

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. However, the Emerald does present on this page columnists and letter writers whose opinions reflect those of our diverse readership and not those of the Emerald itself.

PHIL SEMAS, Editor

ANNETTE BUCHANAN
Managing Editor

MIKE FANCHER
News Editor

CLIFF SANDERLIN
Editorial Page Editor

WILBUR BISHOP JR.
Business Manager

CAROLINE PITMAN
Advertising Manager

NOMI BORENSTEIN
Associate Editor

University of Oregon, Eugene, Friday, January 13, 1967

President Yields To Faculty Pressure

"Flemming Refuses Student Request" read the headline in Wednesday's Emerald. That's something of an historic event. To our knowledge, the Emerald has never had occasion to run such a headline before. President Flemming has always been a man who readily agreed to reasonable student requests.

The president responds that he really didn't deny the student request. He would maintain that he did, in fact, give students representation on the committee to select a dean for the new community service school.

But he agreed to put the student body president on the committee. That wasn't what students asked for. They asked to have three students designated by the ASUO president on the committee.

The important thing is not the question of numbers. Nor is it President Flemming's statement that this may result in setting a precedent for putting students on committees later on, true as that may be.

The important fact is that the president yielded to faculty pressure. He allowed the faculty to assert their right to jealously guard a prerogative which they should not have.

Students have a legitimate right to request reasonable representation on a committee such as this, where the decision will have an important effect on the development of a program intended primarily for the benefit of students. And President Flemming has a right and a duty to accede to a reasonable student request for involvement in the choosing of a member of his administration. A power-conscious group of faculty members should not be allowed to pressure him into backing down from his right as the institutional executive nor his duty to students.

At the beginning of this year we heard President Flemming tell ASUO President Henry Drummonds, "I believe that when we decide students should participate in the running of the University, we should ask student government how students should participate. Many university administrations kid themselves—and sometimes students—that they are giving students a role in the University by sticking them on a few committees." We think that's sound reasoning. He should have followed it in this case.

Bad Decisions

We can't dispell ourselves of the idea that President Flemming has made, at best, uninformed decisions about the sites for the new Law School and for the addition to the School of Architecture and Allied Arts.

First of all, we believe the Law School would have been the most ideal school to initiate expansion of the campus across Franklin Boulevard. The school is relatively self-contained; the students who are enrolled in the school have the bulk of their classes in the same building.

As to the Art and Architecture addition, why did the president go ahead and approve construction of the addition without knowing what the division of classroom space between the art and architecture departments would be? Surely he knows the Planning Committee, whose recommendation he approved, is a committee made up of several members of the architecture department. And surely he realizes a showdown between the two departments over who will get which classrooms will be imminent after the addition is completed.

It seems important, in this case, that the builders know which classrooms are to be used for which department in the planning stages, so they can design them accordingly. For example, art students could use ground-floor classrooms more appropriately than architecture students, since much of their activities involve outdoor work.

Why has President Flemming rubber-stamped the Planning Committee's recommendations in both cases? Is he protecting the feelings of the deans of the schools and departments? Or has he just failed to do his homework on these questions before making his decisions?

Whatever the reasons, we think both decisions were bad.

Paul Harvey Jr.

Legislators to Face Oregon Tax Problems

Editor's Note: Taxation is, of course, a key question for the University and the entire State System of Higher Education. That's where our money comes from. This column analyzes the possible solutions to Oregon's tax problems which might come out of the present Legislature. Paul Harvey Jr., is the veteran Associated Press writer in Salem and has covered many legislatures. All during the session the Emerald will present articles by Harvey and other writers, including some of our own staff, about the Legislature.

SALEM (AP)—Most members of the Oregon Legislature want to pass a tax program and put it on the ballot at a special election in April.

The merit in that idea is that the Legislature could find out, during its session, what the people would stand for in the way of new taxes in order to reduce their local property taxes.

The legislators don't want to repeat the 1963 session, when they voted an income tax increase, only to have the people reject it at a special election. That forced the Legislature to come back in special session to reduce the appropriations they had approved at the regular session.

If the idea of having a special election in April works, it will be a miracle.

The Legislature would have to complete its tax program by March 20 to have a special election at the end of April.

To do that, the lawmakers would have to grind out a tax program in 70 days—a speed unheard of in modern times.

If there were some meeting of minds on this whole business, it could be done.

But there are likely to be as many tax plans as there are members of the Legislature. These will have to be resolved in both houses.

