.

But passenger services is absolutely necessary if the airport is going to be a factor going forward. Losing federal support for it would cause a collapse of local support and a harm to local businesses who depend on reliable air transport.

But perhaps more importantly it curbs future growth, and could keep future investors from even considering Pendleton in the first place. Reliable and viable transportation is necessary and essential.

We shouldn't be arguing over inches when the real issues are much bigger.

Unsigned editorials are the opinion of the East Oregonian editorial board of Publisher Kathryn Brown, Managing Editor Daniel Wattenburger, and Opinion Page Editor Tim Trainor. Other columns, letters and cartoons on this page express the opinions of the authors and not necessarily that of the East Oregonian.

OTHER VIEWS

Legislation rarely follows mass shootings

The Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle

It is taking on a life of its own, this horror known as "the mass shooting." How many of us, reeling from the massacre in Orlando, are left wondering if it is too late to stop this monster? It is too big. It is too contentious. It is too unpredictable.

It has a cold-blooded indifference for American lives, preying on innocent school children, ambitious college students and devout churchgoers. It slithers into movie theaters, holiday parties and gay nightclubs, piling up victims of all ages and ethnicities.

It feeds on prejudice, hate and hopelessness, and poisons us with prejudice, hate and hopelessness when it strikes. It breathes a dark cloud of fear, which has spread across our entire country. And, it has gained an imposing accomplice: the United States Congress.

The U.S. Senate and House of Representatives have given this beast the freedom it needs to expand its deadly quest. As a whole, our lawmakers have shown virtually no leadership in addressing this horror. In other countries, such as the U.K., Australia, Japan and Germany, the shock, grief and anger that follows mass shootings has resulted in very effective legislation to reduce it. Not in America.

Here, the legislators who could help reduce mass shootings hide behind the misrepresentation or misunderstanding of our constitutional rights. They are so afraid of upsetting powerful lobbyists, that they are failing to protect less mighty citizens. They fire off strong rhetoric as if

it has the force of a bullet, while refusing civil debate and productive compromise.

This lack of bravery in our nation's capital has left us with the feeling that there is nothing we can do but wait for the beast to strike again. So that is what we do.

We wait for 49 people to be killed at a nightclub in Florida. We wait for 9 people to die in a South Carolina church. We wait for 9 people to die at a community college in Oregon. We

wait for 14 people to be killed at a party in California.

We wait for 12 people to be killed in a Navy yard in Washington, D.C. We wait for 12 people to be killed at a Colorado theater. We wait for 27 people, most of whom are young children, to be killed in an elementary school in Connecticut.

We wait for 10 people, including a baby, to be killed during a shooting spree in Alabama. We wait for 13 people to be killed at an immigration center in Binghamton. We wait for 13 to be killed at an Army base in Texas. We wait for 32 college students to be killed in Virginia.

We all know that there are many parts to this beast, including guns, mental health, terrorism, bullying and prejudice. We are becoming increasingly divided over which part should be controlled, to the point where even simple conversations at the office or around the dinner table easily become heated.

Our leaders should be working together to examine the entire beast, and unite the nation around reasonable solutions.

While you are waiting for the next mass shooting, let Congress know it must act now.

It breathes a dark cloud of fear, which has spread across our entire country. And it has gained an imposing accomplice: the United States Congress.

OTHER VIEWS

SEE NO TRUMP

HEAR NO TRUMP

SPEAK NO TRUMP

VOTE FOR TRUMP



Ralph Reed, all in for Trump, urges Evangelicals to follow

As Ralph Reed, the longtime evangelical leader, sees it, Donald Trump did two smart things in his appearance before Reed's Faith & Freedom Coalition Road to Majority conference in Washington recently.

First, Trump showed up. "Showing up really matters, and we have not had, either at Faith & Freedom or my preceding work at Christian Coalition, a nominee show up, announced, with a full-dress speech, since George H.W. Bush in 1992," Reed told a small group of reporters after Trump's appearance. (Bob Dole did an unannounced drop-by in 1996, Reed said.)

Second, Trump hit the right notes, according to Reed, focusing on the issues that resonated with the activists in the audience: right to life, traditional marriage, religious freedom, support for Israel, opposition to the Iran nuclear deal.

Yes, Trump did indeed say all the right things. But Trump has often said the right things on Reed's issues. The bigger question is whether there is sufficient basis for conservative voters to believe him.

As an example, I asked Reed about Trump's list of possible Supreme Court justices. Most conservatives said it was a great list, of top-notch candidates. It's just that some of those same conservatives don't trust a President Trump to actually do what he says.

Reed's answer was both confident and nuanced. I trust him, Reed said — and by the way, what has trust gotten us in the past?

Reed explained that he met Trump in 2011 after he, Reed, saw Trump discuss abortion with Fox News' Bill O'Reilly. In a later interview with a religious blogger, Reed praised Trump's performance, and almost immediately after the post hit the internet, Reed's cellphone rang. It was Trump. Reed invited Trump to that year's Road to Majority gathering. Trump came, and the two have kept in touch ever since.

