

SECOND WIND

Second Wind is an opinion column for Gateway staff

The University Athletic Board (UAB) wants our money.

UAB will give third and final reading on December 8 to constitutional change that would give it power to raise athletic fees 15 per cent next year or any year after without having to obtain student input, other than the board itself or its members on Students' Council.

The constitution now allows UAB to charge each undergraduate student a compulsory athletic fee of \$27. A discretionary increase of \$1 per year is allowed, representing a 3.7 per cent increase over the existing rate. The new 15 per cent increase would amount to a \$4.05 change in fees bringing them to \$31.05 next year. The following year, the fee could increase to \$35.71. Increases would no longer be arithmetical, but exponential, a much higher rate of increase over time.

Dickson Wood, chairman of UAB, president of Men's Athletics, and Students' Council member, says that the proposed constitutional amendment is only a means to maintain present levels of athletic programs, in both intramurals and intercollegiate sports.

In my first interview (and subsequently, my only interview) with Wood, I asked whether the intent of the motion was clear. He was not sure. As the motion now reads, the intent of discretionary fee increase power to maintain the status quo is not clear. He has refused to comment further on the topic though he has agreed to write a letter expressing his views.

Wood has been partially misrepresented during the UAB debate.

Liz Lunney, Students' Union v.p. Academic, has been Wood's main opponent to the UAB action. She stated in a Gateway interview that Wood refused to

let Students' Council examine the UAB budget.

Minutes from the October 27, 1981, Council meeting read:

Lunney asked if Students' Council could peruse the 1981-82 operating budget for the University Athletic Board. Wood replied in the affirmative, but pointed out that it could not be altered.

As it stood, Lunney could not have input into the UAB budget.

The existing UAB constitution says that Students' Council does have input into the budget. This has fallen out of practice over the years, however, and thus the SU did not have a say in the '81-82 budget.

At the next Student Council meeting, November 10, Wood reported that the lack of input into the present UAB budget was not his responsibility alone.

Students' Council has five members who can sit on UAB. This includes the president of Men's Athletics, president of Women's Athletics, two v.p.s from both athletic committees, and an executive member from the SU. Any of these five people could have taken the UAB budget to Council.

Wood's most disturbing remarks also came at this meeting of Council.

He was asked if he thought a referendum on the issue of discretionary fee powers would fail. Wood replied if the referendum were honest, meaning a fair representation of students across campus, then yes, the referendum would fail. Yet he added if the usual student apathy for elections and referendums held true, only the interested parties would vote and the referendum would pass.

I am not sure Wood's logic is valid. Conversations with other students on campus have shown me that they would

generally favor an increase in athletic fees. The catch is, they want more say in where those extra funds go.

The UAB gives approximately 30 per cent of its budget to intramural programs and clubs; the other 70 per cent goes into intercollegiate sports. Of the intercollegiate portion, 70 per cent is diverted to men's intercollegiate teams and the other 30 per cent into the women's teams. A similar male/female disparity is seen in the intramural portion of the budget.

These are some of the discrepancies students and I object to. Many students would like to see funds go into encouraging more people to participate in the intramural program and into a greater emphasis on women's athletics.

Wood claims that the U of A has one of the best, if not the best intramural program in the country. Other students agree that the U of A has the best program in the variety of activities presented, but the use of its programs is lacking.

Part of the problem may be in promoting the activities. The heaviest advertising for athletics appears in the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation. Outside of it, the promotion is dismal. UAB cannot justify this by saying the greatest interest is in the Phys Ed faculty, and then suggest the rest of university students should have to pay its costs.

First something must be done to gain the interest and support of the students across the campus. Sure, the facilities and programs are open to all, but they are used primarily by just a few, an elite.

Before the UAB decides to raise our fees, let them show either that students supports it in maintaining the system as it now exists (through referendum) or change its priorities until it reflects what

the students of the U of A want.

But why a referendum, they ask? Is not the UAB composed of and dominated by students?

Yes, the UAB is composed of 10 students to 8 staff. But most of the students are actively involved in sports as designated by their appointment, except for the executive SU and Graduate Student members. The staff too, is heavily sports oriented. Many are actually coaches of intercollegiate teams.

This representation seems lopsided. Wood admits that the present UAB membership is not totally representative of the campus population, but the potential for it to be so exists. The key word is potential. As UAB exists now, that potential is not realized.

I am sure the UAB "intends" well as Wood has suggested, but it seems to show a great lack of faith if it thinks students across campus would not understand the situation that prompts this move. All I ask is that the UAB reconsider its low opinion of students ability to recognize their own needs.

U of A students did so last year when they approved a \$5 SU fee increase. It was approved because the Students' Union guaranteed where the new funds would go (into capital and clubs).

University of Saskatchewan students did so this November when they approved an Athletic fee increase. They approved it because their Athletic Board guaranteed where the funds would go (into intramurals).

Here at the U of A, for athletics, let us, the students, decide.

Wes Oginski

Pseudohuman character condones reckless driver

Re: Pseudohumans and Pterodactyls in the November 24th issue of *The Gateway*.

As I have come to understand, a cartoon, caricature or comic strip is a feature used by the media to interest or amuse by portraying persons, objects or events in an exaggerated way.

Often these sketches or drawings are meant to be light entertainment, at other times they provide a new perspective or insight to an important issue by satirizing or making an appropriately sarcastic comment. Many of the "cartoons" in your paper of late have failed to meet these criteria.

In earlier issues of *The Gateway*, you have used paragraphs of inane dribble as admitted space-fillers, now you have resorted to using "cartoons" as well.

