

GREG PORTER
Editor

BEN CORNELIUS, Managing Editor
ED RANKIN, Associate Editor
LOU BILIONIS, Associate Editor

LAURA SCISM, University Editor
ELLIOTT POTTER, City Editor
CHUCK ALSTON, State and National Editor

SARA BULLARD, Features Editor
CHIP ENSLIN, Arts Editor
GENE UPCHURCH, Sports Editor
ALLEN JERNIGAN, Photography Editor

The Daily Tar Heel
85th year of editorial freedom

Migrant laws not enforced; inspection neglected

Southern California, though much publicized, isn't the only place that migrant workers receive abuse. A hearing last weekend in Raleigh investigating migrant treatment in this state strongly suggested that laws protecting migrants need enforcement.

Witnesses testifying before the N.C. Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights repeatedly cited inadequate housing on North Carolina farms. And they cited one major reason — inspectors responsible for migrant camp conditions either did poor jobs or did not do their jobs at all.

Two state agencies, the Employment Security Commission (ESC) and the Dept. of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) are responsible for inspecting the camps. ESC supposedly certifies housing for occupancy before workers arrive, and OSHA inspects the camps later.

Thus migrants entering North Carolina each year are ostensibly assured of adequate housing. But, as the testimony Saturday pointed out, the two state agencies have totally ignored their responsibilities to the migrant farmer. And one ESC official even denied his agency's obligation as inspector. "I don't think the ESC should be responsible for housing," Chairperson Manfred Emmrich said. "We believe there should be adequate housing, but we're not housing inspectors."

It's obvious that the rest of Emmrich's agency do not believe they should dirty their hands with inspecting migrant housing. Florida Legal Services, which followed crews to North Carolina this summer and investigated 100 ESC-registered camps in two counties said, "categorically, no housing under investigation met regulations — none."

And of 153 camps issued permits by the ESC in the spring of 1977, 53 were later inspected by OSHA. All but 10 of those were cited for structural housing violations, according to the Center for Rural Studies in Durham. OSHA apparently is not willing to fill the void of pre-occupancy inspection left by the ESC.

What's crucial here is not a lack of legislation, but a lack of enforcement. Perhaps officials of the two agencies feel they don't have to answer to anybody and are free to choose what they want to enforce. The attorney general's office should issue a sterner reminder to the agencies that arbitrary enforcement of migrant laws will not be tolerated.

Noise ordinance needs reform

Party reputation jeopardized

Over the years *Playboy* magazine in its back-to-school issue has rated the top party schools in the country, and Carolina has ranked high in nearly every poll. One year, in fact, Tar Heels were said to be so far superior to the other collegians that *Playboy* ranked them alone in the "professional" party category, with all others falling in the amateur classification.

But in recent years Chapel Hill's professional partiers have been shackled with a hazy noise ordinance. Many times the men in blue have been summoned by neighbors to put a damper on an affair — even one designed to raise money for charities. And the judgment as to what is too loud is left totally up to the police.

Alderman Marvin Silver suggests the use of mechanical devices to measure volume, providing objective criteria for noise judgments. Such a plan has promise, but careful consideration must go into establishing the criteria. The distance of the measuring device from the noise in question must be spelled out. Different noise limits must be set for different hours of the day. For instance, most early afternoon parties should be allowed anything shy of breaking the sound barrier before they are quashed, while late-night extravaganzas should be more subdued.

Most importantly, however, it should be spelled out that no criteria are to be invoked until a legitimate complaint has been registered with the police by a person directly affected by the party. If a party is not distracting to its neighbors, there is no need to measure its sound output. We doubt the Chapel Hill police would want to monitor partiers who had inspired no complaints, but it is best that any new ordinance make clear there is no burden of enforcement on the police department until the phone starts ringing at headquarters. As they say on the basketball courts, "No harm, no foul."

The Daily Tar Heel

News: Tony Gunn, assistant editor; Mark Andrews, Jeff Collins, Meredith Crews, Shelley Droscher, Bruce Ellis, Mary Gardner, Grant Hamill, Stephen Harris, Kathy Hart, Nancy Harris, Keith Hollar, Steve Huettel, Jaci Hughes, Jay Jennings, Will Jones, Julie Knight, Eddie Marks, Amy McRary, Karen Millers, Beverly Mills, Beth Parson, Chip Pearsall, Bernie Ransbottom, Leslie Scism, Barry Smith, David Stacks, Robert Thomason, Howard Troxler, Mike Wade and David Watters.

