

Student reaction to tuition requested

Despite regular exhortations to the contrary, the State Board of Higher Education annually increases tuition for the seven state colleges and universities. The raises are sometimes large (especially for out-of-state students) and sometimes small. But over a period of four years the average student is asked to pay significantly higher tuition for roughly the same (or reduced) educational services.

Clearly the system has some inequities, and it is in response to those inequities that the State Board has begun a study of long-range tuition alternatives. According to member John Mosser, the Board must either continue raising tuition or prepare to do battle with the State Legislature for increased funds.

The Board's Finance Committee will receive input from the seven institutions at its meeting in December. As a part of that input Mosser suggested the schools plumb student as well as administrative opinion. In response to Mosser's suggestion University President Robert Clark established the Student-Faculty Task Force on Tuition Alternatives.

That body will study tuition alternatives, seek student and faculty input, before presenting a report to Clark later this month. That report will form the basis of Clark's presentation to the Board.

Clearly, there is a need for student input in the tuition discussion. It is one area where students and their families are directly affected. And if tuition

standards are to be made fair and equitable, it is important students respond to the Task Force request.

The Task Force has outlined five basic questions the Board will be asking. Those questions are printed elsewhere on this page, with room for Emerald readers to write in their responses. Answers to the questions may be as lengthy and detailed as the respondent desires.

Students answering the questions should return the forms to the Emerald office, 301 Alien Hall, where the results will be summarized for publication sometime in the near future. All responses will then be forwarded to the appropriate members of the University Task Force for incorporation into their study.

Letters

Editor's Note: The following ASUO election letter was inadvertently left out of Friday's paper. It is printed in today's issue with apologies to the candidate.

From Konka

My campaign for ASUO Senator is based upon two issues. The first one is that of no dogs on campus. It seems clear that the majority's rights have been violated by those few who think that a dog is man's best friend. Dogs have bitten students, run over students, and shit on students. It is time to speak out for the concerns of people—those here on campus, and those in the third world who are being denied needed protein by American dog food companies.

The second concern is that of the appalling waste of student money for competitive athletics. \$135,000.00 of student fees per year is given to the Athletic Department. If students want to pay \$3.00

to see supposedly mature men (the support for women's athletics is infinitesimal) compete against one another, then that's their hang-up. But to require every student to pay approximately \$3.00 per term to support the Athletic Dept. is reprehensible.

As one ASUO Senator, I will do all in my (limited) power to carry out these two campaign pledges.

Make your vote mean something—vote for Paul Konka, Off-Campus, no. 3, for no dogs on campus and no student money for athletics.

Paul Konka

Disreputable practice

The letter from Richard Houghton in the Nov. 7 ODE brings to mind my previous experience with Mac's Hi-Fi.

Last year, after experiencing a malfunction with my phono, I was prompted to have it fixed by Mac's Hi-Fi's offer of \$5.00 free servicing on any stereo repair, which appeared in my Duck Dope booklet. After taking it in and describing the problem, Mac's said they would call

when it was ready "in a few days." My phono also housed my radio and amp, but I decided to go without, for a short time, in order to have it repaired.

Six weeks later, Mac's informed me the stereo was repaired, and after \$5.00 off, there was a charge of \$4.00 additional. However, when I returned home and tested the unit, I found the phono had not been repaired. The next morning, I returned the phono and charge slip to Mac's, and they apologized and again took it and said they would call me "in a few days," when it was ready. (Deja-Vu?)

Six weeks later, after Mac's call, I went to pick it up, but decided to test it there. Again, it had not been repaired. At this point, an employee tried his hand at impromptu repairs, and began to tap my needle and cartridge until there was a response in the phono. On his cue of "it works now," I took it and left. It worked at home for 10 minutes. I later had it repaired completely at a reputable dealer, after three days wait, and a modest fee.

I write this letter in the hope that before anyone else gets conned into the Mickey Mouse show going on at Mac's they understand exactly what kind of disreputable practice their money encourages.