I think a shorter, more meaningful format would be an improvement if writers, artists and advertisers are in short supply and you must rely on space-fillers to pad your pages.

Unless I have missed some underlying truth that pertains to the human condition and our plight on planet Earth, "Eddy the Asthmatic Stand-Up Comedian" (*Gateway* November 26), is nothing more than an attempt to use up space (on the Editorial page, no less!) There is no humor in his lives, nor in his hacking cough, nor in the oxygen tank remedy. It is unfortunate that you find a condition such as asthma an object of comic interest.

Although I find your selection of "cartoons" in bad taste, I am outrightly disgusted by the "Pseudohumans Pterodactyls" of November 24. For readers who have forgotten, it portrays a frustrated student who releases the pressure he feels "in the safety of (his) car" and thinks "God, it's fun being an asshole." I failed to see any humor in the situation, but at least his self-perception was correct.

What is so annoying is that

assholes such as this are the ones who cause untold suffering because of motor vehicle accidents on our roads.

Cars, like all vehicles, have transportation as their major function. In recent years they have taken on new uses (eg. recreation) and have become important as status symbols. But please don't condone or legitimize their use as a release for frustration!

A car is a powerful machine, and in the hands of a responsible driver, is an integral part of today's society and standard of living.

Unfortunately, licences are also given to irresponsible and unskilled drivers, some of whom disregard safety standards for their vehicles, the law, and their limitations in controlling that vehicle.

There are many socially accepted ways of releasing frustration - vigorous physical activity, immersion in a hobby or distracting event, a talk with a close friend or confidante...even a letter to the editor can suffice.

Please, don't make reckless driving socially acceptable by printing such material - unless you can also provide a fenced-in acreage where these frustrated students (who happen to drive 'souped-up' cars despite cries of unfair tuition and athletic board increases) can be let loose to wreck their havoc on each other, not the community at large.

I believe that by allowing the "cartoon" in question to appear, you have insulted the intelligence of the university community and have provided a poor image of what our prevalent standards of behavior are for others in Edmonton.

As was shown in the "cartoon", it is the innocent bicycle riders, pedestrians, drivers and passengers who suffer the consequences of an irresponsible operator - whether the recklessness is intentional or not. Why else is driving a "power trip"

- if not to have power over other people as well as the machine?

Ambulance attendants, police officers, hospital personnel, plastic surgeons, psychologists and lawyers can describe the terrifying trauma experienced by the victim and his family, and the medical and legal procedures which may be drawn out for years - prolonging the pain and the suffering.

Somehow, most people manage to deny and ignore it all - despite the Stop-Check campaigns and the "Safe Driving Week". Until they are personally affected, when either themselves or someone close becomes a victim, it is all taken for granted. Pity that humans can't learn from others' mistakes.

No one can ever say "I'm sorry" enough and no legal settlement of money can ever compensate for the physical pain and disfigurement; the changed lifestyle due to the redefinition of goals based on new limitations,

Philosophy

Today is tomorrow's yesterday. Make well what is done and steer today.

In the course of your dreams That tomorrow will yield. Change today; mold it for the next.

For today will be yesterday; Tomorrow, today. Take yesterday for what it was, It isn't a dream, it is real.

No change can be done - it is over. But use the wisdom it has given To shape today for tomorrow's goal.

Make well what is done to change today For the course of your dreams That tomorrow will yield. It is the essence of life

To treat today with integrity And to live it for tomorrow, For today is tomorrow's yesterday.

T. Zarowny 1st Ed.

the changed relationships and personality, the nightmares and fear of vehicles; the continuing medical problems; and the imposition of new set of values.

Some may come out stronger in character for having dealt with the problems and facing the challenges of readjustment. With time, the wounds may heal, but there will always be scars, both

inside and outside.

It is the emotional and psychological responses which are affected the most. There is a bitterness and an unceasing anger towards reckless drivers that I hope you will never have the misfortune to experience.

Renu Khullar B.Sc. (Psychology) 81

Grads oppose fee hike

To the editor,

The Executive of the Graduate Students' Association wishes to express its opposition to the attempt of the University Athletic Board to give itself the power, through a constitutional amendment, to raise athletic fees by up to 15 per cent per annum without having to seek specific approval by the students concerned. We consider such approval to be mandatory in light of the fact that all full-time undergraduate and graduate students have to pay the fee, without the possibility to opt out. We therefore request that the proposed constitutional amendment be submitted for approval to a referendum among undergraduate students and to the Council of the Graduate Students' Association.

We also wish to express opposition to the proposed deletion of the constitutional requirement to have the UAB budget submitted to the Council on Student Services and the Students' Union Council for comments and recommendations. We ask that the budget likewise be forwarded to the Council of the Graduate Students' Association for comments and recommendations.

We wish to make it clear that we would regard refusal by the UAB to be fully accountable to the students whose money the Board is spending as an inexcusable violation of democratic principles.

Niall Shanks, President
Lodger Mogge, V.P. (External)
Rhoda Zuk, V.P. (Academic)

Wallflower

Nov. 28, Dinwoodie:
A lesson in ultraconservation. Your average university student, sitting through a whole set of good music, waiting for someone else to get up.

Maybe it's not "fashionable" to dance the first set... What a loving crowd. But then, I think the "Subhumans" are great and "X" sucks.

Kevin Dardis
Commerce II

Don't forget to come to the staff meeting STAFF.

Thursday at 4p.m.

Rm. 282 SUB
the Gateway

more letters on page 6