

Editorial E COOSH EEWA:

(The way it is)



Just trying to be fair

Legislature '79

Well, it's happened again. We just received an unsigned letter to the editor that would probably have been interesting to our readers. But because it was not signed, we stapled it to the envelope and stuck it in the file of letters we can't print.

It was tempting to bend our policy a bit and go ahead and print the unsigned letter, anyway. It was in response to Lewis Pitt's letter about Kah-Nee-Ta renovation. The trouble is that most unsigned letters lack the responsibility that generally accompanies a signature. Some take the form of personal attacks and contain slanderous statements. Others are peppered with foul language and comments inappropriate for a family newspaper.

Most people write responsibly and aren't afraid to attach their names to their letters. It wouldn't be fair to this majority if we welched on our policy now. It's too bad because this letter was a good one and there is no reason the author should be ashamed of it. Maybe the writer was not aware of our policy and will send us another one, signed.

We appreciate the caliber of letters we've been receiving and printing in the *Spilyay*. It makes us feel like somebody out there cares about what's going on when we open a letter to the editor. And it makes us feel good when people respond to something they've read in our paper. It makes it all worthwhile for us.

Atiyeh brings new attitude to Salem

(Editor's note: This is the fifth in a five-part series in which our State Senator, Ken Jernstedt of Hood River, analyzes the major action of the 1979 Legislature. In the fifth installment, Jernstedt explains the State Government under the Atiyeh Administration.)

by Ken Jernstedt
State Senator

Governor Vic Atiyeh brought more to Salem than a new administration.

He also brought a new attitude—or at least an attitude that had been forgotten in Salem in recent years.

Atiyeh brought the attitude that tax relief should be the first priority, and that it should be

achieved by putting the brakes on runaway state spending.

Any of the past three sessions would have denounced the Atiyeh approach as irresponsible.

But these aren't normal times. They ceased to be normal when a quarter-million Oregonians said "enough is enough" by signing a tax limitation petition.

Such a massive outpouring of support couldn't be ignored by anyone—not even by the hard-of-hearing liberal element in the Oregon Legislature.

The result was more born-again conservatives that we've seen in a number of years—and the tightest state budget we've seen since 1971.

Spending slowed

Those of us who have been fruitlessly urging government belt-tightening finally found enough philosophical friends to do something more than talk about it.

The combination of Atiyeh's attitude and the retreat of liberals produced a fiscally conservative session, with nearly half of state revenues coming right off the top for tax relief and state aid to local schools.

To do this state government growth has been drastically curtailed.

In the past six years, state spending more than doubled. Worse yet, it far outstripped the rate of inflation and



Senator Ken Jernstedt

economic growth.

Under the new budget, however, general state spending will increase at less than half the pace of inflation.

This will be a refreshing contrast to most government units, which use the rate of inflation as an excuse to automatically increase spending.

In charting this course, Atiyeh said he believes government should do only those things the people are unable to do for themselves, and it should do them as efficiently and economically as possible.

The Legislature, in embracing his philosophy, emphasized that all legitimate state needs can be met within

(Continued on page 12)

Letters to the Editor

Meet housing needs here first

To the editor:

I feel it is my responsibility as a member of this tribe to express my thoughts in response to a recent article you printed in the *Spilyay Tymoo* regarding the purchase of farmland, which is known as the Vanora townsite.

It is stated that this land was sold for \$471,200 to the Tribe, with a downpayment of \$100,000 being paid to the former owners. WHY?—I ask why should \$471,200 be invested in purchasing land off the Reservation for (quote) "future projects such as housing" (unquote) when the housing needs haven't been met here on the Reservation for Tribal members.

This article also stated that there may also be some back taxes to be paid by the Tribe. If there are back taxes, how much money are we really investing in this land? I say we because it is Tribal funds that are being used to purchase this land. Also with such a large amount of money being used to purchase this land—when do Tribal members get to express their agreement or disagreement on such an investment? In any case, it appears that it is too late now, since the purchase has already been agreed upon. But let's start taking care of business in our own back yard and start investing money in developing the Reservation where a majority of tribal members have expressed their

desire to live. And let's replenish the resources which were utilized to gain these funds.

