

- Complaints have been aired against higher tuition fees of Private Universities when these are said to be highly profitable to their owners.

NEEDED RESTRAINT ON PROFIT SCHOOLS

A lot has been written about private schools raising their tuition fees. To begin with we must say that it would be a great mistake to lump all private schools under one category. We must distinguish between the schools that are non-stock and non-profit from those that declare fat dividends and whose main reason for being is profits. When we were Secretary of Education we were never strict in so far as the non-stock and non-profit schools are concerned. These schools are doing the country a great service, and if they were to cease operation it would be no exaggeration to say that our entire educational system — particularly on the secondary and collegiate level — would suffer a blow from which they would never recover. These institutions need all the help they can from the administration. It is unfair to accuse them of profiteering. Yet

this is exactly what is happening today. Instead of acknowledging the great service that they are doing for the cause of education, they are being branded as profiteers.

The Administration should get tough with the schools that have been established for profits. They should pass a law to limit the dividends of these institutions. It is very difficult to establish an educational institution for profit, and still maintain standards, although we must admit that some universities have succeeded in doing both fairly well. The best example is the University of the East. But this is not an easy task. Why? Because what makes a good educational institution and what makes a good business are two entirely opposite factors. It is the large per capita investment per student that is the foundation of a good college and

university. Investments in a good faculty and educational facilities. A good business, on the other hand, is where you invest little and derive a large profit.

The only way to classify private schools is to separate the profit ones from the non-profit ones. The non-profit schools should be given a free hand — so long as they follow the rules and regulations that the government should clamp down on.

The University of the Philippines, for instance, spends ₱2,200 a year per student. This is double the tuition of the Ateneo and La Salle, which is only ₱1,100 per annum. The Department of Education is always talking about standards. Yet, it obviously expects these institutes of higher learning to maintain their high standards of excellence at half of what it cost the U.P.

If we want to have a high standard of education, we must be willing and ready to pay the price for it. It is the job the Department of

Education to educate the public on the facts of the high cost of education. We maintain that it is unfair to accuse non-profit schools of profiteering. These schools should be helped — not condemned. As for the commercial schools, it is about time that steps were taken so that they would be things of the past.

Education costs money. This week's issue of *Time* is about the spiralling cost of education. What is true in the United States is also true here. There is no such thing as a bargain basement when it comes to education. If the non-profit schools find it necessary to raise their tuition in order to maintain their standards, they should be allowed to do so. The Department of Education should concern itself with standards — not fees. Clamp down on profit schools, and help the non-profit ones. That should be the policy. — *Alejandro R. Roces, Manila Chronicle, June 27, 1967*