

Opposition to child care stand based on errors

By Robert Liberty

The *Emerald's* editorial of Monday May 5, "Child care needs state funds, breathing space" contains a number of misconceptions that should be corrected. I have always been willing to listen to people who disagree with our (the ASUO Executive's) position on (no) funding for the CCDC, but I have little patience with people or publications which oppose our position on the basis of incorrect information.

1. The editorial states the CCDC "is asking for \$61,000 in emergency funds to allow it to continue operating in 1975-76...". The total cost for the CCDC is not \$61,000. The Parent Equalizing Payment request, the indirect grant portion of the program cost, is \$61,728. The total cost of the program is almost exactly \$80,000, which includes 2/3rds of Ms. Sacks' salary and payroll assessments, (the other third of her salary is allocated to her work for the Day Care Center), and other expenses.

2. The editorial states "Because the CCDC can expect reinstatement of federal and state monies within the next two years...". At our hearings with Kathy Sacks and in later conversations I got exactly the opposite impression, that support is not likely to be forthcoming in the next two years.

3. The editorial states "Like the Black Student Union, which receives IFC funding, the CCDC enables a group, which might otherwise be unrepresented here to attend the University." The BSU is not funded for any grant program "which enables a group, which might otherwise be unrepresented to attend the University". This is total nonsense. The BSU is being funded for cultural activities open to all students; the \$61,728 P.E.P. of the CCDC's request would be used for approximately 75-85 student-parents.

4. The editorial states "Support for child care has been conspicuously absent from ASUO lobbying priorities." So has support for a hundred other issues from marijuana legalization to land-use. In fact, child care support was on our original list of lobbying issues, included at the request of Kathy Sacks. However the *Emerald* seems to forget the ASUO has two lobbyists. Our top two priorities, protection of the Dept. of Higher Education's budget and a student role in faculty collective bargaining has, and will, continue to absorb 90 per cent of our time. These issues concern all students' education, not just low-income student-parents. Of necessity, other issues will be "conspicuously absent".

5. On February 7th, the *Emerald* editorial endorsed the Executive's budget criteria stating that the criteria would help us "do a fair and unbiased job" of allocating budgets. But three months later, the ODE looks "in their 'baby blues/browns'" and turns to mush. Our reasons for recommending no funding are based on those very same criteria and policies.

As for the tutoring experience the CCDC provides, there are currently many other work-study positions available, and the ESCAPE staff informs us that other opportunities for Day Care experience in the Eugene area exist. Opportunities for experience are plentiful; money is not.

Robert Liberty is ASUO president

Sacks replies

By Katharine Sacks

The ASUO Executive's budgeting criteria appear to be rational, and based on high ideals. The child care issue is a complex one and the issue of child care funding at the University involves some difficult reality-based factors. The purpose of this article is to respond to some of Robert Liberty's comments and to elaborate further on the issue.

Robert is correct in stating that the total amount of the CCDC request is about \$80,000. The \$18,000 plus that is not within the Parent Equalization Payment request is in the EMU's program budget — consistent with the way other EMU programs are budgeted. This portion of the budget has been pointed out to the Executive, the IFC and the *Emerald*. What distinguishes the CCDC budget request from the other EMU program requests is the \$61,728 for parent equalization payments.

The vagaries of State and Federal funding are such that no one can be certain of what funding will exist in the future. The Executive takes a pessimistic view of the situation. Our view is that we are at the low point of child care funding and that the situation will gradually improve. In support of this view are, at the Federal level: 1) the passage of a Public Employment Bill which provides funds for child care; 2) the U.S. Dept. of Labor's recommendation that child care jobs be considered eligible for CETA funding; 3) the possible passage of the Child and Family Services Act which would provide substantial support for child care training programs and services.

At the State level an administrative rule prevents most University student parents from obtaining government subsidies. Recently, however, the CCDC was approached by Marjorie Wright, Chairperson of the State 4C Council (Community Coordinated Child Care — administers funds for child care programs state-wide) to outline the needs of campus child care programs. This is an indication that the CCDC's efforts to organize other campus child care programs and the lobbying done during this legislative session have laid the groundwork for a more responsive state government in the future.

ASUO General Budgeting Criteria state, "The benefits of its (the Program's) activities must be at least potentially available to, and directed toward all students..." The Executive insists that the CCDC benefits only the student parents who are directly

involved in the program — ignoring the fact that the entire University community benefits from having a diverse student population. The CCDC makes it possible for a variety of student populations to attend the University, nearly all low income. Over a third of those served are single parents; another third are members of ethnic minorities. Also, the average age of student parents is 29 years.