It is also stated that this land is "Geographically" related more closely to Warm Springs than Madras. Is this supposed to be some type of justification in the purchase of the land? Simnasho, Miller Flat, Webster Flat, Seekseequa, Dry Creek, etc. are also "Geographically" related to Warm Springs.

I feel at this point I need not say more, but I can't help express my concern for developing and meeting the needs HERE ON THE RESERVATION FIRST.

Sincerely,

Theresa M. Katchia

Let's plan first, build later

To the people:

Concerning the 6.6 million dollar housing package coming to a referendum vote November 15, it is not only "ambitious" but to me seems premature. The planning department is presently doing a survey on the housing needs and, as stated in the Tribal Newsletter, "...is proving to be quite a help in determining our reservation's housing needs.

If it has such an impact when only partially complete, why can't we wait and analyze the total impact of a completed survey? The newsletter also states, "...The total housing survey package is due for completion by the end of 1979."

But the present push is to have us tribal stockholders approve \$6.6 million before the community's housing needs can be collected, analyzed and summarized. I also view housing as the most pressing priority today. But just naming the amount of money and the quantity of structures that sum can build—and then looking for the people to fit them—does not make much business sense.

Past planned housing construction has always puzzled me in its absence of Indian labor, including the lack of on-the-job training for valuable construction skills, the low degree of quality of the construction work, materials used, and the house design. Our present houses are not going to last forever, renovation will be needed. So why can't it be done by Indians we helped train? Puzzling or not, I now see a move to ignore the planning department's completed survey almost entirely.

Is this the order of business on the reservation—to put out money now, and later find out what we want it for specifically? If the planning department is doing its job we should use it. But if we fail to use them I question even having the money budgeted to them for the upcoming year.

They are our planners, planning for the community's every need, and more so. As representatives of what we people want and need, they can only be effective if they represent us people. If they are going to be ignored we will also

be ignored, as the survey on housing is one of our avenues to plan housing growth.

We voters have this referendum vote to think about. As business people, would it be smart to pass the 6.6 million dollars before we are assured that any Indian who wants the job training can get it? Before we have a realistic knowledge of what the community needs and wants concerning housing, can we afford to decide about a multi-million dollar project like this before the facts are in?

The housing survey will be completed by the end of 1979, giving us more time to make an informed, intelligent decision by a called referendum, knowing what we need and want.

In Christ,
Lewis E. Pitt, Jr.

P.S. It's not only a privilege and a right to vote, it is your responsibility. You have the power to vote No as well as Yes. If you feel a No vote might offend somebody, just remember that it's your money that pays the bills.

Tribal Council Agenda

November 5 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 10:00 a.m. Report on Northend Horse Roundup-Clint Jacks.
2. 2:00 p.m. Education Needs Assessment-Jody Calica/Mike Clements

November 6 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 10:00 a.m. Sr. Citizen Home Remodelling Program
2. 2:00 p.m.
3. 3:00 p.m. Review for General Council General Council-Housing/Adoption Referendums; Street Naming
- Dinner—6:00 p.m.
- Meeting—7:00 p.m.

November 12 Holiday

November 13 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 10:00 a.m. Realty
2. 2:00 p.m. 1979/1980 Bonus Dividend
3. 4:00 p.m. OEDP-Ray Rangila

November 15 HOUSING AND ADOPTION REFERENDUM

November 16 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 9:30 a.m. Referendum results
2. 10:00 a.m. PP & L
3. 2:00 p.m. Court Task Force Recommendations

November 19 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 10:00 a.m. 509-J Report-Darrell Wright, Superintendent
2. 1:30 p.m. Enrollments/Enrollment Procedures

November 20 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 10:00 a.m. Law Enforcement Task Force
2. 1:30 p.m. Census Bureau-Alice Solomon, Seattle
3. 3:00 p.m. Review for General Council General Council-1980 Budget
- Dinner—6:00 p.m.
- Meeting—7:00 p.m.

November 26 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 9:30 a.m. Tribal Council Priorities
2. 1:30 p.m. Committee Task Force Recommendations

November 27 Tribal Council Meeting, 9:30 a.m.

1. 10:00 a.m. Progress Report/Necessary Action-Powerhouse Generator
2. 2:00 p.m. Management Reports