

A costly, clumsy policy

In August of 1974 Congress was riding a wave of post-Watergate moral enthusiasm. One product of this bizarre period was the Buckley amendment, an attempt to legislate protection for the privacy of student records.

Gerald Bogen, the University's Vice-President for Student Affairs, recently returned from Washington, D.C., where he testified against the amendment before the Privacy Protection Study Commission.

Bogen told the commission that he approved of the intent of the Buckley amendment but that the law was so ambiguous and its regulations so difficult to implement that Congress should repeal it and start over. Bogen was speaking as a representative of land grant colleges all over the country.

Under the Buckley amendment and its 13 pages of fine-print regulations, students have complete control over their records. No information other than that classified as directory information may be released without written consent from the student.

This sounds good in theory but it doesn't work in practice. No one knows exactly what information qualifies as "directory information." It's difficult, often impossible, for students to allow the release of information to a group or category of employers or schools. Accrediting institutions and research organizations are unable to obtain statistical information on many aspects of education that concern students. The amendment's regulations were drafted without consulting university administrations, much less university students.

But the chief objection university administrations have to the Buckley amendment is that it costs an inordinate amount of time and money. This university's student records policy provided privacy protection since 1971 that was in many cases even more thorough than is required by the Buckley amendment. But the administration's efforts to conform to the Buckley regulations has cost a lot of money and caused a lot of heartache.

Bogen argues convincingly that what universities need is a federal student records policy that sets guidelines under which each institution must establish their own procedures. The guidelines would require a certain level of protection of student's privacy rights, but each university would be able to draft a policy adapted to its particular circumstances.

Specific records policies would be developed at the university level, preferably by a committee composed of student, faculty and administration representatives. The policy could even be presented to the student body and the general faculty for ratification.

Such a system of policy development would provide students with the privacy protection they need but no more than they want.

Letters

HEP a success

I'd like to tell you something about my experience in HEP (High School Equivalency Program.) When I first came to HEP, all I knew was that I could get my G.E.D. in this program. I've been here four weeks and I've learned a lot.

In high school, cutting classes was my problem. Here in HEP, I like going to classes. All the teachers are nice and understanding. They help you with your work if you need help. I've learned many words I didn't know before. When I speak, I use new words in my everyday vocabulary without noticing it; my friends experience the same thing.

But what I like best about HEP is that everyone gets along. You go to school and everyone says "Hi" to you. There are Whites, Chicanos, Indians and Blacks in HEP. It's all races mixed together. As long as you've done farm labor and have a low income, you are eligible to enter.

Before, I would only stick with Chicanos. I'm glad I came to Eugene because I got a chance to meet different people from different places at the University. In HEP we really get the chance to know each other as individuals rather than judging by the race someone is. Here we're all a group; we're together.

I've had some problems living at

the University because I'm a Mexican. Because of my color, some people treat me badly. I don't believe in prejudice. In my opinion, it is all wrong. Why should people look down on you because you have a different color and you are poor? We are all humans. God brought us into this world to all be equal. My background has been in farm work. People look down on the farmworkers; they call us dirty. Yet the same people are anxious to go buy the fruit that we "dirty" farmworkers pick.

I think we could do something about prejudice. If we could get different races together so they could really meet each other, this world would be much better. After you meet someone who is really nice to you, how can you refuse his friendship because of his color? Think about it!

Olga Rodriguez
HEP

Not criminals

Tom Bornson and Lonnie Davis are two of the 10 million unemployed workers in this country. On May 7 they were sentenced to nine and seven years in jail. For what? For refusing to starve. After being thrown out of work in the oilfields, moving to Oregon and, finding no work, they were denied food stamps because they were too broke to have a permanent address. Demanding food stamps, medical care and press coverage they took over a Port-



"THE VERY RICH ARE DIFFERENT FROM YOU AND ME" ... "YES, THEY HAVE MORE MONEY."
Ernest Hemingway — "The Snows of Kilimanjaro"

opinion

The history of the BPA power play

The great debate over Bonneville power is not new. It goes back to the days before the enactment of the original bill in 1937 and is apparent in the testimonies of various officials and representatives before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which considered the bill, and in the debates on the floor of the House as reported in the Congressional Record.

