

Lindauer defends allocations

To the Editor:

A reprint in a recent Anchorage newspaper of part of a Ket-chikan editorial commented on my direction of capital monies for use outside of District 10 (mid-town).

They implied I was either a fine fellow pursuing a good idea or I was considering a state-wide political race. I am happy to report that Messrs. Young and Stevens are safe, from me at least.

Last year the governor vetoed almost all human services projects. This year looked like a repeat unless someone was willing to dig in their heels and try to obtain the necessary changes. So I did.

I channelled capital monies to the 23 most worthy human-

services capital projects I could identify. Twenty of them are in Anchorage. They range from group homes and shelters for the blind, children, and handicapped to matching funds for the museum and visual arts center.

The needs are real and these private non-profit organizations provide services at a fraction of the cost of having government do it. Moreover, the projects are relatively small so that they will be built by Alaskan contractors instead of big builders from outside.

Most of my money went to Anchorage because we are the center of human services for the entire state. Even so, the reality of our time is that some of Alaska's most glaring unmet human

service needs are outside Anchorage.

The Cordova Hospital and the CHILD Home are good examples. Both face immediate closure due to their dilapidated condition.

The injured, ill, and severely disabled may not vote but they sure are Alaskans, and more important than the outsiders who are getting rich off our big construction projects and state contracts.

You are right, of course, that the current capital appropriation system needs to be changed. Alaska and our people and the wise use of our monies need to be put first.

Sincerely,

John Lindauer

State Representative

Judiciary tries to cast off blame

To the Editor:

The people are aware of the need for open choice elections of our judiciary. Will it take a loss of permanent fund dividends to compensate Hansen victims to make us all demand American elections?

Our appointed judiciary claims it needs independence from the people (society) in case there is difficult decision to make, but then that independence extends to all their other decisions as well, Hansen cases for example.

Some of our independent judiciary seemed to be attempting to throw a guilt trip upon society, possibly to cover appointed irresponsibility. One ju-

dicial officer in justifying soft handling of rape and kidnapping said, "Public opinion of the time." Another one said as he sentenced Hansen, "I can't think of a bigger indictment of society..."

The people must not accept guilt or compensate Hansen victims for the independent judiciary. If society accepts guilt and punishment for the independent judiciary, it will only encourage judicial ineptness and criminal expansion.

For society to be responsible for the judiciary it must have a judiciary that can be held responsible to the laws of society through open choice elections.

"Public opinion" of consequence to an elected judiciary would be expressed in legislative law and enforced through open elections.

Leonard E. Moffitt