

Friday-at-Four?

\$1,000 for AWS!

Two ASUO senators, Larry Brice and Dick Allen, are meeting with AWS officers this week to go over the proposed 1958-59 AWS budget. The budget will be submitted to the Senate for approval next week. The budget asks for \$1010.50 to run the "legislative" function of AWS. This is a \$157.17 increase over last year's AWS budget of \$853.33.

A number of senators expressed concern in the last senate meeting over the AWS budget. Senator-at-large Bud Titus, for one, thought the \$290 total for state and national conventions was too costly, and that one convention (the state AWS convention, to be held on this campus next year) was enough for the year, instead of making an additional trip to Arizona State College at Tempe for the national convention, too. We agree with Titus.

Also questionable is the benefit derived from the AWS Apple Polishing Party, which requires \$65 out of the proposed budget. When asked how many students attended this year's party, new AWS president Barbara Pinkerton replied that she didn't know, but that 300-400 free cups of coffee were consumed. It is extremely doubtful that the freeloaders who attended the party were all desirous of "meeting their professors on an informal basis." If AWS wants an "Apple Polishing Party,"

they'd be doing the students (and the budget) a favor by cutting expenses considerably.

The whole question of AWS finances has been hassled over before. AWS considers itself a service to the University with its two functions: "legislative," and scholarship fund raising. In the past, the organization was criticized for using money supposedly attained for scholarships for AWS expenses. To remedy this, an AWS budget—with funds to be used for "legislative" expenses only—was set up within the ASUO budget in the hope of keeping these two functions financially separate.

This was undoubtedly a wise idea. But AWS has gone too far in asking \$1010.50 of the taxpayers' and students' money (male students as well as the females support the "for women only" organization through their student fees) to run its "legislative" process. The ASUO budget (excluding AWS requests) is only \$3104.84. It is doubtful indeed that AWS does one-third as much for students as does the ASUO.

Since AWS is strictly a women's organization, why wouldn't it be more justly financed by a per capita tax on the constituents of AWS' member organizations?

The Emerald suggests that the senate adopt a "get tough" policy with AWS and its budget requests. AWS simply doesn't do a thousands bucks worth of good.



James Marlow

Morse, Neuberger Praised For 'Interest Conflict' Stand

WASHINGTON (AP)—Now the toe-dance.

The House subcommittee investigating pressure on the Federal Communications Commission to grant TV licenses, moved like fire until it got one of the FCC commissioners, Richard A. Mack, to resign under threat of impeachment.

Its witnesses had all been non-congressional. But then one of them suggested the subcommittee call some senators who, according to the testimony, had intervened with the FCC in a TV license case.

Right there the subcommittee ducked behind closed doors. When the chairman—Rep. Harris (D-Ark.)—emerged, he said there was no plan to invite the senators to testify.

It's an old story. Members of Congress fall over backwards to avoid stepping on one another's toes. They are eager to investigate everyone but themselves.

The subcommittee's apparent reluctance to dig into the activities of senators—in connection with the FCC—reduces its whole investigation to a few simple questions:

Just how thorough an investigation does the subcommittee intend, or did it over intend? Are members of Congress a privileged class? Will it let its investigation fade away now that it has put the ax to Mack?

This subcommittee was supposed to investigate the big government regulatory agencies which made decisions involving millions of dollars. And maybe it will go on with its investigation.

But it can hardly claim to be making a thorough one if it treats members of Congress like sacred cows and backs away from asking them questions, no matter how innocent they are. All this opens up an old sore.

Members of Congress get outraged that FCC commissioners receive fees for making speeches. They insist that certain high

government officials—before they go to work for Uncle Sam—divest themselves of outside interests.

This is supposed to avoid a conflict of interests: meaning it will keep a government official from doing government business with a firm in which he has a financial interest.

But members of Congress can accept fees for speeches or articles they write. They can accept campaign contributions from groups which have a financial interest in legislation they want passed.

