

## Canuck army eyeing athletes

CANADIAN INTERUNIVERSITY SPORT RECENTLY signed a \$500 000 sponsorship deal with the Canadian Armed Forces. In return for the cash, the military will receive logo placement at CIS events and on the organization's website. More controversially, they will also receive recruiting opportunities at CIS national championships and one-on-one time with CIS athletes. Though it could be argued that the CIS has hand-delivered its 12 000 athletes to the Forces with little yellow bows around their necks, this is actually a very solid deal for both parties.

The Armed Forces gain access to what amounts to their ideal recruits: physically fit young men and women who are adept at managing their time and listening to authority figures. The military has taken the stance that they want CIS athletes as officers, not merely your rank-and-file soldiers, and that those with athletic backgrounds have historically served best in these positions.

For the CIS, they get a badly needed influx of money into their organization. Some of it has already been allocated to producing nationally televised events—25 of them, in fact. With the advent of Rogers Sportsnet's regional coverage and the Score's push to show more live programming and fewer highlights, CIS has been searching for a foothold on TV for the past few years, but they've never been able to get it done, always resorting to last-minute agreements with one channel or another just for basic coverage of national championships. By finally having the green to get some playoffs—or even regular-season competition—on the tube, CIS now has a great opportunity to build their sports into the national consciousness.

There's an opportunity for money to be made off CIS sports as well. The NCAA in the United States generates huge revenues: football alone received \$80 million US over four years for broadcast rights to its Bowl Championship Series, and there's very little reason that the CIS couldn't eventually do the same. Men's university hockey, football and basketball, as well as both men's and women's curling, all have the potential to be money-makers—the sports have done so at numerous levels in Canada over the years—and in doing so could subsidize the other 18 sports that will hold national championships next season.

The money not being put into broadcasting costs has been earmarked for team travel. This is another move by the CIS to improve the quality of their product, as increased travel means more matchups between top teams from different parts of the country in non-conference play and more international competition. People want to see their team take on NCAA or international competition. The U of A's Main Gym is at its fullest for the Can-Am Challenge or when the volleyball teams host some European national squad. Moreover, increased travel subsidies could be a good thing for the students of the member universities. Programs such as the U of A's Legacy Fund, a fee levied by the SU and given to the Athletics Department to support travel costs, may not be necessary if CIS can afford to cover those costs out of its own coffers.

Even for some of the athletes who are allegedly being exploited, a deal with the Canadian Armed Forces isn't a bad thing. Some athletes are in school mainly to play varsity sports—and I don't blame them, I would do it too if I was good enough—and not to become academics. While many will graduate and move on to successful careers of their choosing, there are also Golden Bears or Pandas every year who make themselves academically ineligible. For these people, the military would be a great alternative for subsidized school costs or for a stable career. It's not like Bears b-baller Scott Gordon is going to walk into a hotel suite in Ottawa during Nationals, talk with a military recruiter and realize that he'd rather drive a tank than become an accountant. But even if he did, he could still be exposed to the same message at a job fair in the Butterdome.

Giving athletes the opportunity to join the Armed Forces doesn't take away their ability to form the word "no." What this deal does give them, however, is the ability to experience things they might never do otherwise—like compete in Greece or have their family see them on Rogers Sports Network.

PAUL OWEN  
Sports Editor

## LETTERS

### Disabilities don't necessitate abortion

I was Googling the news when I saw the outrageous editorial on aborting the conjoined twins (re: "Modern science only complicates abortion debate," 31 October).

[It said that] "whether they can live happy, fulfilling lives after being separated—or after not being separated—is definitely questionable and will, undoubtedly, be the cause of a lot of strife." Ridiculous. People find ways to live fulfilling lives without being fully healthy. Outsiders cannot be the judge of quality of life.

Humans are not to be disposed of like trash just because they have disabilities. People with disabilities fear that attitude because they know it leads to the eugenic mentality that seeks to eliminate them. It's an extremely dangerous attitude.

SUZANNE FORTIN  
Via e-mail

### Ash's prescription deadly

So the emotional and physical effects notwithstanding, Amanda's prescription is a medical execution of innocents at 20 weeks, when it was first detected?

Does Amanda feel there should be law to govern similar situations? Has Amanda ever heard of "eugenics" or "slippery slope"?

KEVIN FRASER  
Via e-mail

### A modest, preventative proposal

Let me see if I have this correct: a 21-year-old unmarried woman on social assistance has twins. She already has two children, and one is four years old—which means she was making babies when she was 16.

