

Salem Scene

by Jack Zimmerman

56TH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY CONFOUNDS THE PROGNOSTICATORS

What kind of a session is the 1971 meeting of the 56th Legislative Assembly? With only six weeks of the session completed, it's pretty early to characterize and categorize. Nevertheless, speculation and conjecture are part of the "scene" at Salem.

Pre-session guesstimates went something like this: There will be a record number of bills. The session will be a long one, possibly a record-setter. No new tax programs will evolve to provide long-sought property tax relief. The environment and consumer movements will occupy the bulk of news space and time devoted to the session. And a sagging economy—coupled with a lack of carry-over surplus from the last biennium, will produce an austerity budget for all concerned.

Whether or not these predictions come true, Oregon lawmakers already have upset the

prognosticators. Prior to January 11, for instance, who was predicting Portland's John Burns would emerge as Senate President?

And despite repeated pledges to the contrary, House Republicans have submitted a proposal that would provide property tax relief to senior citizens, all homeowners generally and a bonus for those who make improvements to their homes.

Although some might argue whether the property tax relief package involves new taxation, cigarette smokers likely will pay an extra nickel-a-pack to support their habit if the GOP program prevails.

Meanwhile, it appears the number of bills introduced could set a record at the Statehouse. A third of the way into the session lawmakers have introduced two-thirds of the total number of bills introduced in 1969. Some observers predict total bills will come close to 2,000 to this session—compared with 1,554 in '69.

Length of session is up for

grabs. After a two-week Senate organizational delay, Ways & Means is really just beginning the struggle of balancing the budget. It still looks like an austerity instrument. But revenue estimates by gubernatorial advisors are holding up so far and there's a faint note of optimism among those who determine how the state will spend its money.

With the economy still sluggish, however, the session's length (always dependent upon Ways & Means deliberations) probably won't be estimated accurately until State Income Taxes are collected and added up some time after April 15.

When it comes to the environment and consumer movements, total numbers of bills regarding these subjects so far are misleading. Quite a number of bills involving both subjects have been introduced and more will follow. But quantity doesn't always portend quality legislation.

Fully half the bills introduced each session of the Oregon Legislature never get out of committee. And the most substantial changes in state law likely could evolve from a mere handful of bills.

There are these types of "substantive" bills in abundance this session because of unprecedented interim committee activity. One such bill is SB 40, which would revise the Oregon Criminal Code. Another is SB 20, revising statewide election laws.

On the environmental and consumer "fronts," the action is interesting from two particular standpoints. First, there is a scramble of sorts by Legislators to be associated with these popular causes. And,

second, there's a whole new lobby on the job in behalf of both drawn largely from the ranks of housewives and students.

The popularity scramble so far has produced some expected confusion. Duplicating measures are commonplace. The Attorney General and consumer interests have competition. Deceptive Trade Practices Acts, for instance. Consumer protection advocates have introduced a batch of bills, each aimed at righting a specific single alleged wrongful practice. Business, on the other hand, has countered with one comprehensive measure that would cure most of the ills and still make it attractive for merchants to keep their doors open.

Environmental bills are more complicated. Attracting most of the public attention will be anti-litter bills involving taxes or deposits on beverage bottles and cans and shipping containers. Less glamorous environmental bills involve strong new powers for enforcement of existing anti-pollution laws and placing the state's environmental watchdogs on an expanded, fulltime paid basis.

So far most of the big headlines have concentrated on granting 18-year-olds the right to vote, control of explosives, field burning and disposition of Camp Adair.

Warming up are reapportionment, governmental reorganization and problems of local government.

February's a lousy time to guess what the Oregon Legislature will be doing in May. But by May it should be relatively simple to talk about what will happen in June.

Advertising in The Mill City Enterprise Brings Results—Try It Every Week



Look At THE ENTERPRISE CLASSIFIEDS

TURN YOUR TRASH INTO CASH
List Your FOR SALE Items In The Enterprise Classified Section for Quick Low - Cost Results.
Now Is The Time To Clean Out The Attic, Garage and Closets.

The Mill City Enterprise
Phone 897-2772 Mill City

Notice Of School Budget Hearing

NOTICE is hereby given that a meeting of the governing body of Linn-Benton I.E.D. School District of Linn-Benton County, State of Oregon, will be held at I.E.D. Office on the 8th day of March, 1971 at 8 p. m. o'clock for the purpose of discussing with interested persons the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971 and ending June 30, 1972, hereinafter set forth.

The budget was prepared on a basis of accounting consistent with that used in the preceding year. Major accounting changes, if any, and their effect on the budget are set forth in an accompanying statement.

A copy of the budget document is available for inspection at I.E.D. Office between the hours of 8:30 p. m. and 5 p. m. The budget document may be obtained for \$1.00, or parts of it may be obtained for 10c per sheet.