The Executive dismisses the value of the CCDC to practicum, research, and work study students by saying, "Opportunities for experience are plentiful; money is not." While it is so that opportunities for child care experience are available in other programs, it is important to note certain unique features of the program: 1) the CCDC has one of the few infant and toddler programs that exist in Lane County (relatively few exist in the country); 2) there are no other child care programs as accessible to the campus as is the CCDC; 3) the CCDC aide trainer and educational coordinator provide a unique training experience for students unavailable in other programs; 4) by combining the open classroom and individualized instruction models, the CCDC has created a unique educational program.

The CCDC anticipates continued ASUO support for its lobbying activities. We also anticipate continuing to be the major source of child care lobbying at the University until the ASUO has a lobbying staff adequate to take on the project. We agree with Robert that this is not the case now.

Robert has criticized the *Emerald* for endorsing the Executive budgeting criteria and then recommending significant funding for the CCDC. I submit that the *Emerald* editors have come to this conclusion based on an interpretation of the budgeting criteria different from that of the Executive's — and one that included direct experience with the program.

Debra Corbett visited the CCDC in the summer of 1974. To my knowledge, no other member of the ASUO Executive has visited the program since then. While I realize that the members of the Executive are very busy people, it is my opinion that before they decided to cut the CCDC, they should have risked complicating their view of the matter a bit by coming to see first hand what the program is.

We agree that students shouldn't have to foot the bill forever. The point is that we need funding now to enable us to continue pressing for government and University support. We are confident that we will be able to show that progress has been made in these areas by next year at this time. Students have a right to demand such a progress report.

It is not our wish to disparage the efforts of the Executive to create budgeting guidelines which provide consistency in the allocation of student money. It is our position that the CCDC meets all the essential General Budgeting Criteria.

There are now more than 3,000 students who have signed petitions in support of the Child Care and Development Center's request for Incidental Fee funding. We invite the members of the ASUO executive to visit our program and to reconsider their recommendation for zero funding.

Katharine Sacks is the director of the Child Care and Development Center

Letters

Smokers oppressed

While oppressed minorities throughout the country are gaining in power and forcefully asserting their rights, there is one such group suffering under an increasing amount of tyranny. I refer, of course, to the tobacco smokers of America. More and more, these unfortunate souls are confronting segregation, job discrimination, demeaning stereotypes and unequal treatment by the law. These are all classic signs of oppression, yet they are ignored by everyone, even people who claim to be concerned with civil rights.

No one protests when smokers are banished to the back of the bus or airplane. No hearts bleed when smokers are ousted from those institutions of higher learning, the libraries of our country. No quotas are proposed when it is discovered that there are no smokers among the lawyers in our courtrooms and the doctors in our hospitals.

Women in the feminist movement typically react with righteous indignation to female stereotypes. But if a man pulls out a Marlboro they will ask him why he feels the need to assert his masculinity. Let someone light up a pipe and he is immediately regarded as indecisive, excessively intellectual, or both.

These demeaning stereotypes extend even to science, where they are unique. When a doctor from a prominent university proposes the hypotheses that blacks are genetically different, in some respects superior and in others inferior to whites, he is ridiculed and prevented from presenting his case at college campuses throughout the country. Yet when other doctors speculate, on the basis of mere case studies, that the tobacco smoker is an oral personality, overly dependent and emotionally immature, they are widely respected. Moreover, their ideas become pervasive.

The unequal treatment of the tobacco smoker is clearly shown by the fact that there is not a single place on this campus where he can study. The library is quiet, but they allow smoking only in the hallways near the exits. You can smoke in a few places in the EMU, but then you have to contend with loud music, loud people and lousy acoustics. There are several conference rooms and small dining areas in the EMU that would be ideal for smoking and study. Why are they locked up most of the time? And why not allow smoking in one?

Until this is done, the facilities granted the tobacco smoker will remain both separate and unequal!

John Mighell
1869 Kincaid #3



Paid to go to school

This is because what William McKenzie wrote to you. It's right that people do blame the H.E.P. students. Just because some of us have been sick on the weekend we all get blamed no matter who threw up even if it wasn't us. They are mad because we are here learning about things and they want to keep us dumb.

The other students say we never study,

but how much did they study in high school? We are here because they pay us to go to school even if we never did well or left. If it wasn't because the director had to have 50 students in the program most of my friends wouldn't be here. They are paying us to be here so why do the students want us to leave?

Marty Ortegón
H.E.P. program
Tuesday, May 13, 1975