Now we have an unmarried woman on social assistance with four children, two of whom need 24-hour-a-day support at taxpayers' expense. The issue is not whether Felicia should have had an abortion as Amanda Ash suggested—Felicia Simms needs her tubes tied.

GORDON STAMP  
Alumnus

### Samarasekera seeing stratospheric strudels

I agree with Rocky Yoo that "the provinces' flagship university is not measuring up," but I disagree that aiming for the status of "Top 20 in 2020" is the solution to our university's woes (re: "University's vision blurred by lofty goals," 31 October). Quite the contrary: undergraduate education suffered while this university strived to be 'Indisputably Recognized' as former president Rod Fraser travelled worldwide to attract research dollars, international reputation and profile.

In the meantime, classrooms are more crowded, one-on-one time with professors is harder to come by, and student public space for study and social is increasingly insufficient; and, of course, as quality has declined the costs of an undergraduate



SCOTT C. BOURGEOIS

education have risen dramatically.

If for one am not at all convinced that chasing the mirage of "reputation" is the way to build a great university for undergraduates, especially since the "key performance indicators" measured by the international university rankings tend to be research- and institute-focused, and are generally not undergraduate-focused.

Rather than asking the Students' Union to join the University in advocating for a pie-in-the-sky vision, Mr Yoo might consider asking the University to join with us in asking first for the funding and tools necessary to restore quality to the basics in public undergraduate education: more professors in classrooms, lower tuition, better student aid and more student study- and social-space. Only after we've covered the basics can we reasonably talk about "aspiring to greatness."

SAMANTHA POWER  
SU President

### Jeske returns for 291 words, 0 points

In response to Ross Prusakowski's article about the Bears' QB situation, I would like to tell him that first he has to learn about the game before he can start bashing the players (re: "QB's football team's weakest Linke," 31 October). Honestly, what have you been smoking? Both Cam and Quade are great quarterbacks and to have you just rant and rave at how bad they are without even realizing the amount of work, pressure and knowledge they need and go through to play is extraordinary.

Here's the situation. I'll give you 20 seconds to call a play for the offence,

get to the line and read the defence to make sure that that play will work, and then if it does, just start avoiding the guys that are 250-plus pounds and athletic (unlike you) that want to rip your head off. If the play won't work, well now it's time to change to something that will.

I applaud Cam for his efforts to make our team better. And to have you completely belittle my quarterback's performance is outrageous. He may not have played all five years of his eligibility, but that was Cam's last game too, so to have you make the comments you did for that man's final game is stupid. Maybe you should find out that both of them are intelligent, athletic and excellent at what they do. Do you honestly think that Peyton Manning, Steve Young or even Joe Montana were great in their first year at starting quarterback? I doubt it. So Ross, why don't you get educated before you start running your mouth and ripping all the varsity teams which I have seen you do way too often.

KENDALL JESKE  
Education V

### Change wouldn't do UNICEF good

I'm writing in response to both the "Streeters" section and Chloe Fedio's article "Trick or Treat—or \$20, bitch" in the 19 October issue of the Gateway. Both pieces took a cynical, incomplete, and misleading look at UNICEF's trick-or-treat campaign.

To clarify, UNICEF has in fact moved away from sending children on Halloween to collect coin door

to door in favour of new-campaign. Instead, children fundraise for the whole month of October and teachers, parents, and kids are welcome to fundraise however they wish. UNICEF supplies posters where classes can build a school out of \$20 "bricks" (there is no \$20 per child rule) and each kid gets a trick-or-treat bag with UNICEF logos to raise awareness on Halloween. Volunteers give presentations at schools about UNICEF's projects, and teachers can tie it in to their curriculum. In conjunction, there is the "Dare-to-wear" campaign where adults can pledge to dress-up in embarrassing costumes if their colleagues (or university students) raise enough money.

There are many very realistic reasons for this change. True, paranoid parents were a factor, given that UNICEF needs parent co-operation; but this was minor. Collecting so much coin is a logistical nightmare. Schools were becoming frustrated with issues in collecting, storing, and transporting vast sacks of coin. Coin is heavy and it had to be shipped, at UNICEF's expense, to centralized processing centers. UNICEF began to realize that this was vastly inefficient, and a lot of money that could be helping children was being lost to overhead. It observed that when it decentralized fundraising and let schools/groups do their own fundraisers they could make much more money and help more children.

ANDREW THEOBOLD  
Communications Chair  
Campus UNICEF

Letters to the editor should be dropped off at room 3-04 of the Students' Union Building, or e-mailed to letters@gateway.ualberta.ca.