encouraged to do their natural and moral function – parent their chil-dren giving as much time and effort as they can. Children not only need both upper decoarsely them.

rents desperately, they

Pay back taxpayers

was intrigued with your headline in the Nov. 23 edition of your paper (Board seeks help in spending money). From the tone of the article

one would get the impression that, magically, \$9.5 million had simply been given to the Farmington Hills school district.

Might I point out that this is not

a zero sum windfall? This money is supposedly to make up for under-funding by the state for various

funding by the state for various mandated programs. The programs were not dropped, the money was spent. That money came from everyone of us taxpayers in this district. The sensible solution seems to be Let's Pay Ourselves Back! Hopefully no one has forgotten a few months ago we passed a huge bond issue. We have voted to tax curselyes 'EN million' to pay off this

ourselves \$93 million to pay off this debt. Placing this "magical" \$9.5 million as the down payment on that debt service would seem a pru-

that debt service would seem a pro-dent thing to do.

Doesn't it irritate everyone of us to know that, left to themselves, we know the school beard isn't going to make this one of the options they

suggest? Let's make sure a lot of us

suggest it to them.

Richard F. Stoc
Farmington Hills

Ronald Oliverio Farmington Hills

LETTERS

Kids need both parents

ff n 1992, deadbeat dads owed nearly \$34 billion to their 23 million children." And "49 percent default on their child support agreements" according to a column written July 29, 1994, by Ellen Goodman. This has been universally accepted until recently as fact. It was based on Theoretical Mathematical Models and not based on cold hard facts. The real facts are as follows; the Current Population Reports by the U.S. Census Bureau Reports by the U.S. Census Bureau puts that figure at \$14.8 billion dol-lars owed. Seventy-five percent or 11.1 billion has been paid. That leaves \$3.7 billion owed, a far cry from \$34 billion! Current information from multiple sources indicate 10 percent of non-custodial fathers fit the "deadbeat dad" categor Fathers with joint custody pay 90.2 percent of ordered child support, ones with visitation pay 79.1 percent and 44.5 percent of those wit NO visitation rights still support their children, (source; US Census Bureau report, Series P-23, No.

The problem is the \$34 billion dollar figure is still accepted as correct and politicians need to be educated about the correct figures. While we condemn the current multi billion dollars owed in back with the correct and politicians need to be educated about the correct multi-

multi billion dollars owed in back child support, the figures do not warrant the type of treatment responsible yet financially strapped non-custodial parents are receiving. Furthermore, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala has said that with increased enforcement \$50 billion in back tild support can be collected (Wall child support can be collected. (Wall Street Journal, March 2, 1995). Yet in that same article they take a hard look at the figures and come to a much different conclusion. In the overnment's Annual Child Support leport of 1992 the figures were at \$10.9 billion owed in court ordered child support, of that, \$6 billion had been paid. That left less than \$5 bil-lion owed! Of the \$5 billion owed 30 percent of those owing are in jail and as many as one-third of the prisoners in county jail are in for

non-payment of child-support. Many of the other "dead beat fathers" are addicts, alcoholics, disabled, mental-ly incapacitated, unemployed (or ly incapacitated, unemployed (or underemployed), or otherwise unable to pay court ordered child support. However the largest number of those that owe back child support simply do not exist. In 1992 the General Accounting Office (GAO) found 14 percent of fathers who owe back child support are dead. In a 1991 Consumbary Bergan study found 1991 Census Bureau study found half of all fathers received no visita-tion order. When fathers receive vistion order, when nathers receive use intation almost 80 percent pay all court ordered child support. When they receive joint custody the figure jumps to 90 percent, 'est joint custody is awarded in around 10 percent. cent of all divorce cases. According to two independent studies 40 to 50 percent of all mothers interfere or block meaningful access to the children. "Given this documented condren. Given this documented con-nection between father's access to his children and the payment of child support, why does Washington seem intent on punishing the father? What about the mother who creates a climate encouraging non-compliance?" (Wall Street Journal March 2, 1995). The Clinton Administration has since backed off on

Donna Shalala's figures.

We have witnessed over the years a campaign of misinformation, outa campaign or misintermation, out-right lies, ignorance of the facts, gender bashing, political pasteuriz-ing and vindictive attitudes in all levels of this "problem." The ques-tion that needs to be asked are at what cost to family, children and society? Is this new generation of children from broken families see children from broken families seeing this type of governmental attitude and enforcement going to
result in the type of citizens we
want to raise? Or is it going to have
some far reaching effects that could
ultimately result in a social decay
and increased government intrusion
in our daily lives to the point were the freedoms we enjoy now become a memory? While these questions can't be answered, nevertheless it is something to think about.

