

Open meetings?

Friday, the mayors and city managers of Eugene and Springfield had a luncheon meeting which lasted for more than two hours. The mayors decided at the beginning of the meeting that newspaper reporters should not be allowed to attend.

The meeting was about the proposed Eugene-Springfield dog pound. Though the issue itself may not be of earth-shattering importance to University students, it carries a good deal of importance for many people who are concerned about dogs and other animals and how the city handles them when they are neglected or stray. That meeting — and any meeting — between the mayors on an issue, no matter what it is, is of interest to the public. The fact that the meeting was closed to reporters implies that the discussion there may have resulted in some kind of agreement about the issue. Agreements should be made by public officials only in a public setting, and the exclusion of reporters from a meeting clouds both the purpose and the results of such a meeting. And such decisions may be made without public input.

The intent of the open meetings law is to ensure that the public is aware of decisions made by public officials. Though discussion of some matters, including some personnel decisions, may be considered outside of the public forum, the matters discussed by the mayors in the Friday meeting was of direct concern to the public.

The mayors may not have violated the letter of the open meetings law by meeting Friday, as the Attorney General's office has said, but they certainly violated the law's intent. The implication is that a decision was, or may have been, arrived at during the meeting. Further, the mayors said that the meeting was intended to discuss "mutual concerns." That could cover anything from the dog pound to major land-use planning concerns. That's not to say that that's what happened, but it is meant to say that that's what could have happened and may happen in the future.

The main point against closed meetings between two such political figures as the mayor of Eugene and the mayor of Springfield is that the public doesn't know what *did* happen and what was discussed at the meeting. The presence of high-level staff people at Friday's meeting indicates that it was more than a leisurely get together between Keller and Meyer.

In the future, the mayors should insure that the public issues are discussed in a public setting, and that reporters are allowed to be present at all meetings between such officials.



THE FENCES HAVE BEEN MENDED ON THE WEST FORTY

opinion

Halpern blasts Frohnmayer

Submitted by
PAUL HALPERN
Graduate student, LCC instructor

University of Oregon law professor David Frohnmayer is caught in a serious, irreconcilable conflict of interest between his job as legal council to Pres. Boyd and the University administration and his position as an elected State Representative.

As long as Professor Frohnmayer maintains the fiction that he can both serve the University administration and his constituents, some of whom may have serious legal disputes with the University, the public is being short-changed.

On October 6, Professor Frohnmayer admitted to the press that his "lawyer-client relationship" with the University administration prevents his availability for discussion of legal disputes within the University community, including those involving his constituents, some forty per cent of whom are directly affiliated with the University as faculty, staff or students.

When I called him earlier this month to discuss my recent conflict with the Graduate School over Buckley Amendment violations, Professor Frohnmayer told me he was unable to help me, because to do so would be contrary to "legal ethics" and would violate his previously mentioned lawyer-client relationship. What about political ethics and his moral obligations to his constituency, of which I am a member?

Professor Frohnmayer has broken his representative-voter relationship in favor of his Johnson Hall lawyer-client role. When he asked us for votes last November, he made great claims to having been involved with Common Cause. Yet he now finds himself in a bind of political hypocrisy and conflict of interest, occupying a dual role that makes him a potential adversary to a significant block of voters in District 40 who are now without a full-time, uncompromised State Representative.

I am not accusing Professor Frohnmayer of any legal infractions, and I am not concerned that he is in violation of existing conflict of interest statutes. Still, an investigation of the legal situation might be helpful in clarifying this sticky matter, which Professor Frohnmayer continues to avoid. Certainly a full disclosure by the Professor of his annual publicly funded income would be appropriate.

However, the voters have a right to demand that their elected representatives be more than merely within the law. These politicians must also honor the unwritten laws of political decency and morality. Professor Frohnmayer is in a moral conflict of interest, which can be resolved only by resigning his seat in the State House or his position as legal council to Pres. Boyd and the University administration.

Professor Frohnmayer is collecting three salaries, all at the taxpayer's expense, as a professor, a state representative, and as legal council to the University administration.

In short — Dave Frohnmayer is wearing too many hats.