The questions are varied and complex.

One is whether a sales tax should be referred to the people, and if so, should it be two or three per cent? Should food be taxed?

Income Tax

Another is whether the income tax should be increased. If so, which of many ways of doing it should be tried? Should the rates be boosted, or should deductions be reduced or eliminated?

Should both sales tax and income taxes be put on the ballot, giving the people a choice?

These are the major questions, and there are many minor ones involved in each.

Legislators are hopeful that the people will approve some increase in state taxes to provide property tax reduction.

Most proposals to boost the income tax center on removal of the federal income tax deduction in figuring the state tax.

The people defeated almost exactly this same proposal 570,025 to 115,610 in 1960, and 362,845 to 103,737 in 1963.

Would the people change their minds now to get some property tax relief?

Heavy Defeat

The last time a sales tax was on the Oregon ballot was in 1947, when it was defeated 180,333 to 67,514.

Some people wonder why the Legislature doesn't pass a tax bill without referring it to the people.

The answer is that if the Legislature didn't refer a tax bill, referendum petitions would attack it, so that it would be suspended until the people voted on it in November, 1968.

In all other states, the legislatures can pass tax bills and put them into effect immediately. The Oregon Legislature, because it can't put an emergency clause on a tax bill, has to allow 90 days after the end of the session for people to file referendum petitions.

This has kept Oregon taxes down. But it has made it hard for the Legislature to plan an intelligent finance program.

Most Republicans favor a sales tax. Most Democrats want a higher income tax.

The odds are that the Republican-dominated House will vote

(Continued on page 11)



"TOUCH FOOTBALL IS A ROUGH GAME."

Emerald Editor.

Mod Shakespeare, "Ugh!"
Emerald Editor:

I was shocked and upset at the new presentation of Shakespeare's "Twelfth Night." I had earlier wanted to see the play, but, I felt I had no time to see it, and I wish to save my money.

From what I have read about the new presentation (Wed., Jan. 11) I feel that the play is not worth time or money, even if I were rich and free to go to plays.

Why should this be? First, the "jet set" presentation of "Twelfth Night" is a travesty on Shakespeare, a corruption and downgrading of his work.

I am no expert on Shakespeare or the theatre, but I am

(Continued on page 11)

Oregon Daily Emerald

Jean Snider,
Assistant Managing Editor
Dave Baronti, Sports Editor
Maxine Elliott, Feature Editor
Tom Thompson, Photo Editor
Paul Polsky, Associate Sports Editor
Jay Tillapaugh, Entertainment Editor
Lee O'Conner,
Women's Affairs Editor
Jaqui Thompson,
Political Affairs Editor

Editorial Board: Phil Semas, Cliff Sanderlin, Annette Buchanan, Nomi Borenstein, Dave Baronti, Bob Holmes, Robin Tuttle, Gary Barnes, Chuck Pruitt, Tom Nash, Dave McCloskey, Roger Leo, Spencer Block, Jean Snider, Mike Fancher.

Russell Sadler

Tuition Increase May Pay Off

Student leaders meeting here Saturday to discuss the proposed tuition increase would do well to examine the history of tuition increases and the role tuition funds might play in improving teaching quality.

The last general tuition increase took effect in the fall of 1963. At that time the share of educational expenses paid for by tuition fees was 26 per cent. By the fall of 1967, that share will have dropped to below 22 per cent.

At the same time, data compiled by the Chancellor's office indicates that there has been a general improvement in family income among residents, perhaps as much as 10 per cent.

There are few students to whom the additional \$99 a year would make attendance at college totally impossible. The financial aid to these students in the form of scholarships, federal and state grants and loans, and work opportunities is impressive, and has increased markedly in the past four years.

CAN ONLY REPEAT

Student body President Henry Drummonds can only repeat the desire of Chancellor Lieuallen when he suggests the ability to pay should not be the deciding factor in determining a field of study in higher education.

Little-publicized features of the tuition increase proposal are aimed specifically at this goal. For example, there is a proposal to eliminate the special charges for private lessons for music majors and prospective teachers with music minors, a substantial expense to those students.

Preparation for the medical and dental professions requires tremendous financial resources, limiting enrollment, in general, to the affluent.

Part of the current proposal would reduce the resident tuition at the Medical and Dental Schools in Portland to a level equal to the proposed resident graduate tuition at Eugene and Corvallis.

This should open the medical and dental professions to many interested but less affluent students. There has never been any

(Continued on page 11)