

# daily oregon emerald

An Independent Newspaper

Vol. 79, No. 90

Eugene, Oregon 97403

Tuesday, January 31, 1978



## Can you hack it?

Here it is, folks, *The Rick and Tom Show*. Today they're demonstrating the game of Hacky, an activity you can really kick up your heels to. Hacky is played with, naturally, a hacky sack — a small leather bean bag. In case you couldn't guess, the object of the game is to keep the sack in the air using feet and legs.

Photo by Erich Boekelheide

## Tuition: No gift in store next year

By RICHARD SEVEN  
Of the Emerald

Surprise! Tuition will probably go up again next year, according to Keith Jackson, budget director for the State System of Higher Education.

Jackson says the main reason for the increase is the same reason all other prices are rising — inflation.

"Oh yes, tuition will probably increase next year," says Jackson, although he adds it's too early for exact figures.

Jackson says his department must find the rate of cost not only of direct instruction, but also of the various student services available. His department must then combine these costs with the other state colleges and find the average cost.

Jackson says his department should have next year's tuition figures ready to re-

commend to the State Board Finance Committee at its April meeting. The board as a whole is expected to finalize the figure at its May meeting in Ashland.

In determining the expected tuition costs, higher education officials divide the number of full-time equivalency students (FTE) by the expected cost of instruction. If the total cost of instruction is estimated at \$100,000 and 10,000 students are expected to enroll, the total cost of instruction per student would be \$100.

The Legislature has a policy of charging a resident student only 25 percent of his or her actual cost of instruction. Bill Barrows, a legislative analyst, told the Emergency Board in Salem Thursday, that students were actually overcharged for tuition this past year.

The Emergency Board decided that \$540,000 out of the \$1.7 million of unbudgeted tuition income should be used to

help offset future tuition increases.

Much of the increased tuition income has been a result of a greater than usual number of out-of-state students attending state colleges.

University Pres. William Boyd says he doubts if the figure is large enough to make a substantial difference. "I think it was mainly a gesture of good faith," he says.

One possible cause of soaring tuition costs is the decrease of FTE's. According to Ralph Sunderland, University director of management and budget, the Legislature subsidizes higher education for every FTE, which is 15 hours or more.

Working in the current biennium, if the University were to lose a great number of FTE's, it would only lose that amount of tuition. In the second period of the biennium, which is next year, the University would lose both the students' tuition and the legislative subsidy.

"The second year of the biennium is usually more costly in terms of tuition because of inflation and related salary increases," Sunderland says. He feels however, that a drop of FTE's would be directly responsible for a tuition increase unless accompanied by a different "mix" of students.

The "mix" comprises the non-resident students as opposed to the residents. Out-of-state students are charged 100 percent of the actual cost of their education. It is their tuition that has given higher education its \$1.7 million tuition surplus.

Sunderland says tuition used to be set for a two-year period. "We sort of got away from that," he says. "The increase in tuition cost after the biennium was always too great of a percentage."

Instead higher education sets tuition rates every year to make the percent of the change more gradual.

## Horton rejects unethical behavior claims

By GARY NORRIS  
Of the Emerald

Pat Horton, Lane County district attorney Friday denied making "erroneous and misleading statements" at a Jan. 13 Oregon Government Ethics Commission hearing to investigate alleged unethical behavior on his part.

The hearing was requested by Eugene Attorney Charles Porter, who claims Horton and Deputy DA Thomas Meehan reached an improper plea-bargaining agreement with the attorney of a California man arrested for transporting cocaine.

The commission dismissed the complaint against Horton and Meehan, but Porter, in a Jan. 18 letter to the commission,

said Horton made "erroneous and misleading statements", and asked that the commission re-schedule his complaint.

According to Porter, Horton acted improperly by having the defendant, John Arthur, turn over a \$7,500 camper to the Lane Interagency Narcotics Team (LINT), and he misled the ethics commission by stating that Arthur had also agreed to return to California and work as an undercover narcotics agent for a year, which was not mentioned at Arthur's sentencing.

Horton called Porter's charges "a sham." He said the forfeiture of vehicles is provided for in the "narcotics forfeiture statute" either before or after a conviction has been obtained.

"I have no doubt that it (forfeiture of vehi-

cles) is within the law", Horton said.

Horton said the statute dates back to prohibition days when bootleggers used the state's highways, and was recently updated to apply to narcotic travelers.

Arthur had also agreed to do undercover work, Horton said, but he said no mention of that was made at the sentencing because, since sentencings are on the public record, identifying Arthur as an informant would have destroyed his cover.

"It was obviously a part of the agreement," Horton said. "I mean, why else would this guy mysteriously disappear, and then show up a year later for sentencing?"

However, Arthur's attorney John Halpern, has denied that Arthur agreed to be an informant.

"As his attorney, the agreement was made through me," Halpern said. "It was absolutely not a part of the plea agreement that Arthur work as an undercover agent for anyone."

The commission will consider Porter's request for a new hearing at its Feb. 23 meeting. But according to Lewis Hampton, commission chair, the only charge it can try Horton and Meehan for in this case is "use of public office for private financial gain."

"Based on what was before me then," Hampton said, "there was clearly no indication of private financial gain. Our concern was whether LINT was a for-profit corporation."