On one side stood the advocates of low-cost power for all the people as delineated in the progress report of the National Power Policy Committee transmitted by President Roosevelt to the Congress and described by Secretary of the Interior Ickes in his statement before the House Committee and included in the Congressional Record. As stated there, the bill was to insure conformity with the National Power Policy by giving preference to public and non-profit cooperative agencies, and otherwise to encourage the widest possible economic use of electric energy so as to distribute wisely and equitably the benefits of an integrated power development. This is the language clearly enacted in the bill in 1937.

At issue in the debates and hearings leading to the passage of the bill were the questions of monopolization by industry, the yardstick principle and rate control; widespread use or concentration for a restricted area and the related constitutional issue; transmission lines and their construction; reservation of power unpledged by long-time contract for public power districts; centralization or division of authority as reflected in the duties of the administrator.

Every issue illuminates this basic conflict between low-cost power for the people and those who stood for monopolization by energy intensive "tidewater" industry and over-capitalized private holding company-controlled utilities desiring a switch-board rate. Anyone seriously concerned with Bonneville Power and its use and distribution should read over the 500 pages of hearings before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and see for themselves the clarity of the conflict and the obvious expression of the will of the Congress in acting in favor of the National Power Policy and its concomitant parts. That these were conceived as great and fundamental national issues is clearly apparent. Monopolization by industry was unquestionably rejected and industrial development was to favor labor intensive, "dinner pail" industries as opposed to switchboard clustered, energy intensive, automated organizations.

Direct contrasts are drawn between the rates paid at such public power projects as Niagara Falls, where switchboard rates prevailed and

power was monopolized by industries around the generating site and private utilities, and the low cost, widespread "yardstick" rates of T.V.A. and the municipally-owned public power of Seattle and Tacoma, Washington. Transmission costs, but not those of distribution, were to be included in the legislation as a part of the overall investment of the federal government to foster equalization of rates and widespread distribution and use of the power. Specific warnings as to the dangers of the aluminum and electrochemical trust crowding to the "bus bar," as they did at Niagra, are repeated and comparison is drawn with the mistakes of Teapot Dome. Divergent rate theories are discussed and specific allegations of the industrial and utility advocates are refuted, point by point. A single unified administration was created to place operation and rate-making under one authority for more effective implementation of the enacted policy.

Specific language in the enacted legislation can only refer to these and other enumerated controversies and their appearance in the law clearly signals the decision and the will of the Congress. The decision, and the preference for the rural and domestic consumer and public power organizations and cooperatives, can only be entirely understood in the context of this sharply defined, basic controversy as to the role of the Federal government in the development and distribution of national hydro-electric resources by means of publically financed projects such as Bonneville.

The issue, squarely joined, was clearly decided some 38 years ago in favor of low cost, public power for the people in the original law which has never been seriously questioned or revised as to its basic principles. Yet today the public interest finds itself in conflict once again with those very same highly energy-intensive, aluminum and electro-chemical industries and a Bonneville Administration often uncooperative, and even hostile to organizations desiring aid and access to the development of low cost, widespread public power: It was President John F. Kennedy who said "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to relive it." Fortunately, for us, the past is clearly illuminated by the debates and hearings printed in the record of the 75th Congress. How can we allow the hard-fought victories of our public-spirited representatives of those days to be taken from us today?

Bob Zagorin
KZEL News

The sources for this article are available on request-ed.

land food stamp office, fighting back against this system that can't even provide a job for every worker.

Tom Bornson and Lonnie Davis are not criminals, and every day they remain in prison is an outrage! While working people like Tom and Lonnie sit in jail, the courts allow the rich — like Patty Hearst and the Watergate criminals — to either go free or be set free on bail. Then they run around the country making \$\$\$ appearing on Johnny Carson's show and

writing articles and books, while Mary Bornson and her six children are forced to live off welfare — the same welfare denied the family before the food stamp office takeover.

But also, while Tom and Lonnie sit in jail, thousands of workers, students and others have been organizing and fighting to get them out. Right now the focus of the campaign to free them is on the demand for bail, which has been denied to them by the courts while their appeal is pending.

For people interested in finding out more about the Bornson-Davis case, and about the campaign to free them, there will be a program Tuesday, Dec. 7, in the EMU at 7:30 p.m. The program will include a speaker from the Committee to Free Bornson and Davis in Portland and a slide show prepared by the Committee.

Free Bornson and Davis! Set bail now — no restrictions!

Kevin O'Hara
P.O. Box 3723
Eugene, OR 97403

Wednesday, December 1, 1976
Herald-Examiner