

# Editorial

## INS changes policy; now farmers must act

The Immigration and Naturalization Service correctly responded to a local shortage of fruit pickers by changing immigration procedures for the collective benefit of farmers, migrant laborers and consumers. The revised procedures will make it easier for migrant farm workers to enter the United States and obtain agricultural employment for up to nine months.

The shortage of migrant workers, which was devastating to strawberry crops in Oregon, initially was caused by the over-implementation of the Immigration and Reform Act of 1986.

In executing the immigration reform law, the INS went too far, making it difficult for immigrant laborers to gain legal access into the U.S. agricultural job market. Specifically, the INS's original mistake was two different but inter-related requirements: an insurmountable degree of paperwork submitted to a single application processing center in Mexico City.

But in a conciliatory move last week, the INS rectified these problems by providing an information clearing house to facilitate easy preparation of paperwork and by moving application processing centers to the Mexico-U.S. border.

The INS should be applauded for changing its policies to benefit not only the labor-intensive needs of local farmers, but migrant workers as well.

Congressmen, including Oregon Sens. Mark Hatfield and Bob Packwood, pressured the INS to make the changes and deserve credit for straightening out some blundered bureaucracy.

But the recent fruit picker shortage resulted from the practices of local farmers as well as the INS. Now it is time the farmers do their share.

Fruit farmers, for example, are too dependant on illegal aliens and migrant farmworkers, and have become accustomed to paying them a subminimum wage. The farmers have placed themselves in a vulnerable position that can backfire when the INS cracks down. Therefore, to help overcome the farm labor shortage, local farmers must decrease their reliance on migrant workers by offering a higher wage to attract local pickers.

## Strong questions needed for North's testimony

Lt. Col. Oliver North will testify publicly before congressional committees investigating the Iran/Contra scandal today. His testimony will answer some important questions regarding President Reagan's role in the scandal.

The committees will ask North if the president knew of and approved illegal funding for contra rebels in Nicaragua. Because North has been granted limited immunity he should not hesitate to answer these questions truthfully.

Limited immunity guarantees that anything North says during his testimony will not be used against him by the committees or by the independent commission investigating the scandal.

North also was given a private session with the committees on Monday. The session previewed some sensitive questions they may ask in today's testimony. This will include details about who initiated the funding plans.

North will not give out information willingly about Reagan's role or his activities; therefore, it is important the investigating committees be direct and aggressive in their questioning.

With his immunity, North has no reason to perjure himself unless he is protecting someone else. If the committees shy away from direct questions, then both the committees and the public will lose valuable information.



# Commentary

## Scholarship proposal shows bias

A proposal at last week's annual National Collegiate Athletic Association conference in Dallas, Texas, wanted to mandate a cut in the massive amounts of money colleges spend on sports by reducing the number of sports scholarships.

The association's Presidents' Commission decided to postpone a decision on the proposal indefinitely after it encountered intense criticism.

Commentary by  
Will Holbert

The proposal would have reduced the number of scholarships available for athletes in "non-revenue" sports — meaning nearly every college sport except football, which would be spared from any reductions. The proposal also would have spared men's and women's basketball, women's tennis, gymnastics and volleyball.

In other sports, such as swimming, skiing, and soccer, NCAA rules would have reduced and placed a limit on the number of scholarships that a college could award to promising athletes.

However, critics of the proposal were not fooled by the exceptions made in the four women's sports. Critics said the

proposed scholarship reductions would decimate the number of opportunities available to women and minority athletes. The proposal sought to bring the amounts of scholarships awarded to men and women to an equal level, but because there are fewer women's sports and scholarships available in the first place, the end effect would be a cut in scholarships that favored men.

For example, the proposal would have reduced the amount of men's cross country and track scholarships from 14 to 13, while women's scholarships would be reduced from 16 to 13.

The proposal would have left football scholarships at 95.

University President Paul Olum, who spoke out against the proposal, called the proposed cuts "unconscionable," and unfair to women. Olum supported a proposal to cut football scholarships by five, but it was defeated.

"To refuse to cut football even this very small amount and then to proceed to reduce awards in a large number of so-called minor, or 'non-revenue,' sports... seems to me disgraceful," Olum said in a speech he delivered at the conference.

At least the NCAA has recognized the problem. For years colleges around the country have dumped millions of dollars into their sports programs in a free-for-all race for more money and more attention. The obsession with sports has caused some well-deserved speculation as to whether colleges have sacrificed their academic purposes in favor of gaining gold and glory on the playing field.

Meanwhile, the NCAA engages in occasional shows of hand wringing over the problem of academics losing precedence to sports. The association itself commissioned a study in 1981 that documented the rise in college expenditures on football. In

1981, 31 out of 53 large colleges spent less than \$2 million annually on football, 22 colleges spent between \$2 and \$4 million, and only one college was at \$4 million. In 1985, another report said that 27 colleges spent less than \$2 million, 54 were more than \$2 million, and 11 were at \$4 million.

At the University, \$625,000 will go to football next year, followed by basketball at a distant \$170,000, according to Chris Voelz, University associate director for inter-collegiate athletics.

It's clear where the money and the prestige that the NCAA is so worried about is going. But, the only proposal that they can think of ignores the ever-expanding collegiate football empire, and points the finger at sports that offers opportunities to minorities and especially women.

The proposal showed a callous disregard for the ambitions of women athletes, another concern Olum expressed in his speech.

"To take away awards from a large set of women's sports at this moment will be seen — whether it is intended or not — as clearly sexist in effect," Olum said.

According to Donna Lopiano of the University of Texas, the percentage of women's scholarships that would be eliminated in the Pac-10 would come to 9.5 percent, compared to a 3.4 percent reduction in men's scholarships.

The proposal has been tabled indefinitely, but the fact that the NCAA actually thought it up as a possible solution remains. It hoped to finally do something meaningful about the exponential rise in collegiate sports cost, a problem that definitely needs a solution. But its timidity in ignoring the main reason for that rise could have negated one of collegiate sports' real benefits: giving the disadvantaged and the discriminated the chance to experience higher education.

## Oregon Daily Emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Tuesday and Thursday during the summer by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403. Daily publication will resume with the fall term.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

### General Staff

Advertising Director  
Production Manager  
Classified Advertising  
Assistant to the Publisher

Susan Thelen  
Michele Ross  
Alyson Simmons  
Jean Ownbey

Editor  
Managing/Sports Editor  
News Editor  
Editorial Page Editor  
Photo Editor

### Associate Editors

Student Govt./Student Activities  
Higher Ed./Administration  
General Assignment/Entertainment  
Community

Advertising: Janelle Heitmann

Production: Sandra Daller / Ad Coordinator  
Kelly Alexandre, Eliot Knight, Diana Moy, Angela Muniz,  
Ingrid White, Serena Williams

News and Editorial  
Display Advertising  
Classified Advertising  
Letter Perfect Graphics  
Production  
Circulation and Business

Stanley Nelson  
Lucinda Dillon  
Eden Godby  
Angela Muniz  
Shu-Shing Chen

Carolyn Lamberson  
Mike Drummond  
Aaron Knox  
Stephen Maher

686-5511  
686-3712  
686-4343  
686-5511  
686-1381  
686-5511