

editorial

The UAB referendum scheduled so late in the year is suspect on two counts. First, why has it taken this long for the UAB to identify its projected shortfall? Shouldn't the need for a fee increase of almost 50% be evident at a much earlier stage? And what about priorities for the spending that makes the increase necessary? There is some confusion about where the money will be spent and what will happen if the referendum is turned down.

The UAB's preliminary budget for 1979-80 was released this week; it detailed the projected expenses given an eight-dollar fee increase. Clearly the net gains will go to the high-profile, expensive intercollegiate teams — and of those, the men's teams. Though preliminary, this budget must be considered seriously because it is produced as evidence of the immediacy of the UAB's financial predicament. Without the increase, the UAB warns, the present levels of programming will suffer.

The preliminary budget is also important because, historically, final budgets are preliminary budgets with minor adjustments. So, while the figures released this week are admittedly tentative, they are a good indication of the UAB's ultimate priorities.

The problem arises when the possibility of living without the extra \$8 is discussed. When potential cutbacks are cited, it's the intramural — not the intercollegiate — program that apparently is being threatened. Now, if intercollegiate sports are the priority for extra funding, then the lack of money should not be taken out on intramural activities. Participants and supporters of the intramural program should not be blackmailed.

The referendum will likely be supported by them anyway. But if intramurals do not stand to gain as much as they're subtly being told they'll lose, perhaps these supporters should re-evaluate their position. And get some guarantees in advance. Intramural sports are not the priority for extra-funding and the referendum should not be touted as the intramural last stand.

It still seems funny that the UAB didn't begin this referendum campaign sooner. With barely a week to organize there's bound to be misinformation, accusations, and innuendo surrounding the question of increasing the UAB fee from \$17 to \$25. Therefore some additional facts must also be considered.

Don't forget, the U of A has a fine athletic facility, good intercollegiate teams and a better-than-most intramural program. If the referendum passes our athletic fees, at \$25, will still be reasonable — about the national average. And that includes the above average returns on our investment. This is all based on the fact that every U of A student will *not* draw on the privileges he/she pays for.

Unfortunately for the UAB every undergrad student is subject to the levy and is eligible to vote in the referendum. Some are already disgruntled with the mandatory fee.

It is up to the UAB — in the short time left — to first justify the internal allocation of the proposed increase. That is, it must make minimal guarantees to both the intercollegiate and especially the intramural budgets. Then it must promise to budget over a longer term. That way future increases can be predicted and adequately discussed. And program priorities can be made explicit.

Otherwise if another eleventh hour referendum is called, it will not only be suspected, it will be rejected.

Loreen Lennon

the Gateway

VOL. LXIX NO. 44
FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1979
SIXTEEN PAGES

If it happens on campus...it's news to us.

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. With a circulation of 18,500, the Gateway is published by its proprietor, the Students' Union, Tuesdays and Fridays during the winter session. Contents are the responsibility of the editor; editorials are written by the editorial board or signed. All other opinions are signed by the party expressing them. Copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. The Gateway, a member of Canadian University Press and the Youthstream Network, is located at room 282 SUB, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2J7.
Newsroom 432-5168
Advertising 432-3423

Ron Thomas, Fran Treheane, Alison Thomson, Keith Wiley, Portia Priegert, where are you Andrew?, Hollis "Rap" Brown, Millie Campbell, Robert, . . . er, Linda Wagner, welcome back Sue, Bonnie Bobryk, Des Richardson, Pat Frewer, Jonathan Berkowitz (defending champion), Alex Tindimubona, Sylvia Betts, Maxine Murphy, Veronica Uzielli, Kevin Peterson.

SENIOR STAFF
EDITOR—Loreen Lennon
NEWS—Tom Barrett
ASSOCIATE NEWS—Lucinda Chodan
MANAGING—Kent Blinston
ARTS—Gordon Turtle
SPORTS—John Stewart
PHOTO—Shirley Glew
COPY—Tony Higgins
PRODUCTION—Will Stephani
CUP—Keith Krause
ADVERTISING—Tom Wright
MEDIA PRODUCTIONS
Margriet Tilroe-West
CIRCULATION
Ken Daskewech

Requests not necessarily granted

Once again, I find it necessary to offer some help to ensure that the readers of this paper are given true facts on which to form their opinions.

My particular reference is to the front page article in the Tuesday March 20 edition concerning the University Athletic Board (U.A.B.) Recreation and Athletic Fee Referendum.

The incorrect portion of the article begins in paragraph seven. This paragraph states "The Board has also released a preliminary budget..."

In actuality, the figures quoted were accurate but they are simply budget requests from our coaches. The UAB has not released anything yet, because our priorities for budget cuts cannot be drawn up until the outcome of the referendum is known. Therefore, the figures are high and seem to indicate a fattening of the athletic program.

