# IFC funds the EMU child care center

The Incidental Fee Committee reversed an earlier decision and allocated money for the director of the EMU child care center during Tuesday night's budget hearings.

Bob Schutz, business manager of the EMU, asked IFC members to reconsider their decision Monday night not to fund the director's salary. He said reorganization within the EMU will combine the EMU Child Care Center and the Child Care and Development Center (CCDC), and the loss of funds would hinder that effort and increase child care costs.

The reorganization would also convert CCDC from a full or half-day program to an hourly schedule plan, said Schutz, enabling more students to use the ASUO child care programs.

"Reorganization alone will not change the ratio of student to community parents using the center," said Wanda Venturacci, director of CCDC. But more student-parents will use the center if hourly rates are charged instead of daily rates, she added.

The IFC allocated CCDC's request of $31,443 in addition to funds for the EMU child care director after warning child care supporters in the hearing room that child care costs will soon be beyond IFC support.

"There will be a time and a place when child care will be way too expensive for us to fund," said IFC member Harry Ricks.

The IFC allocated a supplemental request of $870 to the Senior Quacks for a senior ball. The money is on a 100 percent payback plan to the IFC.

The EMU Outdoor Program received its request for $14,486 with little debate.

IFC hearings will continue through Thursday. The complete IFC budget, with vetoes by ASUO Pres. Ramon Herrera, is due May 4 at the ASUO executive office, from which it will be forwarded to University Pres. William Boyd.

## Tuition

(Continued from Page 1A)

of this tuition increase, then the plan would not yield all of the projected $1.3 million.

Consequently, resident undergraduate tuition could not be reduced to the 23 percent level.

At the subcommittee's special hearing on the "110 percent plan" last Thursday, Jim Bernau, executive director of the OSL, asked Saalfeld about the calculations that went into the plan.

Saalfeld responded by shrugging his shoulders, according to Bernau.

He was then asked about a statement made April 9 when Atiyeh said "A 110 percent increase is simply too big an increase for any student to bear, regardless of category."

Again, Saalfeld responded to a question regarding what had been viewed as his plan by shrugging his shoulders.

After the meeting, Bernau talked at length with Saalfeld.

"He was visibly upset," Bernau says. "His fists were clenched and his face was red. The gist of what he said was that the 100 percent proposal was the chancellor's plan and that he had nothing to do with it. He indicated that he wasn't involved in the calculations."

Saalfeld, however, contends it is "absolutely untrue that I was upset. There was no way anyone could have reached that conclusion."

When asked if the 110 percent plan originated in the governor's office, Saalfeld replied, "It is being *promoted* by the governor's office, yes."

He responded with a "no comment" when asked if the plan had been conceived in the chancellor's office and passed along to Atiyeh — a fact neither of the latter two disputes.

Last Friday, one day after the hearing, Sen. Ed Fadeley, D-Eugene, asked his legislative assistant to trace the history of the proposal, one Fadeley assumed had come from the governor's office.

A call was made to Stoddard Malarkey, the state board's lobbyist, who came immediately Fadeley's office. When told that the 110 percent plan had come from the chancellor, Malarkey appeared visibly shaken, according to those present.

He also stated that "the governor and Bernie (Saalfeld) had a number of options to chose from and they chose the worst one," according to notes of the conversation.

Fadeley, a member of the subcommittee, remains undecided on the issue, but says he is dissatisfied with the apparent communication breakdowns.

"If it's true that the plan came from the chancellor, I'm going to be irritated with both of them (the chancellor and the governor)," Fadeley warns. "And when we asked the chancellor to consult the board for alternatives, he should have told us that the first plan came from his office also. We had no notion that the governor's plan was really the chancellor's plan."

Lieuallen acknowledges that the increase for foreign graduates was one of a number of options to the governor at Atiyeh's request.

"I have no reluctance to admit that," he says.

Though Lieuallen refers to the options he presented as a "shopping list," he says no actual list was compiled and that he had nothing to do with the calculations.

"I simply didn't raise the attrition factor,' he explains. "I should have but I didn't. But the governor made the selections. The board then came back and said 'we'd prefer others.'"

Atiyeh's background in the nuances of tuition policy may be suspect to some. But the governor maintains he and Lieuallen agreed in concept on the tuition for foreign graduates. It was their staffs that worked out the projections. This seems to contradict Saalfeld's reported claims that he had "nothing to do with the plan."

And though Lieuallen says he and Atiyeh sat down and discussed his "shopping list," the governor claims he can't remember if the chancellor was even in the room at the time.

"There are serious implications to this," Bernau says. "We don't have all the information, but what we do know spells trouble. And I'm going to get to ths bottom of this."

## Lobbyist

(Continued from Page 1A)

IFC members Scott Bassett and Rhodes said the discussion cleared the OSL of the charges made by Friedman, while Maria Rojo, Harry Ricks and Rocky Schatz said that they felt the OSL was doing a good job for students. Eggleston called the meeting "a waste of the IFC's time," adding that she still had doubts about the OSL's credibility and only voted for the allocation because a "program like the OSL needs to exist for students."