Zack Lorts
Junior, Economics

Unfair advertising

I'm writing in regard to "fair play," which I didn't receive when I visited Mac's Hi-Fi, in answer to their full page ad placed in the Emerald (October 23 and November 1, 1972).

The ad stated, "Free, check that deck . . ." and then it went on to say that some audio technicians from the Tandberg Corporation would be there on November 1, 1972 from 12-9 p.m. to give reel to reel tape decks or recorders, that were brought in, a free check-up, diagnosis, adjustment, head demagnetization, etc., all for free. "REMEMBER, IT'S ALL FREE. DON'T MISS IT," the ad boasted.

This was of course a promotional "gimmick" to attract reel to reel recorder and deck owners to preview some of the Tandberg line of merchandise and to speak to the factory technicians. They want to sell tape decks, and a promotional "gimmick" such as this would do a fine job, since they would have a captive audience.

I own a reel to reel recorder, and in response to the ad, I disassembled my component set and lugged my machine downtown in the rain to Mac's Hi-Fi, with a friend. We arrived there at 8:05 p.m. (55 min. before the offer expired) and were told, by a clerk that they had stopped taking machines at 6 p.m. (3 hrs. before the offer expired), because they had received too many machines. I told him that I was in no hurry, and that it didn't matter how long it took, because I was interested in having my machine diagnosed and adjusted, as promised by the full page ad in the Emerald.

I then asked if I could have a "rain check" and was given a flat "no". After speaking with the manager of this

"reputable establishment" on the phone, his response came out something to the order of "too bad" and included other comments like, "You could have stayed here all night," which gives absolutely no satisfaction at all.

Poor business practices such as this are not in the better interest of the student community. When an establishment advertises, it is taken as a contract of good faith as well as a legal contract to the public. If the business can't meet its obligation, it should make some sort of restitution to keep in the good graces of the public (who, by the way if Mac's has forgotten, is the business' "bread and butter").

I feel that the Emerald should investigate "rip-offs" such as this and use what they find to establish some honest advertising practices, in order to prevent further recurrences of this type.

Remember the Gentleman's Retreat hassle?

John A. DeChristopher
Sociology

Greater understanding

It seems that I have something to say to those that worked so hard for peace candidates in the past election. Something I want to say . . .

We lost the election. We in Eugene lost everything from the Presidency to the county sheriff. After over six months of virtual day to day campaigning, after investing so much of our time and substance in our defeated vision—it was time for a good cry. Tuesday was a sorrowful day. Yet I think before we mourn, we ought to realize what we in Eugene did win. I think we ought to remember what committed us to the investment we made in these candidates. For most of us, we were never politicians or bureaucrats, we simply held a common vision of what could be . . . of what humanitarianism and freedom just might be all about. The underlying foundation of our commitment was hope—hope for the future. Surely, we can despair but that would seem incongruent with the love and positive virtues which we began with . . .

I can say I personally felt like crying . . . McGovern, Morse, Porter, Wooten, Larry and King—they all lost . . . but to their supporters I can say that I truly feel a bond with each one of you. We are bound by the vision we pursued and though we are a minority, we have the incentive to grow and work for the future because the implementation and practice of the virtues which our candidates represented are self rewarding.

Perhaps my words are inarticulate, but hopefully a greater understanding comes from the feeling behind this letter. To the supporters of these candidates I want you to know that you are truly my brothers and sisters. We are not alone and there will be good people who will need our help in the future. Please join me in making that personal investment again.

Timothy C. Farris
Page 5

What do you think . . .

1. Should there be a difference in tuition between lower division and upper division undergraduates?

4. Should tuition be charged on a sliding scale from a minimum to a maximum based upon the student's and the student's family's ability to pay?

2. Are students willing to support a \$1 to \$2 per term tuition increase to provide a pool of monies for foreign student scholarships?

5. Should there be different tuition charges based on the cost of a program one is enrolled in?

3. Should graduate students pay the same percentage of the cost of their instruction as undergraduates?