Letters

For Hildreth

This is an endorsement letter for the write-in candidacy of Dan Hildreth. I have known Dan Hildreth for some time now, and he is the type of person I would like to see on the EMU Board. Dan is a motivated guy with an open mind to new ideas and a genuine sincerity to implement them. I realize that it takes a little extra time and effort to mark the candidate's name in on the write-in ballot, but Dan Hildreth for the EMU Board is a name well worth remembering and writing.

Karl LaRowe
Senior, Psychology

Warren for IFC

We students at this University are fortunate to have at our disposal a number of ways to have an impact on the decisions that affect us. Our many opportunities for involvement in decision-making such as through membership on student/faculty committees, the University Senate, the Bookstore Board of Directors and the Incidental Fee Committee put University students in a position of influence that is unique to Oregon and is one of the few such cases nationally.

We also are fortunate to have many qualified students to serve in decision-making capacities at all levels. Jeff Warren is one such

person with whom I have worked over the past year. Jeff has held all of the positions mentioned above; and he has always tried to do what is best for students. I support his bid for election to a full term on the Incidental Fee Committee and I hope you will, too.

Be sure to read the candidates statements carefully and vote in the coming elections.

Mark Cogan
Senior, Political Science

Write in Hildreth

I am endorsing Dan Hildreth in his write-in candidacy for the EMU Board because Dan is the kind of person who spends more time listening and examining a problem than complaining about it. I've known Dan Hildreth for a couple of years, and his attitude of concern for others and following through on his word has impressed me.

In the coming year the EMU Board will be again concerned with making the most of its resources in light of inflating costs and decreasing enrollment. Dan Hildreth's help on the EMU Board will best serve the interests of the University community because he is serious in his commitment to the efficient allocation of student-paid incidental fees, and dedicated to the EMU meeting the diverse needs of the students.

As a write-in candidate, Dan Hildreth is at something of a dis-

advantage. There isn't any box for you to quickly check off on the ballot. To vote for Dan Hildreth you need to write in his name. I'm sure that his performance on the EMU Board will justify that extra work.

Dusty Rhodes
Member, EMU Board
Chairman, Budget Committee

Hallquist for SUAB

Instead of having a good friend write in and expound on my personal integrity (like Gordon Mallon did), I would like to take this opportunity to state where I stand on issues before the University Senate. By compounding awareness of these issues and decisiveness, with the knowledge that student input is essential, I believe I am best qualified for Student University Affairs Board position No. 18.

1. I support the establishment of an ad hoc committee to investigate the impact of various policies such as mandatory age requirements and early retirement schemes now being considered by Pres. Boyd.

2. I feel that students should be able to officially declare a double major.

3. I am personally against changing over to a semester system, but I will base my decision on how students feel.

4. I am against raising admission standards, but support the reorganization of academic advising and improving our inadequate registration procedures. The University should become more educationally viable rather than becoming elitist.

5. ROTC off campus.

Greg Hallquist
Senior, Asian Studies
Candidate, SUAB No. 18

Laing for IFC

I have known Gary Laing well for two years and I wholeheartedly support his bid for an IFC position. Gary is a reasonable, clear-thinking person who will not be overawed by the "sacred cows" of the campus. He has developed a set of criteria for programs to be funded. They include service to the students and educational, environmental or cultural enrichment. Gary is strongly motivated to represent the type of students who seldom get involved in student government. As one of those students, I want to encourage the rest of you to support Gary Laing. You won't be sorry you did.

Charles T. Ford
Graduate, Mathematics

Editor's note: Because of space considerations, the Emerald

will accept no more than three letters of endorsement per candidate for the upcoming elections.

Frasority roots

As an original member of the FEA Frasority, I would like to comment on Mike Merback's article in Oct. 24th's Emerald.

The Frasority was started in 1975 when a group of people went to my parents' home, which my parents had named FEA, for a weekend. While there, we decided to form a club, and since there were males and females in the group we hit upon the name FEA Frasority. Since then, a lot of the original members have moved to different parts of the state.

It was a surprise to read Mike Merback's article. I had no idea that we had all those past presidents; as far as I know, the one and only president is listed on the "official" membership cards. It seems that the original purpose of a group just for fun and the original members got lost along the way.

Incidentally, two new chapters, one in Chicago and one in Los Angeles have been formed, according to Barbara Streeter, president and founder of the group.

Tricia Streeter
1640 S.E. 162nd, Portland
Tuesday, November 1, 1977