

letters

To the Editor:

Your editorial last week was very well written and your point was totally correct. I have been very liberal in the ASG meetings this term as the procedures were new to all of us in student government. Mistakes must be made if anyone is to learn.

I must compliment the Cougar Print and staff. In one term it has taken the paper from a grade school crap sheet to an upper high school variety. I hope by the end of next term they will be able to bring this college and community a paper worth reading.

To close this letter I feel one thing must be stated to the students of CCC. You have failed in your responsibility to this college, and unless you start taking an active role by helping to do things, this college will continue to displease generations to come because you were too lazy to help now. Think on that this holiday as January 1 is a new year and we hope it will be prosperous.

Happy holidays

Michael Ayers
ASG President

To the Editor:

We appreciate having information about the Self-Help program printed in the Cougar Print, but unfortunately the main points emphasized in the article last week were incorrect and therefore, of course, misleading.

The college is not establishing this program. It will be developed by the group effort of people in our community rather than any "agency."

At this point we are still in the "idea" stage. There is no director, (Jean Carner and myself are co-chairing the meetings.) By no means have we limited our group to welfare people. Although Roseburg's Confidence Clinic leans this way, it is not necessary to imitate their program to that extent. The main guidelines we hope to utilize from their Self-Help concept is a red tape cutting approach to meet the needs and desires of people in our community; that doesn't strip a person of individual choices, and is not dominated by professionals.

Ultimately the structure of this program, whether for low income people or not will depend on all of us involved and needs we see can be met in our community. I would like to encourage anyone interested to call me at extensions 288 or 257; or Jean at 655-6879. Thank you.

Marcia Tuma

To the Editor

I attended a forum on inter-collegiate athletics at Clackamas Community College today, in which there was very little community involvement. I heard some factual information given regarding amounts of monies spent, students actually benefitted by the program, and support actually provided by the community and the students for the program. This information demonstrated to me that the program is not significantly (I considered total student and community participation) supported by anyone but the teaching staff of the athletic department.

I came away wondering whether or not we are so totally caught up in the idea that we must offer a competitive sports program or be considered un-American, that we are unable to see this issue clearly. There seemed to be a willingness to overlook the reality of the budget, community and student needs in order to accommodate the program.

Some support offered in favor of the program included statements (my interpretations) like, "at least we offer some opportunities for Blacks that aren't available elsewhere." I thought, "opportunity for what?" It was stated by an instructor that these particular students, who are primarily coming in from other districts, are often not prepared for the heavy academic load also required of them here. This leads to a high rate of drop-outs (as many as half) which may add to an existing, societally imposed sense of failure.

Another statement made in support of the program was that athletic programs promote national health. This was said by an admitted overweight, out of condition P.E. instructor.

It was said that the average age of students at CCC is 28 or 29 years, obviously older than the majority of students participating in the competitive athletic programs. This point (the students themselves) brings me to what I saw as terribly inconsistent; the majority of students participating in competitive athletic programs are either out of district or out of state students! Many of these stu-

dents are on tuition waivers, that is, their tuition is paid in some way by the community.

One of the athletic instructors pointed out that students enrolled as P.E. majors needed this competitive experience. What that seems to me to be saying, is that we must strive to meet criteria set by the four year, higher tuition, higher budgeted colleges on our two year college monies. One of the reasons I chose CCC was the lower tuition rates.

I see a need to accommodate athletic programs as other programs are maintained, directly proportionate to community/student needs. Our present program does not do this.

Are we going to avoid making a difficult decision -- deferring it -- hoping someone else will do it? Or, are we finally willing to decide where our priorities are and make a commitment to support them? I see these priorities as the people in this community who financially or otherwise support CCC but who, in this area, are not the beneficiaries.

I do not advocate discontinuance of class type athletic programs at CCC. In fact, I would like to see more variety offered for all ages, sexes and interests. I do suggest that we cannot afford the athletic program we presently have, given the reality of the budget, and at the cost to other human resources.

Susan Fredd
20251 S. Beavercreek Rd.
Oregon City, OR 97045

To the Editor:

I think it would be unfortunate not to provide further clarification regarding the proposed Randall-McLoughlin bridge referred to in Louise Stults' letter to the editor, which appeared in the Cougar Print two weeks ago.

First of all, the letter claims that several benefits will be derived from the construction of such a bridge; among them being improved access for the handicapped to the west side of Randall through the use of the McLoughlin elevator, the provision of three additional classrooms and the provision of additional instructor office space. It is my belief that a closer examination of a few of these "benefits" is in order.

At first glance, the concept of "improved access to the west side of Randall" for the handicapped sounds truly magnanimous. However, upon observation of the situation at Randall, one very large-scale flaw in the concept becomes glaringly evident; there is already in existence an elevator in Randall -- an elevator which, for some mysterious reason, no one is allowed to use! If we are so concerned with making the facilities accessible to handicapped students, may I ask why the Randall elevator is not opened? We don't need a bridge to open Randall to everyone -- just a locksmith.

With regard to the provision of additional office and classroom space, it is my feeling that while most students will, in all probability, agree that such additional space if badly needed, still a question must be asked here: Why put it in the air?

It is obvious that specialized construction techniques are required to support a concrete structure between two buildings. And if there is one thing that economic experience teaches, it is that specialized techniques cost more.

It is not inconceivable that we could obtain significantly more useable space for our money by constructing additional office and classroom space at ground level. An added benefit of ground-level construction would, of course, include immediate accessibility to the facilities by handicapped people.

In closing, there is one final point to be raised: in her letter to the editor two weeks ago, Ms. Stults, referring to the federal (tax) dollars to be blown off on this bridge, states (and I quote), "...the federal funds are available specifically for construction projects such as the bridge, and cannot be used for other purposes."

Let me get this right: are the people who run this school seriously trying to tell us that the federal government turns over a double fistfull of our tax dollars to the school administration with the admonition, "You can only use this money to build bridges! Nothing more; nothing less!"

Preposterous! If the bureaucrats of this institution plan to continue handing out such lines of unadulterated crap, may I humbly suggest that they move their offices over to the compost heaps outside Smucker's Center -- where within 15 days it can do everyone some good?

Sincerely,
Jay Haight

Thursday, December 9, 1976

Page 5