Having received physical custody of my oldest son at the time of my

POINTS OF VIEW divorce (despite the interference from the Oakland Friend of the Court which very, very rarely recom-mends physical custody to fathers) I can uniquely appreciate both sides of the custody issue. Instead of reducing fathers and in rare cases mothers to the role of "disitor" in their children's lives, they should be Trustee choice needs review

or decades, political insiders have been shaking their heads in won-der at Michigan's odd and virtual-ly unique system of selecting members of major education boards.

By state constitutional mandate, candidates for the State Board of Education and for the boards of the Big Three universities — University of Michigan,
Michigan State and Wayne State — are nominated at party state conventions and elected statewide on the partisan ballot in November.

The usual result is that those so

selected are virtually unknown and ignored by a news media preoccupied with other races. This lends a random quality to the outcome of elections, with winners generally riding on the contails of Democratic or Republican candidates.

tails of Democratic or Republican candi-dates for governor or president.

That's too bad, because these boards, have a considerable impact on Michigan public policy and shouldn't be selected merely on somebody else's contrails.

The State Board of Education, for The State Board of Education, for instance, oversees the contentious charter school experiment, while the U-M Board of Regents is at the center of the far-reaching lawsuit challenging the university's practice of using affirmative action in admissions decisions in order

action in admissions decisions in order to achieve a diverse student body. This system has worked pretty well in practice. The key to making the process work has been sensible and far-sighted board members who, in advance agrical board memoers who, in advance of conventions, have recruited able can-didates and worked to wire the conven-tions by selling their candidates to the

tions by selling their candidates to the party leaders and interest groups. Sometimes the system doesn't work. Absent good early candidates and a pre-wired convention, there is an urge to play ticket balancing or interest group politics. The Republican Party has expe-rienced considerable trouble with educa tional nominations, in part because the tional nominations, in part because the solitical litmus test required of all canpolitical litmus test required of all cal didates by Right to Life, the predomi-nant interest group in the GOP, is an unquestioned anti-abortion position.

Two years ago, for instance, Judy
Frey, an experienced civic worker from
Grand Rapids, was recruited by Gov.
John Engler to run for the U-M board.



Engler even gave her nominating speech. But Frey lost the nomination to specen. But Frey lost the nomination to Mike Bishop, an unknown lawyer from Rochester Hills whose main claim to fame was serving as president of his fraternity while an undergraduate at U-M. The issue was abortion. Frey was pro-choice; Bishop, whose late entry into the race was orchestrated by Right to Life and the religious right, was pro-life.

Life and the religious right, was pro-life. Sen. John Schwarz, the leading leg-

Sen. John Schwarz, the leading legislative authority on higher education, is angry about it. Schwarz argues that it is "not only wrong but absolutely wrong" to choose university trustees solely on or the services they have rendered to occupate a party interest; groups.

or the services they have rendered to powerful party interest groups. Schwarz, who chairs the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on higher education, wants to do something about it. At a recent meeting of the Michigan Association of Governing Boards of State Universities, Schwarz proposed a 1 statute specifying primaries rather than conventions for nominating candidates for state university poets. Legislation could take immediate effect without a progressing the state Constitution.

could take immediate effect without amending the state Constitution. Sen. Schwarz has performed an important service by bringing into focus an important speet of the soft underbelly of Michigan politics. His ideas deserve a fair, robust hearing. Phil Power, a member of the University of Michigan Board of Regents, is chairman of HomeTown Communications Network, Inc., the company that owns this newspaper. He welcomes your owns this newspaper. He welcomes your comments, either by voice mail at (313) 953-2047, ext. 1880, or by e-mail at ppower@oeonline.com.

Political parallels connect adversaries Young, Patterson

either would probably acknowledge it.
But there are striking similarities
between Oakland County Executive L.
Brooks Patterson and former Detroit Mayor
Coleman A. Young, who died Saturday.

They never ran against each other, but they were contemporaries — although opposites politically. But Young, 79, and Patterson, 58, ponteany, but rough, for and raterious, of, were intelligent, strong, willed individuals—fiercely committed to the people who elected them, loyal to friends and disdainful of enemies. To the delight of their respective audiences and the media, each knew the art of public.

speaking, capable of turning a phrase or skew-

when asked if he saw any parallels between him and the former mayor of Detroit, Patterson responded: "God, I hope not." I never got the chance to ask Young the same question, but I suspect he would have reacted much the same.

