

No Major Alterations

Higher Education Subcommittee Exhibits Intelligence In Reconsidering Building Priorities Decision

The Oregon State Legislature was at it again last week. Unlike the righteous indignation over student pressure exhibited after the Emerald's April Fool's Day edition, the latest activities of the Joint Ways and Means Educational Sub-Committee are not the cause for a "laugh is on you" chuckle.

Basically, the problem is this: only \$10 million of the \$47 million State Board of Higher Education building program for 1963-65 can be obtained by financing through the state general fund. What is to be done about the rest? Must the 30,000 students at state system institutions suffer because of a lack of facilities? Or must they submit to a hodge-podge of schemes to limit enrollment, increase tuition, and diminish available funds for operational expenses? Clearly the Sub-Committee on Education is groping for solutions, but so far it has been unsuccessful.

Tentative action by the Sub-Committee, which would have altered the State Board of Education's capital construction priority list, was reconsidered. This was indeed encouraging—the Sub-Committee graciously decided not to substitute its judgment for that of the state board in an area which clearly falls into the defined, legitimate role of the board.

After meeting with the board Monday, the Sub-Committee decided not to make major changes in the priority list. Changes in the priority list could have resulted in inter-institutional competition and a breakdown in cooperation within the state system. In the long run, higher education would suffer because needs would be decided on a political and regional basis rather than on long range educational objectives.

They did, however, add three projects: land purchases, campus development at

Oregon Technical Institute and building renovation at Oregon College of Education. This rejuggled the priorities and pushed two University of Oregon projects, including the library and science addition, down on the priority list. Previously listed as seventh and ninth on the board's priority list, the two Oregon projects are now tenth and twelfth. This is, however, an improvement over the Sub-Committee's action last week which would have changed the library to fourteenth and moved up the science building. This would have cancelled the library project.

It is encouraging to see that the Sub-Committee has reconsidered its tentative plans. This would have brought back the days of fierce competition when the presidents of the University and Oregon State went to Salem to lobby for their individual programs.

Although the Sub-Committee has reconsidered the priority problem, we find disturbing its latest proposal to issue self-liquidating bonds for financing the building program. This proposal, tagged as the Corbett-Mosser plan, seems to be another stop-gap measure that fails to meet the long run need—the need for a broader revenue base for higher education. The bonds would be self-liquidating—in fact, they would be student-tuition liquidated. This can mean one of two things—less money to meet rising operational costs and therefore, a decrease in educational quality, or another round of tuition increases.

The future of higher education is grave. We are hopeful that this legislature will attempt to work out some long-range solutions to set guidelines for future growth. We believe that a legislature which has time for cat control bills and other hair-brained schemes should also have time to find means for a broader revenue base for higher education.

University Atmosphere is Changing

Student Endeavors on Up-Grade

The University of Oregon is a university with a changing face and a changing personality. The institution is growing in numbers of buildings and numbers of students. In terms of serious intent of scholastic endeavor, the University seems definitely on the up-grade.

- The Honors College has brought a new tone to scholarship in the last three years. The student leaders in Honors College have provided the opportunity for group discussion in the Honors College Lounge and have initiated weekly discussions on topics of campus-wide interest.

- The number of married students enrolled at the University has increased since the 1950's, after the tone for the attached student was set in the late 1940's by returning veterans. This has brought a feeling of stability and serious intent among some areas of student population because of the necessity of meeting family and academic obligations simultaneously.

- The number of graduate students has gradually increased in the last decade and a half, from 597 in 1949 to 1,583 in 1962. With a total University enrollment of around 10,000, the graduates have come to represent approximately 10 per cent of the student body.

- The augmented summer school program is also drawing more lower division

students who see the advantage of year-round class schedules and the opportunity for stronger academic concentration in particular areas of interest which cannot be accommodated in the usual nine month school year. The growing numbers of the summer enrollees indicates that intellectual endeavor is important to the general student.

Students in specialized categories are not the only ones increasing their numbers. The total University enrollment is up, to say the least. In the last 10 years the number of men coming here has been increased by nearly 95 per cent, and the number of women enrollees has increased by approximately 130 per cent. These figures represent trends of the changing University of Oregon may well be of interest to leaders in student government, who must see to the needs and interests of all portions of the campus population. University building, curriculum, and general service planners must also be cognizant of the total picture of the people with whom they will work. The public at large should also be encouraged by the nature and ambition of the people who are receiving education in part through public tax money. The view for the future seems just as bright as a University education becomes a valuable asset in a student's later life and proof of serious intent of his undertaking.



Mike Estey

We should seek what we need

ASUO Senator-at-Large Mike Estey was one of four senators who favored the general philosophy of the majority discipline report, but voted against a Senate motion to endorse it because of a disagreement on specific recommendations.

The only reason advanced thus far explaining the "weak majority endorsement" is that some senators haggled over specifics. It appears as if some senators do not truly represent their constituents—as it is obvious that a majority of the student body favors the majority report.

First, let it be understood that as far as the philosophy is concerned, the vote would be closer to 195. This is representative of student feeling. But it is the opinion of this senator that the students are tired of their Senate asking for consideration far beyond their needs—be it a budget request or a liberalization of discipline codes. It is time we sought what we actually need.

It is my contention, and it is shared by many of your other senators, that by displaying intelligence regarding our demands from "higher up"—they will, in a short while, come to trust and respect our judgment. When this happens the "higher-ups" will not have the feeling that they have a responsibility to protect us from ourselves.

The Senate is capable of handling this themselves. We are going to try. And it is when we reach this position in the eyes of the administration, that the Senate will be a tremendous asset to the students.

The relevance the discussion above has to the Majority Report is:

- 1) The committee that is to formulate the codes can actually only make use of the philosophy. At best, a couple of the specifics (revised) could be carried over.

- 2) The specific recommendations, therefore, serve no benefit except to clarify the idea behind the philosophy. This clarification is no longer needed. All it does is cause revisions, rejection (opinions, argument, stalemate—and we have the status quo.

The committee then concludes that the students had the right idea. But instead of taking "a step in the right direction," they let the idea "run away with them."

The end result: We get nowhere.

The Emerald publishes views of ASUO officers in column form as a public service. The views expressed by columnists do not necessarily represent those of The Emerald.

Letters to the Editor

Parliamentary Procedure Emerald Editor:

Concerning the ASUO Senate and their manner of handling problems and procedures, it appears quite evident that a good majority of the senators do not know parliamentary rulings to any useful extent.

Last Thursday evening there was too much time wasted in quibbling about which motions take preference, which require two-thirds majority to pass and which can be interrupted. Although there is no dire need for a course in parliamentary procedures (this would not do any of our senators much harm), there is a need for at least a single reference sheet illustrating the simple procedures on motions.

With a reference sheet before them, it would have been less
(Continued on page 3)

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published seven 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 opinions of the ASUO or the University.

EVERETTE DENNIS, Editor
LARRY WILLIAMS
Business Manager
JANET GOETZE, Managing Editor
RON COWAN, News Editor
DOUG RAGEN,
Editorial Page Editor
JIM SPEER,
Advertising Manager
DICK RICHARDSON,
Associate Editor
JIM FRAKE,
Assistant Managing Editor
RAY MAST, Sports Editor
CANDY HEMMING,
CATHY NEVILLE,
Assistant News Editors
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
CHUCK BEGGS, JOE BERGER,
PHYLLIS ELVING,
Associate News Editors
ALENE SHARFF
Entertainment Editor
JO GRISWOLD, Women's Editor