Simpler system for registration needed

At most colleges, students read Samuel Beckett's "Waiting for Godot." At the University, students not only read it, they live it.

For years, computerized registration has played the role of the University's Godot. Everybody has been waiting and waiting, but it hasn't quite arrived yet

As some of you might have heard, the Oregon Daily Emerald broke the news first. The University was going to receive a computerized registration process; the cutting edge of technology, administrators said.

One thing: The article ran on Feb. 28, 1967, and the new process was promised for fall term, 1968. More than 20 years ago.

We understand bureaucratic delays. But 20 years? To be sure, arena registration is thrilling. Nothing can get the heart pumping like standing in line for an hour, waiting to get the class you need to complete your schedule and finding out the guy in front of you has taken the last spot on the list.

Good for the cardiovascular system perhaps, but organized? No.

Nearly every other school around has some sort of computerized registration: the University of Washington, the University of Arizona, USC, UCLA, and even Lane Community College.

Oregon State University also has computerized registration. According to its registrar, the entire process takes 20 minutes. It's had the system since 1969.

In fact, of the seven universities and colleges in the Oregon State System of Higher Education only the University and Oregon Health Sciences University don't have some form of registration.

It seems odd that the largest OSSHE school has the most archaic registration process. Computerized registration would eliminate paperwork, hassle and the need to borrow Mac Court for two days each term. It would be easier on administrators, faculty and stu-

Now, we come to find that the University is actively pursuing a computer system not only to register students, but handle admissions, billing and cataloguing as well. Bits and pieces of the system are already in place, but it will be a while before they're integrated and running.

Estimated time of arrival: spring term, 1991.

University registrar Herb Chereck said the system will bring the University into the 20th century. Kicking and screaming to be sure, but 20th century never-

What Mr. Chereck doesn't realize is that by the time the system is on-line and running, it will be almost the 21st century.

Nothing like keeping up with the times.

Godot never showed up. Maybe a easier registration process will.

erald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is pros

Managing Editor Editorial Editor **Graphics Editor Encore Editor**

ecutable by law

Editor Thomas Pro Atice Wheeler Don Peters Mark Ylen Kelvin Wee

News Editor Sports Supplements Editor

Christopher Blair Tracy Sumner Daria Jackson Kelvin Wee

Associate Editors

Community: Hon Walker Student Government/Activities: Brian Bloch Higher Education/Administration: Chris Bouneff Features: Denise Clifton

Reporters: Jolie Andrade, Polly Campbell, Peter Cogswell, Ashley Conklin, Dan Eisler, Catherine Hawley, Stephanie Holland, Janis Joseph, Layne Lakefish, Cam Sivesind, Alice Thornton

Photographers: Steve Card, Bill Haines

Advertising Sales: David Campbell, Maureen Bernadelli, Shellie Hagen, David Hansen, Scott McAvoy, Amy Mittelstaedt, Melissa Nelson, Saum Partovi, Virginia Pearce, Elise Sharon, Kristi Stother, Edward Wenick

Production: Jennifer Archer, Jed Clark, Alice Cannon, Carol Dopp, Jim Finch, Margo Franklin, Yvette Gill, Jennifer Huey, Linda Klaastad, Jim Mason, Wendy Morris, Angela Muniz, Camille Pansewic, Anna Rembecki, Janet Schober, Ted Shepler, Scott Smith, Caitlin Stark, Jennifer Thomas, Jennifer Viale, Ingrid White.

Advertising Director: Susan Thelen Assistant to the Publisher: Jean Ownbey Production Manager: Michele Ross Advertising Coordinator: Sandra Daller

686-5511 Accounts Receivable, Circulation, Newsroom d Advertising. 686-3712

High hopes for drug tests are unrealistic

Drug testing programs recently launched in Oregon high schools undoubtedly were designed to decrease substance abuse by students. However, when such a program also results in the decrease of students' basic constitutional rights, serious questions should be raised about the fairness and tolerance of such methods.

In the Roseburg school district, an original drug testing program would have required student athletes or leaders to resign from their office or team if they refused to participate in the "voluntary" tests. The program has since been revised after the immediate outcry from the American Civil Liberties Union, parents and students that the plan was clearly a violation of democratic principle.

In the Eugene school district, a voluntary drug testing program will begin at Churchill High School this fall. While students who refrain from participating in the program will not be penalized, those who do sign up to be tested will also be signing away their constitutional rights to protection from unwarranted search and seizure.

Therefore, the student who is noble or cooperative enough to agree to drug tests will no longer possess the same basic freedoms as those who decline to get involved in the program. As a result, undeniable rights such as protection from search and seizure may seem much more deniable in the eyes of students who must surrender these freedoms in order to do the "right" thing and be tested.

Besides the question of the constitutional validity of such programs, there also lies the possibility that students will feel pressured by parents or school officials into participating. The student who is asked to sign up and refuses may suddenly be viewed with mistrust or suspicion. In essence, the decision to test or not to test will be just one more pressure placed on the already stressed-out high schooler.

Coercion and pressure to stop doing anything is rarely, if ever, successful in the long run. Drug testing programs in schools, how-ever "voluntary" they propose to be, create the dilemma of being damned-if-you-do and damned-if-you- don't. Those who do participate will be stripped of certain constitutional rights, and those who don't suddenly may seem "suspicious" or uncooperative in the eyes of some proponents of the program.

Obviously, this latest weapon in the war on drugs not only has some serious kinks. but it may also end up backfiring on us all.

Letters

Overkill

I saw the other day where some disgruntled dude wasted a bunch of co-workers with a semi-automatic assault rifle. Hey like the big dude man himself, George Bush, said these things are bound to happen. No reason to ban the suckers. I agree, but the first thing you know some bleeding hearts want to take away my constitutional right to bear arms.

In fact, I'm damned tired of all the restrictions which already exist. It's about time we start reversing this steady erosion of basic American freedoms! I can't understand why I'm not allowed to own a bazooka with armor piercing ordinance (for that really big buck). or a shoulder-mount surface-toair missile launcher for duck hunting.

How about a cruise missile? Or a tactical neutron bomb to take out a herd of Alaskan caribou and cook the damned things at the same time. OK. OK. I can just hear you liberals out there saying. "But is that safe?!" Hey, atom bombs don't kill people, people kill people. If thermonuclear warheads are outlawed, only outlaws will own them.

Assault rifles, George Bush, and the NRA: three reasons to be proud to be an American.

> Richard Wiener **Physics**

Unfair

I would like to bring Section 5153 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 to students' attention

This federal act requires Pell Grant recipients to certify they 'will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance" during the period covered by the grant. They will not receive federal aid until they sign this statement.

William Bennett, the national drug control policy office director, has suggested random drug tests or 'snitching' as a way to enforce the statement.

Although the ASUO and Oregon Student Lobby do not encourage or support drug use we oppose this form of drug enforcement. Random drug testing is a violation of the Fourth Amendment and an invasion of privacy.

Furthermore, this act singles out and discriminates ago low-income students. Their only means of obtaining an education is through federal aid. They must sign this statement and be subjected to drug tests to go the school, while students with other sources of money do not.

The ASUO and OSL are circulating petitions against drug testing for financial aid. We will send the signatures to President Bush and the Oregon Congressional Delegation and ask them to revoke this discriminatory law. Anyone interested in signing the petition should come to the ASUO offices in Suite 4, EMU.

Angela Muniz **ASUO State Affairs** Coordinator Tuesday, September 26, 1989