But consider this: ■ Both had deep root in Detroit, where much of their egos were

shaped.

Both at one time attended Catholic schools. The University of Detroit High School Patterson's alma mater
— was one of three high
schools that refused to Coleman Young grant Young an academic scholarship, even though he had top grades coming out of St. Mary's ele-

mentary.

Young subsequently graduated from Eastern
High School where he was second in his class.
Patterson went on to the University of Detroit
and the University of Detroit Law School.

Both were in the Arrhy Although he never
attended college, Young was a second licutenant
during World War I and a Tuskegee Airman.
Pattorson was an enlisted man in the early
1960s never to law school. , prior to law school.

1960s, prior to law school.

Beth men had distinguished careers before being elected chief executive of their political domains. Young was a delegate to Michigan's Constitutional Convention and he was elected to the State Senate in 1964. He was Democratic floor leader and subsequently the first black on the Democratic betieng! Committee. the Democratic National Committee.

Patterson was Oakland County prosecutor for 15 years, carning a reputation for being tough on crime . . . and welfare cheats.



PAT MURPHY

■ At the age of 54, Patterson became chief ecutive of one of the most wealthy counties in

the United States in 1992, beating Betty Howe.
Young was 55, when elected mayor of Detroit
in 1973, six years after the disastrous riot that
accelerated the flight of whites and businesses

to the suburbs.

Young did little to reverse that flight, and the loss of tax base which, coupled with the oil embargo and recession in the auto industry,

embargo and recession in the auto industry, made Detroit perhaps the most distressed city in North America.

Both were political heavyweights. Patterson — "Mr. Republican" in some circles — is frequently mentioned as a possible successor to Gov. John Engler. Should Engler make it to the White House, Patterson's access and clout could approach that enjoyed by Young under the Jimmy Carter administration.

Young and Patterson are sometimes regarded as racists, particularly by the other's onstituenc

Young had fought for racial equality for

Young had fought for racial equality for blacks — something some whites, particularly those north of Eight Mile Road, saw as racist.

As a brash young prosecutor in the 1970s, Patterson was vehemently against school busing — something some blacks, particularly those south of Eight Mile, considered to be racist. Young had 79 colorful years in which to make his mark. He won the love and admiration of some and the disdain and animosity of others. Patterson rules Oakland County, But at 58, he's a work in progress. He too is loved and admired, and he too is disliked and sometimes misunderstood.

isunderstood.

Both men will be remembered for a long time.

Pat Murphy, Oakland County reporter for the Observer & Eccentric Newspapers, covered Young during his mayoral campaign in 1973 amd L. Brooks Patterson as county executive.



M. Ed. for Ms.s, Mrs.s, and Mr.s! Graduate opportunities in the School of Education

Are you interested in improving your professional standing? It has never been easier. The U of M-Dearborn School of Education offers four 30-credit-hour master's degree grams in Education, Special Education, Public Administration, and Adult Instruction and The U of M-Dearborn School of Education, Special Education, Public Administration, and Adult Instruction ar Performance Technology, Classes are scheduled in the evening for the convenience of working adults. Our creative and experienced faculty are experts in the most current theories and practices in a variety of fields. We are small enough to serve your individual needs, but large enough to offer you a variety of educational options.

From Uof M-Dearborn. Closer than you thought possible.

MA in Education (Endorsement opportunitie including Early Childhood Middle Level (gr. 5-9) and Reading Specialist (K-12)) (313) 593-5091

Management) (313) 436-9135

MEd. Special Education (Learning Disabilities and Emotionally Impaired) (313) 436-9135

Adult Instruction and Performance Technology (MA Degree and Certificate Program) Program) (313) 593-5091

Post-baccalaureate education programs (313) 593-5090

Winter enrollment starts January 7. Visit our web site on the Internet at www.umd.umich.edu/univ/grad. winter entoliment starts january 1. Visit our web site on the internet at www.ind.unied.edu/mygrad.

For further details and an application portfolio, please call the specific office for your gnaduate programs.

For general information about our other programs, call the Graduate Studies Office at (313) 593-1494.

Or send an E-mail: umdgrad@umd.umich.edu. We're conveniently located at

4901 Evergreen Rd., Dearborn, MI 48128-1491.