opinion

ours

Tuition plans would hurt all

Foreign graduate students have become the latest victims of a budgetary squeeze play executed by Gov. Victor Atiyeh.

Last week the governor released a revised tuition policy that would lower from 19 to 9 percent the proposed increase in undergraduate tuition next year. That would be accompanied, however, by a 110 percent increase in the instructional fees paid by foreign students enrolled in master's and doctoral programs.

Atiyeh opined that Oregon receives "minimum benefit" from foreign students because most of them return to their home countries after an education here.

While the smaller rise in educational costs for undergraduates would come as a relief for many — and more accurately reflect the rise in the cost of living — that part of the proposal involving foreign students, of which the University has fewer than 700, seems unfair and short-sighted.

Foreign graduate students now pay the same tuition as others from outside the state. These non-Oregonians already shoulder a larger proportion of the costs of their instruction than resident graduates and undergraduates — 38 percent compared to 29 and 25 percent, respectively.

Differentials in the proportion of costs paid by nonresidents and residents appear defensible — although not necessarily at the higher levels suggested by Atiyeh — because the latter contribute less in the taxes that support Oregon's educational system.

But the governor's distinction between foreign students and other nonresidents is a spurious one.

Like the foreign graduates, most students from other states return to their homes after their Oregon educations. Yet the governor doesn't suggest that they provide "minimal benefits" to the state.

Moreover, foreign students bring diverse cultural backgrounds and perspectives that can only enrich the educational experience of the American students sharing classes with them. This highly desirable benefit would be lost if foreign students seeking an American education abandon Oregon for less discriminatory colleges in other states.

theirs

'OF COURSE, WE WILL HAVE PROVISIONS IN THE FINAL DRAFT TO PROTECT YOU FROM EACH OTHER...

Peace no panacea for Carter

By WALTER M. MEARS
AP Special Correspondent

WASHINGTON — President Carter believes that posterity may rank the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel as the most significant event of his presidency. But that won't help him much in 1980.

The first measure of voter reaction to the treaty Carter engineered seems to indicate that the political benefits are negligible.

Carter's successful mission to Jerusalem and Cairo, concluded Monday with the treaty signing at the White House, has won increased respect for his foreign policy leadership. But Americans seem much more interested in the price of food and a gallon of gasoline.

An Associated Press-NBC News poll showed half the people surveyed would not like to see Carter run for re-election next year. Thirty-eight percent said they do want him to run, and the rest weren't sure.

Of course Carter already is running, although he has not formally declared his 1980 candidacy. His standing in the polls may well improve as the campaign nears and the choice narrows, so that it is not a question of weighing him against everyone else but of choosing between the incumbent president and specific rival candidates.

Still, the AP-NBC News poll conducted March 19 and 20 among 1,600 adult Americans came after a successful, widely publicized and generally popular foreign mission, the kind of thing that usually enhances the standing of a president.

Yet his job rating stood still. Twenty-nine percent of the people called it good or excellent in mid-March, just as they had a month before. Fifty percent said Carter's performance as president is only fair, 18 percent said poor, and the rest weren't sure.

On energy, 35 percent said his work is only fair and 47 percent called it poor. On the economy, 82 percent said he was only fair to poor.

Those are the problems that will plague Carter in the coming campaign, and people expect them to get worse. Seventy-two percent said inflation will be more severe in the year ahead. Seventy percent said they think talk of a gasoline shortage is a hoax, intended to get higher prices.

Carter's coming energy report, and the policy that flows from it, will have a lot more impact on the voters than will the treaty, even though most people see the treaty as a plus for the United States.