

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. Opinions expressed in signed columns are those of the writer.

LOUIE ABRAMSON
Business Manager
MAXINE ELLIOTT
News Editor

CHUCK BEGGS, Editor
BOB CARL
Managing Editor
PHIL SEMAS
Associate Editor

WILBUR BISHOP, JR.
Advertising Manager
ALLEN BAILEY
Associate Editor

Page 6

University of Oregon, Eugene, Friday, January 7, 1966

Unfair Taxation

Freshman Dance Tax' Objections Are Valid

Even traditions are bound to change from time to time. This is especially true on college campuses, where each new student generation concerns itself with different interests. What was "in" on campus during the 1930's is often unheard of today, and vice versa.

Another example of this trend away from the legacies of the past was evident at the University earlier this week, when the Freshman Class Dormitory Council attempted to levy a 50 cent tax on all freshman dormitory residents to pay for the Frosh Snoball, annual class dance.

The same thing was tried last year and drew angry protests from certain dorm groups that they were being unfairly taxed. It's happened again this year, and we agree with the protesters.

To begin with, the Council has no official power to levy any such "tax" upon a group of students, since it was created purely for discussion of problems pertaining to the dormitories and their residents. The group is not officially recognized by the University.

Moreover, the tax is eminently unfair because it excludes nearly 30 per cent of the freshmen, those who live in co-operative houses or with their parents in Eugene. The dormitory residents shouldn't have to finance a dance that can be attended free by those students who don't happen to live on campus.

Hal Kingslien, president of DeCou Hall and leader of this year's opposition, said that he had suggested selling tickets to the dance but was told that, because of lack of interest, the dance would lose money by this method.

What, then, is the need for having a dance at all? Or at least a dance financed by

all dorm residents for only those interested?

Last year the tax, then at 55 cents, was imposed after the dance was held at a cost of \$900. This was obviously shabby planning since the event's organizers had gone ahead with their plans without worrying about how to pay their bills until after the money was spent. This year's planners admit to lack of interest but still apparently feel they must have a dance.

The whole point to this is that each dormitory's social fee is its own use as its residents see fit. The students of a given living unit contributed to the fund and they should decide how it is to be used, whether for a dance, a party, or a scholarship fund. Mrs. Marge Ramey, freshman class advisor, drew a poor analogy when she compared the dance tax to the taxes paid by private citizens to support projects of their various governments. Everybody pays government taxes and, theoretically, everyone is entitled to share in the benefits accrued therefrom. Everyone would not pay the dance tax and, although all freshmen could theoretically attend the dance, compulsory support of social functions is hardly comparable to public services supported by government.

Those dormitory residents who want to have a dance could easily contribute their social fee to the financing of same. Those who don't could choose to use their money in other ways, such as to support a publication, contributing to charity, or to establish a scholarship fund. The social fee has been used in all of these ways in the past with success.

It is clear that many students don't revere traditions such as the Snoball, and choose to channel their money into other areas. There is little sense in keeping a tradition simply for the sake of tradition.

Other Editors Say

No Demonstrations

From the Redlands (Calif.) Bulldog

At Wayne State University an anti-draft teach-in examined the history and operation of the draft with emphasis on how students could avoid it.

At the University of Wisconsin the "Student-Faculty Committee to End the War in Viet Nam" has lined up 100 students who will attempt to be arrested for sitting in on the runways of Truax Field (a base for the state Air National Guard).

At Redlands—nothing. Last week the L.A. Times had an article on student demonstrations.

In it Redlands was mentioned as one of the only two schools in Southern California which

failed to have Viet Nam demonstrations in recent weeks.

We haven't figured out yet if this is supposed to be good or bad.

Most of the students at other schools (who constitute the famous committed, activist generation) no doubt regard us as apathetic and unconcerned—reminiscent of the goldfish swallowing generation of the '50's.

A majority of the older generation view us as patriotic Americans.

The problem is now that we're not even pro-American. We have relinquished our positions to the Hell's Angels—for they believe that "America should be for Americans and those who don't like it should get the hell out."

Because the editorial board is charged with giving dynamic leadership to the student body, we have given some thought to ways in which the UR can prove it is truly committed.

We have narrowed the proposals down to two. After rejecting sit-ins, teach-ins, and think-ins, we arrived at an idea we think may work at the UR: a "bitch-in."

The bitch-in originated at Colorado and is patterned after a teach-in. Each student who attends will have the opportunity to speak for five minutes on

(Continued on page 7)

Why Hide Hotel Loss

From the Ohio Wesleyan Transcript

Ohio Wesleyan University's recent approval of voluntary chapel attendance shows an increased respect for the maturity of OWU students.