Signed: E. W. POLAND,
District School Board Chairman

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

For the Ensuing Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 1971

TAX LEVY COMPUTATION (1)	General IED Office (2)	Contracted Services (3)	IED Equal Levy (4)
Total Budget Requirements	\$ 363,460.00	\$ 214,000.00	\$ 7,659,777.00
Deduct Total Budget Resources Except Tax To Be Levied	60,000.00	214,000.00	
Revenue Necessary To Balance Budget	303,460.00		7,859,777.00
Add Est. of Taxes To Be Levied But Not Rec'd in Ensuing Year			
Taxes To Be Levied for Ensuing Year	303,460.00		7,859,777.00
Analysis of Taxes To Be Levied			
Within 6% Limitation	303,460.00		2,850,339.00
Outside 6% Limitation			4,809,077.91
Not Subject To 6% Limitation			
TOTAL TAXES TO BE LEVIED	\$ 303,460.00	\$	\$ 7,659,316.91

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

For the Current Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 1970

TAX LEVY COMPUTATION (1)	General IED Office (2)	Contracted Services (3)	IED Equal Levy (4)
Total Budget Requirements	\$ 344,646.00	\$ 160,500.00	\$ 6,385,196.31
Deduct Total Budget Resources Except Tax To Be Levied	40,000.00	160,500.00	
Revenue Necessary To Balance Budget	304,646.00		6,385,196.31
Add Est. of Taxes To Be Levied But Not Rec'd in Ensuing Year			
Taxes To Be Levied for Ensuing Year	304,646.00		6,385,196.31
Analysis of Taxes To Be Levied			
Within 6% Limitation	304,646.00		2,670,636.20
Outside 6% Limitation			3,714,560.31
Not Subject To 6% Limitation			
TOTAL TAXES TO BE LEVIED	\$ 304,646.00	\$	\$ 6,385,196.31

Approved by Budget Committee Feb. 11, 1971
Signed: ORVAL JESS, Secretary
NORMAN MORGAN, Chairman

LINN-BENTON COUNTY I.E.D. BOARD BUDGET SUMMARY

GENERAL FUND

Actual 1968-69	Actual 1969-70	1970-71 Budget	Proposed 1971-72
\$ 69,556.39	\$ 70,722.32	\$ 75,717.00	\$ 90,283.80
47,976.96	52,505.95	52,977.00	68,484.30
21,579.43	18,216.37	22,740.00	21,799.50
\$ 73,896.02	\$ 88,005.20	\$ 108,288.00	\$ 118,948.44
60,180.13	76,358.79	78,888.00	88,848.44
13,715.89	11,648.41	29,400.00	30,100.00
\$ 57,342.11	\$ 73,798.03	\$ 80,766.00	\$ 77,227.85
22,776.49	30,505.95	33,266.00	31,227.85
34,565.62	43,292.08	47,500.00	46,000.00
\$ 15,004.59	\$ 21,311.80	\$ 16,975.00	\$ 17,000.00
\$ 22,129.89	\$ 25,964.26	\$ 27,800.00	\$ 24,900.00
\$	\$	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00
\$ 1,595.00	\$ 5,307.38	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
\$239,324.00	\$285,108.99	\$329,646.00	\$348,460.09
		\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
\$239,524.00	\$285,108.99	\$344,646.00	\$363,460.09

OTHER FUNDS

Actual 1968-69	Actual 1969-70	1970-71 Budget	Proposed 1971-72
\$ 41,289.82	\$ 42,930.94	\$103,000.00	\$116,000.00
\$ 46,341.24	\$ 52,250.23	\$103,000.00	\$116,000.00
\$ 333.00	\$ 18,850.00	\$	\$ 6,000.00
18,460.10	21,265.20	26,500.00	26,000.00
21,405.66	39,399.50	26,500.00	32,000.00
\$ 12,500.41	\$ 14,650.04	\$15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
)	15,432.05	5,600.00	5,600.00
2,073.79)	5,000.00	5,000.00
13,675.85)	4,400.00	4,400.00
\$ 15,750.23	\$ 15,043.97	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 19,000.00
\$ 15,608.00	\$ 14,899.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 18,000.00
145.00	130.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
\$ 99,249.54	\$112,740.15	\$160,500.00	\$214,000.00
	(\$ 989.22)		
	\$111,750.93		

Actual 1968-69	Actual 1969-70	1970-71 Budget	Proposed 1971-72
\$ 58,840.38	\$ 61,875.51	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 56,000.00
972.92	1,921.42	4,000.00	4,000.00
59,813.30	\$ 63,796.93	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 60,000.00
		\$304,646.00	\$303,460.09
		\$344,646.00	\$363,460.09

I. E. D. EQUALIZATION FUND	
RESOURCES	
Delinquent Taxes	\$
Current Levy (1971-72)	
student ADM @ 273.06	\$7,659,416.91
28,049.9	
Less Tax Base	\$2,850,339.00
Levy Outside 6%	\$4,809,077.91
TOTAL RESOURCES	\$7,659,416.91
EXPENDITURES	
For Purpose of the Fund	
per ORS 334.260	\$7,659,416.91
Over 6% — \$4.078 per 1000 T.C.V.	