

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during examinations and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Ore. Subscription: \$5 per school year, \$2 per term.
BILL MAINWARING, Editor
MARCIA MAUNEY, Editorial Page Editor **CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Managing Editor** **DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.**
SALLY JO GREIG, SAM VAHEY, Associate Editors **CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor**
JACK WILSON, Sports Editor **GLEN GRAVES, Ass't. Adv. Mgr.** **CHARMION FORD, Office Manager**
EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Sally Jo Greig, Sam Vahey, Chuck Mitchelmore, Cornelia Fogle, Jack Wilson, Al Johnson

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of The Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.

KEN NIEHANS, Business Manager
DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor
CHARMION FORD, Office Manager

Race Clause in Tax Bill: More to Story

The living organization tax relief measure hit an unexpected snag in the old fraternity race clause at legislative committee hearings Wednesday — and the previously bright hopes for exemption from the personal property tax look a bit dimmer today. But that's not the whole story.

Members of the House Tax Committee, the group which has present life or death power over the measure, agreed after the hearings that racial discrimination "should not" be a main point in deciding the bill's fate. "We're just trying to show you college boys that civil rights mean more than just mouthing platitudes," the committee chairman told the Emerald.

So objection number one might have been sermonizing by the committee more than actual objection — it MIGHT have been. There is still the committee member (one of the sponsors of the relief bill) who thought that a rejection by the legislature of the houses' tax relief pleas would be a pressure point against national fraternity race clauses. So don't count out objection number one entirely.

Then there's the economic burden: does \$1.50 or \$3.00 per year (OSC and Oregon respectively according to the committee hearings testimony) constitute a financial burden on a student? Yes, it does, said a number of students. No, not especially —

it's a matter of principle, said others. Burden or not now, it may be one as property values rise when necessary added furnishing are purchased, the bill's supporters argued.

And the competition angle: maybe we should penalize you for the competition to state-operated dormitories which you people represent, said the committee. It's not competition, countered the administration officials — we need the housing space which these living organizations present. How much would it cost to put these people back in dorms, the committee asked? Multiply the number of students by \$4500, said Chancellor John Richards.

So these seem to be the big objections right now. The committee will vote next week. "It may be close," says the chairman. A "do pass" recommendation would practically insure the tax exemption. Otherwise, it's "do not pass" or kill in committee. The bill will probably be reported out with either do or do not pass recommendation because of the bill's easy passage through the senate. But it is by no means through the House yet.

A clause eliminating racially discriminatory groups from the benefits of the bill? "Possible, but not probable," says the chairman. So now it's do or do not pass — racial discrimination and competition vs. economic burden and principle. (C.H.M.)

No Need for Changes?

So the women dormitory leaders are either apathetic to the entire dorm rule controversy or completely satisfied with their living regulations. And without the Emerald's questioning of the situation, freshman women's feelings on the subject would never have been "stirred up." Only two women have so far submitted to the Dean of Women written complaints concerning the existing regulations. The Emerald staff was responsible for creating a temporary hub-bub over nothing.

This was the consensus of opinion expressed Wednesday at a freshman leaders meeting. Only one dorm representative expressed discontent with the rules. And how many expressed any opinion whatsoever? Very few.

Does this mean they are apathetic? Are they content to live within the restrictions of the Handbook for Dormitory Women? Are they convinced that the rules were designed to "develop maturity and responsibility in academic performance, personal behavior, and citizenship," which is the objective of these rules as stated winter term?

When the Emerald began its series of editorials and features on the subject more than a month ago we were very definitely aware of "widespread" discontent among the freshman women. We are still convinced that it exists. After seriously considering the matter we first questioned editorially the existing rules, later expressed our conviction that the women's discontent was justified.

For we were also aware of an obvious discrepancy between the existing rules and what we felt a working philosophy behind

such rules should be. The rules appeared to us then as they do now to be resting upon the assumption that freshman women at the University are unable to assume any individual or collective responsibility for managing successfully their dormitory living.