However, it was demonstrated last week that this attitude has not entered all areas of the University's dealings with students. Robert W. Meyer, vice-president for business affairs, refused to release information on the financial loss the University is taking in housing 34 freshmen in Delaware Inn. Meyer said, "I don't think this is the business of kids."

The implication that college "kids" are unfit to know how much of their continually rising tuition is being spent in this area is an insulting one. Students, especially those operating on marginal budgets, have a right to know just what they're paying for.

The loss the University is incurring is probably not overwhelming and, in view of the men's housing shortage, is unavoidable. Certainly the loss cannot be so great that revealing its amount would discredit the University more than trying to hide it. (ACP)

Bob Carl

New Oregon Resident Can Now Visit Parents

Talking with a student the other day, I learned that he had gotten the opportunity to visit his home in another state for the first time in several years—three to be exact.

He said that he had really enjoyed seeing his family and noted that he had been looking forward to going home for a long time. However, this Christmas vacation was the first time he was allowed to visit his family since his second year at the University.

Didn't he have enough money to travel the almost 1,200 miles to his parents' home? Or was it just that his family didn't want to see him? Maybe he had to work and couldn't get any time off for a vacation?

The answer to all of these questions is the same: NO!

The simple fact is that this student, though his family resides in southern California, wishes to make his home in Oregon after he graduates; so he has been attempting to obtain residency in Oregon.

NOW HE CAN VISIT FOLKS

Last fall term his request for residency was granted. So, now he can visit his parents.

Before last fall term he couldn't afford to visit them because then his request for residency in this state would have been denied. It seems that if a student travels outside the state of Oregon—especially to visit his parents for a few weeks—he jeopardizes his chances for getting Oregon resident status.

However, it does seem just a bit ironical that this student, while he was officially a California resident, could not take the chance of visiting his family, and now that he is a resident of Oregon he gets the opportunity—for the first time in years—to see his folks.

Of course, obtaining residency for this student wasn't easy, even though he tried everything. He registered to vote in Oregon; he obtained an Oregon driver's license; he bought a car in Oregon; he paid his state income tax; he listed his permanent resident as being in Eugene; he was entirely self-supporting.

TWO YEARS TO GET RESIDENCY

And despite all of this, it took him more than two years to obtain residency in the state.

On top of the above measures that he took, he was refused the opportunity to visit his family. (Right on the form that an applicant for residence has to fill out, there is a place to report if you have been out of state in the last year, and why.)

Certainly this student may have had ulterior motives for desiring residency in Oregon—that \$300 per term out-of-state tuition is pretty steep. However, I think it is time for Oregonians to realize that many non-resident students will make their homes in Oregon after they graduate. Surely, the state will benefit from such an influx of college graduates in the long run. Yet it is like pulling teeth for a student to obtain residency in this state—unless he happens to own some real estate in Oregon.

And I wonder how many students—especially those out-of-state students who have to pay one of the highest tuition rates for a public institution in the country—can afford to purchase property in Oregon.

The above case is just one of hundreds. I know of many other students who fully intend to make their homes in Oregon after they finish their education; yet the way they are treated when they attempt to establish residency, it seems that many students might get disgruntled and decide to go elsewhere after they graduate; rather than go through all of the rigamarole in this state.

SOME IMPROVEMENTS LATELY

Supposedly there have been some changes in the past few years to make it easier for students to obtain resident status in Oregon. However, the procedure is still long and tedious.

And as the student who just got his residency last term can tell you, a person soon gets discouraged trying to fight his way through the red tape to obtain that residency. A recognition that out-of-state students—if they remained in Oregon after graduation—will contribute much to the development of the state in the future is needed.

In other words, although it will cost the state a little more to educate such new residents now, in the long run the state will realize great returns compared with its initial investment.

All that I am saying is that there ought to be some set criteria with which all resident applicants must comply before they are granted residence. Then residency ought to be granted automatically.

And I don't think that a person should be penalized for wanting to visit his folks. After all, parents are one of this country's oldest institutions.



"IT'S GETTING SO BAD THAT EVEN PEOPLE ARE COMPLAINING."

Oregon Daily Emerald
Rande Wilmarth, Sports Editor
Nomi Borenstein,
Assistant Managing Editor
Larry Lange, Assistant News Editor
Dave Butler, Feature Editor
Shota Ushio, Photo Editor
Steve Dimco, Entertainment Editor
Mary Ann Wakasugi,
Religious News Editor
Editorial Board: Chuck Beggs, Bob Carl,
Maxine Elliott, Phil Semas, Allen
Bailey, Pam Bladine, Karen Winn,
Cliff Kaufman, Gene Sokolski, Nomi
Borenstein.