News Desk: Reid Tuvim, assistant managing editor; Copy chief, Keith Hollar; Copy editors, Richard Barron, Jeff Brady, Amy Colgan, Dinita James, Carol Lee, Michele Mecke, Lisa Nieman, Dan Nobles, Dawn Pearson, Melinda Stovall, Melanie Topp and Larry Tupler.

Sports: Lee Pace, assistant editor; Evan Appel, Dede Biles, Skip Foreman, Tod Hughes, Dave Kirk, Pete Mitchell, Ken Roberts, Rick Scoppe, Will Wilson and Isabel Worthy.

Features: Jeff Brady, Zap Brueckner, David Craft, Debbie Moose, Dan Nobles, Lynn Williford, Peter Hapke, Tim Smith, Eita Lee, Kimberly McGuire, and Ken Roberts.

Arts and Entertainment: Hank Baker, Becky Burcham, Pat Green, Marianne Hansen, Libby Lewis and Valerie Van Arsdale.

Graphic Arts: Artists: Dan Brady, Allen Edwards, Cliff Marley, Jocelyn Pettibone, Lee Poole and John Tomlinson; Photographers: Fred Barbour, Joseph Thomas, Michael Sneed and Sam Fulwood.

Business: Verna Taylor, business manager; Claire Bagley, assistant business manager; Mike Neville, David Squires and Howard Troxler, circulation manager; Bill Bagley.

Advertising: Blair Kleitsch, manager; Dan Collins, sales manager; Carol Bedsole, assistant sales manager; Steve Crowell, classifieds manager; Julie Coston, Neal Kimball, Cynthia Lesley, Anne Sherril and Melanie Stokes.

Composition Editors: Frank Moore and Nancy Oliver.

Composition and Makeup: UNC Printing Dept. Robert Jasmkiewicz, supervisor; Robert Streeter, Gezane McMillan, Judy Dunn, Betty Ferebee, Carolyn Kuhn, Joni Peters, Steve Quakenbush, Duke Sullivan.

letters to the editor

UNC should hire professors to teach, not research

To the editor:
I have come to understand that the various departments of the University require each of their professors to spend a certain amount of time teaching, whether or not they are involved in research. Ostensibly this policy is sound, but perhaps the students sometimes suffer as a result.

Last year I had a certain professor who, although articulate and apparently very knowledgeable in her area, was extremely unsatisfactory. She openly admitted to a dislike of teaching, preferring to place a higher priority on research. As she pointed out, her department had forced her to spend some time on instruction. She was unresponsive to her students, especially if they interfered with her research time. In fact, she was plainly hostile toward the thought of going out of her way to help us. The course became almost intolerable due to the obvious tension between the professor and her students, and the course evaluations showed this. Yet she continues to teach.

Perhaps the University should allow such professors to concentrate solely on their research. But more intelligently, and more in keeping with the basic ideas of education, the University should not hire people who don't enjoy teaching. As my situation of last year indicates, the professors and the students both lose.

Bradley W. Jacks
550 James

Linebreakers low

To the editor:
I sure got sick and tired of watching people cut in front of the lines while waiting for tickets to the Richmond game Saturday. Sure I know the existing ticket distribution stinks, but cutting in front of people who started at the back of the line is pretty low. For those who cut in line, I hope you got a seat behind a 300-pound gorilla or better yet in front of a wasted Carolina fan who dumped his rum and coke on your head.

Larry Stumpf
12-R Kingswood Apts.

Banner suggestion

To the editor:
We, residents of Avery Dorm, can feel much sympathy for those residents of Melver who had their banner stolen at the game Saturday. Our banner was stolen also!

Many of us put a lot of thought, time, money and creativity into making our banner. We feel it could have placed in the top three. Yet, like Melver, our banner wasn't even given a chance. It, too, was taken prior to kick-off. And, we would like to have it returned.

We know these incidents are not the fault of the cheerleaders (the judges); they can't



help what the fans do. However, we have a suggestion which, if they choose to follow, may eliminate these problems at future games. We propose that a place be designated for the banners to be taken before the game. They can be judged at that time, and then hung up afterwards. The winner can still be announced at halftime, and if the winning banner has been taken down, the prize can still be awarded. This way, the participating students don't suffer if their banner is "ripped off."

Signed by six residents of Avery Dorm

Cops smoked weed?