As an involved student in the UAB I can state quite firmly that an 8 dollar increase will simply maintain our programs, both Intramural and Athletics at

their present level. If passed new \$25.00 fee will only put the 45 percentile of fees across Canada. The average fee is \$27.00.

In keeping with our policy of offering the most, for the money, I hope that the readers of this paper will support the increase, and help us to maintain the finest Intramural, Athletic and Service program in Canadian universities.

Lorne DeG...
Chairman of U...

Ed Note: People interested in facts are advised to read council story on page 1.

We wanted reaction...

In your editorial March 20, you wondered why there was no reaction to the women's Supplement in the Gateway March 9. It was the most stupid inane thing I have ever seen.

The whole supplement was devoted to deviant behaviour pertaining to female glands. I would like to see women defined in other terms than as a sexual object for men either negative or positive. The whole 'libber' approach of your supplement put down women as a 'mad bunny of the Hefner Playboy philosophy'. I would like to think of myself as a person.

Does it really matter whether we are born male or female? I would suggest that the

majority of women look upon themselves as persons and that their gender is not important but that their inherent human dignity is important. Because of the dignity I have as a person I should have the same potential as any other person, and I am not going to sacrifice my dignity for any libber hedonistic obsession. My brothers and I will always be equally worthy of the dignity of person in spite of your denigrating supplement.

C. Smith
Arts 3

Letters

Letters to the editor should be addressed to the Gateway, Room 282 SUB, Edmonton, or dropped off at our office. Please include your name, student I.D. number (if applicable) and phone number. Please limit letters to 250 words or less. If you wish to write a longer piece, come to see us. We reserve the right to edit all submissions for libel.

Can't believe it

Some choice quotes from your March 6 letters page.

"Their concern is so short-term; what about the rights of all children to have a loving mother and father who wanted the responsibilities and challenges of caring for a person..." The choice is not: do we provide each child with such parents, but rather: if no such parents are available for a particular individual, do we kill him?

"Why don't they feel sorry for children who are abused by their parents?" Those who engage in child abuse should be locked up and prevented from hurting children: first those who try to kill their children, then those who break their children's bones, and so on down. It is not inconsistent to want such protection extended to all children, regardless of natal status.

"The therapeutic abortion should be made available to anyone who needs it, for the therapy of the woman and the child." The therapy of the child? Usually, death is considered an unattractive prognosis.

"... why must society dictate to the individual on an issue so personal?" If we are not dealing with a human being in a womb, it's a personal issue. If we are, it is about as personal as the issue of whether or not one is going to use slave labor on one's plantation.

To be fair here's a quote from an anti-abortion letter: "May I suggest that we discuss the question of life in a larger context such as war, capital punishment, and euthanasia." That is certainly a legitimate suggestion. However, capital punishment is depriving the guilty of life, after due process of law: abortion is the killing of the completely innocent. I also hope the writer isn't upset at previous Canadian, U.S. and British governments for not letting Hitler walk right in.

John Savard
Grad Studies

Interests of unborn, unknown pitted against developed adults

John Savard misses the point when he argues that a fetus, being a person, has an inalienable right to life which logically precludes abortion and the right of women not to use their bodies as incubators in the case of unwanted pregnancies.

Fetuses are biological humans, or persons-in-becoming, unquestionably, but before birth they lack any social dimension of personhood. They are not yet, whatever their potential, members of society, neither socialized nor have they absorbed any culture. As far as we know, they have no consciousness, or intellectual activity.

Abortion (at least as Savard sees it) pits the interests and rights of an unborn, unknown, extra-social being, against those of developed and acculturated adults who have a complete set of aspirations, hopes, values, strengths, weaknesses, etc.

What puzzles me is how unhesitatingly the pious anti-abortionists are, in any context, in favour of the rights of the unborn child as opposed to the

very concrete rights of an unborn mother-to-be. Mother frequently commits a woman a minimum of fifteen years' emotionally very demanding work. And if that work imposed by the state (as Savard seems to want) it is involuntary servitude—forced labour. What sort of "life" does Savard logic impose on unborn babies? And how does ensuring their birth to unwilling mothers defend the rights of either?

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

Try the east this spring

If you are thinking of attending spring session and are not sure of what to take, would like to offer a suggestion. Enroll in the course offered by Dr. Prithipaul: A study of Eastern religions philosophies; Religious Studies 300. It covers the Hindu, Buddhist, Taoist, Confusion, Zen, Shinto traditions. Prithipaul, who has an increasing awareness of history as well as current events, brings forth the relevance of Eastern wisdom in the context of modern man. The course is void of the pressure I've experienced in all other courses and is by far the best course I've taken in my 3 years of Sciences. Go ahead, do it yourself.

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

John C. Science

Important Gateway Staff Meeting
TUES 27 MARCH
2 PM Gateway Office