And members of Congress can have all the outside interests they can accumulate, such as oil, banks, law firms, railroads, or farm lands and even serve on committees handling legislation involving such interests.

And they don't have to divest themselves of anything. In fact, they can make speeches in favor of legislation—such as a farm bill—which may mean money in their pockets. Some members of Congress don't like this kind of setup.

For example: the two Democratic senators from Oregon, Morse and Neuberger. Morse last month, as he has before, called on Congress to pass a bill requiring not only all government employees but all members of Congress to reveal publicly any income they have above \$10,000 a year.

Morse never got to first base. Also last month Neuberger wrote a piece for the New York Times covering a number of the points raised in this story, along with others.

Noting that Congress appoints itself to scrutinize the "ethics and morals" of the executive branch of the government, he asked: "Who watches Congress with respect to conflict of interest? ... Who polices the policeman?"

And he said he feared there is a corroding effect on government when senators who "may be dabbling in oil, cotton futures, television, hotel chains or uranium" can order a high government official to get rid of his holdings.

Off-campus Housing?

Recently, the Administration clarified certain provisions in campus rules concerning off-campus housing for women. Unmarried undergraduate women, according to the code, are required to live either in the dormitories or in houses maintained by organized University living groups, such as sororities and cooperatives. Students living with relatives in Eugene and those working for room and board are the only exceptions allowed.

Why are these requirements set? Some observers of more liberal systems in operation on other campuses protest that more "mature" women should be allowed to live off-campus. We assume that this would mean women with upperclass standing or those whose chronological age is much higher than the average college student.

Other schools, some of them state-supported institutions, have no stated housing regulations for women students. However, these schools usually did not have a choice on whether or not to require women's residence. The quick growth of west coast colleges and universities strained housing facilities to the limit, and the construction of dormitories was not able to meet the demand for living space.

Such a situation is not likely on our campus. Long-range planning for the University shows adequate housing plans for the future enrollment.

The issue then evolves as to whether or not the regulations of University housing units should continue to be extended to all unmarried students, regardless of their individual "maturity."

Basically, women's regulations in upper-class dormitories are not unreasonable. There are always those who object to clos-

ing hours, and who protest that the set University hours (for meals, quiet hours, etc.) are not desirable for them as individuals.

And there are a number of University women who are sufficiently mature and responsible enough to live off-campus without abusing the privilege. However, the University's problems would only begin with the difficulties of ruling and determining which women would be allowed this privilege. With a women's attendance last year of 1,894 for regular sessions, the "sorting" problems would be enormous. Any standards set for such an evaluation would be discriminatory, by nature, and would place moral judgments in the hands of the administration of a state institution.

We can't get too excited over the cries for off-campus women's housing. In view of the current problems and conditions, the solution to women's housing has been, and in our view, will continue to be a satisfactory solution.

Of Sun and Spring

The Sun of Spring, in season transition, Now shining hot, now cool, in indecision, Beamed through a veil of early-morning vapor

And glorified the words of his term-paper.

This was a day for using all five senses; When need for six (or more) commences; The air was body-warm, and breezes fine Disturbed the pages of her college-outline.

A scent of blooms, and lawns, and pine-tree boughs

Excited squirrels into making loud carouse. Warbling birds and gnats alike were blessed, While he sat inside and graded tests.

A rhapsody of sound and scent and light Was playing Springtime's Hymn in chords so bright

That he, and her, and he, could not resist To look outside and sigh for what they'd missed.

"Boy, it's great to be alive in Spring!"

"(Sigh) Spring-time weather makes me sing!"

"This recalls a Spring-time verse I read." Don't be silly—you know what they said!

Oregon Daily Emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published four times in September and five days a week during the school year, except during examination and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per year, \$2 per term. 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.

ALLEN JOHNSON, Editor
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
WILLIAM COOK, Editorial Page Editor
PHIL HAGER, Managing Editor