To the editor:
I, who among my peers wishes to help uphold the law, must protest the actions of the two policemen at High Noon. Laws do not make sense when those that are expected to uphold the laws break them. I don't approve of marijuana smoking, and I don't

like seeing policemen, as I and those like me who passed by the Bell Tower saw, smoking pot. I would encourage the University to look into this.

Joseph Cantrell
112 Avery Dorm

Opinion not representative

To the editor:
Last week there appeared a letter in the *Daily Tar Heel* by Mr. David Schnare ridiculing Mayor Wallace and the North Carolina Conservation Board for their opposition to the proposed Jordan Dam project ("Mayor Wallace, conservation board behind Jordan Dam controversy," Letters, Sept. 15). We believe some very misleading and irresponsible statements were made by Mr. Schnare. Mr. Schnare does not, as he states, "... represent those

people; people who, having most of the data, having heard most of the opinions, ... must continue to be responsible for putting this controversy in proper light." Mr. Schnare is a graduate student in the Dept. of Environmental Sciences and Engineering with one opinion concerning this controversy. There are professors and many other graduate students in this very department who disagree with Mr. Schnare's interpretation of the scientific data, especially that concerning anticipated water quality and potential as a drinking water supply, as well as his overall assessment of the project's value or lack of value. To state or even imply that Mr. Schnare "represents" our views or those of "responsible technical experts" is completely irresponsible. One would hope that Mr. Schnare learns his responsibilities before completing his degree.

Signed by 13 persons in the Dept. of Environmental Sciences and Engineering

Higher student fees?

Argument against increase flimsy and deceptive

By **BILL FAIRBANKS**
AND **DAVID WEYNAND**

Most UNC students will certainly agree that one of the most amusing moments of the day comes when they pick up the *Daily Tar Heel* and turn to the legendary back page.

All too frequently they'll find some earnest columnist-to-be has chosen a topic, designated himself expert and decided to enlighten most everybody by gracing this rear page with some delightfully presumptuous comedy of errors.

Bruce Tindall's column against raising student fees ("A little here, a little there," Sept. 14) is a masterpiece of such illogic. Mr. Tindall obviously lacks both rhetorical talent and common sense as his arguments against a student fee increase are riddled with fallacies. Let's take a close look at his "arguments."

First, he suggests that the Campus Governing Council (CGC) should encourage groups to do more fund raising on their own. With approximately 200 recognized student groups on campus, we could enjoy 47 bake sales, 11 car washes, six carnivals, 118 raffles and 29 bingo games each week. Each week? Well how much do you think the average bake sale or car wash makes? Experience shows \$50 would be a bonanza. So if one group wants \$1,000, they would hold 20 activities; with 200 clubs that's only 4,000 events per year.

Second, Mr. Tindall tells us CGC should stop knuckling under to groups that demand "\$10,000 or else." But a few lines later, Bruce mysteriously advocates more funds for the Black Student Movement (BSM) — recall that the BSM was the group with the "or else" demand. What a convenient — and contradictory — lapse of memory.

Third, Bruce says the CGC should take a closer look at who benefits from the groups it gives money to. Sounds reasonable. But then in the next paragraph, Mr. Tindall advocates giving more money to "groups which serve the student body at large" such as the Association for Women Students, the North Carolina Student Legislature and the Fine Arts Festival. We seriously question how many students benefit from these organizations. An obvious minority, no doubt. Certainly, a diverse number of clubs can cater to more students than just the few mentioned by Bruce.

Fourth, Mr. Tindall mentions the "plush" offices in Suite C, with electric typewriters and a "fat" phone budget. Bruce once again fails to reveal the other side of the coin. Plush office by whose standards? By our standards, the offices are rather simple, and quite overcrowded too. And we suppose they should have rickety, antiquated manual typewriters and no phone. Tell us, Bruce, just how can you efficiently run the volume of business that goes through Student Government without the necessary supplies?

Fifth, Mr. Tindall presents us with a slippery-slope argument: "A little for telephone, a little for electricity,

... ad absurdum. In all fairness, two major points should be made. First, let's differentiate between the telephone and power increases, and the fee increase. We obviously receive no benefit from the former (in fact, one could argue that the utility service is getting worse), while we do stand to gain from a student-fee increase. An important distinction, Mr. Tindall. Second, if we do as Mr. Tindall says: not give a little more now, cut funding for all but the largest groups, and encourage fund raising by other clubs, all students would suffer more than a "little." Even Bruce and his SAFE (Students Against Fees Excess) organization might dislike the swarm of fund raisers that would come knocking at his door — magazines, seeds,