Based on that experience, Reed said he has faith in Trump to do what he says. "Trump and I developed a relationship," Reed said. "And when he says that's what he's going to do, based on my interaction with him, I don't really have any questions about whether or not he means it."

But that wasn't Reed's entire answer. "The other thing I would say is, compared to what?" he continued. "Compared to whom? Reagan, who told us those things, and then appointed Sandra Day O'Connor as his first nominee? More than George H.W. Bush, who appointed Souter? I mean who are we talking about?"

"By that argument, you would never be for any candidate," Reed concluded. "Because you would just cross your arms and say, 'I don't trust them.'"

Of course, that's exactly what some



BYRON YORK
Comment

evangelical leaders say about Trump. I asked Reed about one, the Southern Baptist Convention's Russell Moore, who has called Trump representative of the "reality television moral sewage coming through all over our culture." (Moore's shot earned a response from Trump calling Moore "truly a terrible representative of evangelicals" and "a nasty guy with no heart.") Is Moore wrong? I asked Reed.

"I have a great deal of respect for Russell, he's a good friend," Reed began. (Reed, who has been in evangelical politics for a long time, answers a lot of questions that way.) "I just think that it's a binary choice between one of two candidates,

Reed said he has faith in Trump to do what he says.

and given the fact that Hillary Clinton is not only advancing, but I would argue enthusiastically advancing, what we consider to be great moral evils — I just think you have to choose between these two candidates."

During his speech to the Road to Majority gathering a little earlier, Reed took an obvious shot at those faith leaders who can't accept Trump. Describing the extensive voter contact effort his group will launch this fall, Reed said no one should sit on the sidelines.

"There are some who counsel timidity and retreat," Reed said. "And they recommend that people of faith retreat to the cold comfort of a stained glass ghetto and decline to muddy our boots with the mire and the muck of politics. But that is not an option for followers of Christ. You see, we're called to put away our my-way-or-the-highway pride."

Reed stayed publicly neutral during the long Republican primary fight. But now he is touting plans for his group's biggest-ever voter turnout operation. The Faith & Freedom Coalition will distribute 35 million "nonpartisan" voter guides in 117,000 churches, Reed told the crowd. It will make 15 million phone calls. Send 20 million emails and texts to seven million evangelicals in the key swing states of Florida, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Colorado. Knock on a million doors in those states.

All on behalf of Donald Trump. After all, Trump showed up, which is more than a lot of presumptive nominees have done. In the years before a big race — 2007, 2011, 2015, the primary candidates fall all over themselves to speak before groups like Reed's. In the election year, after the nomination is in the bag — not so much. Trump, who after a miserable week mired in controversy over his attacks on the judge in the Trump University case, had reasons of his own for coming. But in return he got the message from Reed that there is at least one (large) part of the evangelical world that's on his side.

Byron York is chief political correspondent for *The Washington Examiner*.

YOUR VIEWS

CTUIR general council must meet about settlement fund

On January 22, a petition for a special meeting was properly filed by members of the General Council of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The GC members called for the special meeting to provide input and have a voice on how a multi-million dollar federal settlement fund will be used.

This petition process calling for a special meeting is authorized in our tribal Constitution. The elected General Council officers should have quickly scheduled and convened the meeting. However, they failed to do so, thereby denying the tribal electorate/constituency their Constitutional right to provide input on this important matter.

In late March, the BOT voted to apply the entire settlement fund to education, although they knew the petitioners and GC members were denied their right to have a voice and input on how the funds should be used.

As a grass-roots tribal member I was unaware of the petition until about three weeks ago. After I obtained a copy of the petition I met with General Council Chairman Alan Crawford and advised that the special meeting must be held. If the special meeting was never held there would be at least three

serious issues to deal with.

First, "the right of the people to peacefully assemble," which is protected in the Indian Civil Rights Act, would be violated. Second, by not holding the meeting the people's right to "free speech," also in the ICRA, would also be violated. Third, included in the oath of office for all elected BOT members and GC officers is the phrase "to uphold the Constitution." It is clear the oath of office would clearly be compromised, if not violated, if the petition is completely ignored and the special meeting never held.

The Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution is not applicable to the 565 federally recognized Indian tribes because of sovereignty. However, in 1968 Congress enacted the ICRA, which does apply to all federally recognized tribes. The ICRA is almost identical to the Bill of Rights as it protects the civil rights of its citizens.

The special meeting petitioned for will be held at 2 p.m. Wednesday, June 22 in the tribal governance center. All General Council members will then have the opportunity to discuss and provide input and recommendations on how the settlement funds should be used. Prior BOT decisions and resolutions can be modified and/or amended.

Bob Shippentower
Pendleton

LETTERS POLICY

The East Oregonian welcomes original letters of 400 words or less on public issues and public policies for publication in the newspaper and on our website. The newspaper reserves the right to withhold letters that address concerns about individual services and products or letters that infringe on the rights of private citizens. Submitted letters must be signed by the author and include the city of residence and a phone number. Send letters to 211 S.E. Byers Ave. Pendleton, OR 97801 or email editor@eastoregonian.com.