The freshman women were invited last term to present their criticisms to the office of the Dean of Women for consideration by Heads of Houses, the organization on our campus which we learned late last term has some authority in changing such regulations. No more than two freshman women have done so. Does this mean they are satisfied? Or could they possibly lack aggressiveness when criticism of the administration is involved? The latter, if true, is only natural.

The Emerald knows specifically of more than a hundred freshman women who have expressed their dissatisfaction with the rules in thoughtful and reasonable terms. But they have not had the courage to present their suggestions for change to the Office of Student Affairs. Why is this?

The Emerald also knows of several women who were either squelched or penalized for such efforts by officials before the invitation for criticism was announced at the end of winter term. Can we blame them for not wishing to be tagged "rabble-rousers" or "trouble-makers"?

But if they want something to be done, they will evidently have to express themselves. For our Office of Student Affairs has smugly concluded that this lack of expression from the freshmen indicates no need for any changes to be initiated from the top. (M.M.)

Sneaky Scholarship Chairman?



College Capers ...

From Coast to Coast

By JOANNE MORRISSEY
 Emerald Columnist

After a most enjoyable vacation marked by a period of extreme co-ordination in which I skated to my downfall and a sprained wrist, I've returned to the ranks of the Emerald.

This column was written as part of my recovery plan because my newspaper cohorts assured me that typing was the very cure I needed for my handicap since the muscles in my wrist would never improve without exercise. Therefore, without further ado, ...

Spring is just around the corner (sounds like a line of a familiar song—familiar before the era of "I'm All Shook Up" that is) and with spring and its open season on love and things, a rash of definitions of this glorious time bursts out.

A male reporter on the University of Washington Daily, lamenting the costs that the season put on him called it "the time that strikes women in the hearts and men in the pockets." (Oh well, it was a new twist anyway!)

Cascade College in Portland came up with a bit of poetic wisdom by an unknown author.

Who borrows all your ready cash?

Your Roommate.

Whose talk is senseless balderdash?

Your Roommate.

Who borrows all your notes and maps

And plans to give them back —perhaps?

Who gets you in the worstest scraps?

Your Roommate.

But who's a constant Pal to you?

Who overlooks the things you do?

Who knows and loves you through and through?

Your Mother.

Another thought for the day (does this remind you of grade school?) came from the North Carolina Daily Tarheel. "Comment on the flooding leak in the bookteria...I can't understand it. The good Lord promised never again to punish sin with water?"

Being poetic again (this modifier dangles no matter how I

try to correct it) brings me to the doggerel I found in a Chesterfield ad in the Michigan State News.

A thousand curses on that slim, incendiary she
 Who—calculating shrewdly—
 my combustibility—

Enflamed me with her eyes
 and let me burn so merrily
 That when the fire was out
 she'd made a perfect ash of me.

(Mighty subtle there, pardner!)

Guess what this ad was for. The headline was "Go, Van, Goh!" and it appeared in the University of Wisconsin Daily Cardinal. It said "Once when the world was really evil, and a thief lurked behind every bush, cautious men had their shirts painted on!"

The reason for this is explained by a perceptive saying of those days: "Forsooth, nothing deters those rascals about town. They'll steal anything that isn't buttoned down." (Are you still guessing—or have you already realized that nothing else but an ivy league shirt was the center of attention?)

Before I finish I must leave a parting thought. Buy school insurance. I've been paying for it for five years and at last I get to collect. (Oh testimonial!) Maybe you'll be lucky someday, too. I have spoken.

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

The fact that few suggestions for changes in rules were made by freshman women at a meeting staged by those charged with administering women's dormitories, as reported by the Emerald, deserves comment.

Apparently the dormitory administrators left feeling there was neither need for nor substantial desire for change outside of the Emerald's offices.

The fact that few changes were suggested may lead to either of two conclusions:

- 1) The rules are now perfect.
- 2) The freshman women involved are not ready to assist

(Continued on page three)