

emerald

Extension service reaps vocal support



Photo by Mark Pynes

Melissa Rose, a sophomore at Junction City High School, spoke in support of the county's agricultural extension program.

By Marian Green
Of the Emerald

Cowboy hats and boots were appropriate attire at the Lane County Budget Committee meeting Thursday night, where more than 300 county residents — mostly ranchers, farmers and 4-H participants — jammed Harris Hall protesting the proposed elimination of the county's extension program from the 1982-83 budget.

The meeting continued a Monday night county budget committee hearing on the 1982-83 proposed \$107 million budget.

The Lane County Extension Service, which provides many agriculture-related services, including grass seed certification, is one of three programs targeted for elimination in the 1983-84 year's \$107 million budget. The Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for predator control are the other two.

Under the budget proposal, the county also plans to ask voters to increase its \$4.17 million tax base by \$10 million on May 18.

The service, run by Oregon

State University, gets 15 percent — approximately \$150,000 — from the county for operating and administrative expenses and receives the balance of about \$850,000 from the state and federal governments, said Mike Stults, an agent for the extension's agriculture program.

More than 50 people signed up to give testimony in support of the extension service — especially its 4-H program.

"It's a super discount for the county," said Susan Chatwood, a 4-H leader with four children participating in the program. "It helps to keep children educated."

"They're keeping their heads and their hands busy, and when they're busy, you don't have to put as much money in the juvenile delinquency program."

Chatwood said more than 8,000 Lane County children are 4-H participants.

Melissa Rose, a sophomore at Junction City High School, said she's gained responsibility and self-assurance skills from her four years in the 4-H program. She said many 4-H members are student body leaders and class presidents.

Scott Bender, a Junction City

County Commissioner Otto t'Hooff, who also sits on the budget committee, said the decision of whether to continue to fund the program is a difficult one.

"If we actually do face a \$10 million deficit, what would you do if the decision comes down to, say, law enforcement or extension service?"

He added, however, "you are high on the priority list of the committee."

Commission Chairman Harold Rutherford said the committee probably would recommend restoring the program.

"This is the type of service the county should be providing, where we have the opportunity to multiply each dollar," Rutherford said.

farmer, said his 10 years in 4-H started him off on his farming and ranching career.

"I'm very proud to be a farmer," said Bender, attired in a plaid shirt, Levi's, cowboy boots and a "Northwest Ag Show" hat. "I started with a rabbit and now my net worth is about \$20,000."

"This is what they (Lane County) get out of it. They get me with \$20,000, and I'm being taxed."

Defense department funds finance research

By Debbie Howlett
Of the Emerald

Some research administrators at the University are speaking out in defense of the burgeoning defense budget Pres. Ronald Reagan is asking of Congress.

The big-bucks defense budget is a boon to the financial situation of University research, say at least four administrators, because it allows the military to increase its expenditures everywhere, including research grants.

An article in a University research newsletter reads, "Aid for defense research and development climbed 22 percent in the last two years, non-defense research funds dropped 16 percent."

Announcements like this have caused University faculty, hungry for research money, to sit up and take notice of the growing availability of funds through defense grants.

"We're trying to keep as much of the Federal government's money coming in as we can," says Charlene Curry, the University's research information officer.

"It's not that I'm so enamored with the defense department," says Curry, "it's just that that's where the money is."

Out of a \$2.1 million physics research budget, an estimated 20 percent comes from the



Graphic by Max DeRungs

Department of Defense, says Bernd Crasemann, head of the physics department.

Not only do the research funds seem to be less constricted, the defense department's guidelines on applicable research projects also have loosened. Curry says that the "Mansfield Amendment" was a major foothold to easing those restrictions.

The Mansfield Amendment allows "a potential applicability" for the research project, rather than immediate results.

Despite the looser federal guidelines, the University has tightened its stance on what they will allow to be funded, says Aaron Novick, head of the University biology department.

"The faculty passed legislation in the late sixties and the

early seventies not to allow classified research at the University," Novick says.

"It poisons the nature of the University — you can't have a University and have secret research," Novick says.

Novick also says that the "majority" of the faculty are opposed to "building bombs" at the University.

"There's no sympathy on this faculty for secret research — maybe there are one or two that feel it's okay but not many more."

The prohibition of classified research, both for the government and the private sector, is not unique to this university.

Rod Frakes, the associate dean of research at Oregon State University, says that he isn't sure if there is an actual

rule, but standard policy prohibits classified research for defense grants. However, Frakes says that a few people are screened for classification of some private research.

If not bombs, then what kind of Department of Defense-funded research goes on at the University?

Curry says that the grants supplied to the University by the defense department are proposals that "build on something that's already there."

One example of research "that's already there" is a project by research associate Dale Grace.

"Dale raises grasshoppers," says Curry. "I'm not sure specifically what he does,

but I believe that he studies their movements for use in tanks. They can walk up the sides of walls and the Army would love to have a tank that could do that."

Crasemann says that he believes some people may be opposed to grants supplied by the defense department because they can't justify it morally. "I respect people's views," he says, "but obviously you reduce your chances for funding."

"I have been here since '53," says Crasemann, adding that he's had a grant from one source or another every year since then.

Outside support comes from many areas, \$30.6 billion worth across the nation, says Crasemann. Of that amount, 44 percent is from the defense department.

At the national basic research level, which is the type of work done at the University, the defense department percentage drops sharply. Only 10 percent of the \$4.6 billion spent comes from the defense department.

The University's share of that 10 percent amounts to about \$175,000.

In 1979-80, defense grants at the University totaled almost \$188,000, in 1980-81, the period in which Pres. Ronald Reagan stepped into office, that figure dipped to about \$176,000.