

Sealaska meeting in Seattle too costly

To the Editor:

By the present decision of the Board of Directors of Sealaska Corporation regarding the annual meeting to be held in Seattle on May 22, 1982, this letter is being written.

We feel that the board's decision will prove to be very costly and most certainly will not involve as many shareholders as if it were to be held in Alaska. The Board of Directors has received numerous correspondence in opposition to the Seattle meeting and yet they stand firm on their

decision. Don't we have a voice at all? Petitions are being circulated opposing any such meeting outside of Alaska. We, as shareholders, have the inherent right to oppose and invalidate that meeting.

Because the Board chooses not to adhere to the shareholders' wishes, and the Seattle meeting is being allowed, where will their next selection be? Las Vegas? Honolulu? Their actions point in this direction.

We feel that the only alternative the concerned shareholders have to express their

opposition, is to boycott the annual meeting in Seattle. We urge all Sealaska Shareholders not to send in any proxies, whether it be management or otherwise, to prevent a quorum at their meeting.

Sincerely,

Eleanor David
1800 Northwood Dr. No.C-18
Juneau, Alaska 99803
Carl C. Nelson
P.O. Box 1113
Juneau, Alaska 99802
Fred Morgan
7337 N. Douglas Rd.
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Utilidor isn't what it's cracked up to be

To the Editor:

I must challenge some of the statistics in your Feb. 24 issue on Phase One construction of the utilidor project in Barrow, Alaska.

The quality control engineer quoted that the monitors have not shown more than a hundredth of a degree change in any direction. I question this statement; the test utilidor section was installed during spring break-up. They were required to run pumps the majority of the time to keep the utilidor tunnel from partially freezing. I wonder what the moisture retention was.

Frank Moolin talks about

this fabulous water and sewage system, but they neglect to ask how the average Barrow homeowner will afford the hook-ups and necessary facilities. Eighty percent of the Barrow homes have neither running water or any kind of plumbing.

The article speaks of the strong utilidors with six inch walls. The author of the article and the quality control engineer must never have visited the utilidor project warehouse. A close inspection will show remnants of utilidor sections that were broken during transit in and out of the fabrication shop.

Should the reader be in-

terested about the King-Kong chain saw, there are 28 throughout the world and not seven. A phone call to Bor Tun, Inc., the manufacturers of the rock saw will verify the true statistics.

Finally, has the quality control engineer considered the fire hazard the penta-oil preservative treated wood all utilidor sections are constructed of presents?

Yours truly,
Edward Brower
Barrow

Editor's note: Mr. Brower is referring to the Feb. 24 article in the North Slope Borough Newsletter which is produced by the North Slope Borough.

Elected judges better than appointed

To the Editor:

Of all cases that people can afford to take to the Supreme Court, a Senator said 50 percent are reversed. This seems to point to "make work," "reason backwards," and conflict of interest decisions from appointed attorney lower court judges. Open election of common sense judges should save

the people and the state millions of dollars thru renewed faith in lower court decisions and cut the reversal rate to well under ten percent.

A recent example that made news, of appointed attorney judges seemingly issuing "make work" decisions is in the Dennison (Driving While Intoxicated) case, which, after

passing thru two lower courts, was returned for re-trial from a Supreme Court citing rules of evidence.

This four or more court case must have cost the state and/or Dennison in the area of \$100,000 because appointed judges possibly chose to ignore or overlooked common
(Continued on Page Eleven)

People should demand elected judges

(Continued from Page Ten)

sense rules of evidence.

A comparison of the above with Senator Holman's predicament seems in order. Holman may have ignored or misunderstood the rules of persuasion. In the Dennison DWI case the lower court judges did ignore or did misunderstand the rules of evidence. Holman — victims, none.

Judges — victims, Dennison and our state, Holman — disgraced etc. Judges — no disgrace and no punishment. The present appointed judicial system, it seems, should have disqualified itself from the Holman case because of possible moral conflict.

All legislators are aware of the above but input from the people seems necessary to en-

courage them to help clear our state's conscience by providing for open election of all judges before coming home.

Leonard E. Moffitt
Palmer

