

God calls us home

Dear PTL Slate:
 Re: Campaign Promises - God calling home
 Being relatively politically aware students we monitored the campaign promises of the various slates with interest. Your campaign promise of God calling us home if we failed to vote for the PTL Slate made us consider the possible implications of this action.

Upon perusing both the Student Directory and the Campus Directory we were unable to find God's residence listed as being on campus. Therefore through deductive reasoning we decided it was elsewhere (the location of God's home is an often-debated subject, we personally feel that Florida would be a good choice)

After much reflection we decided as suggested, not to vote for PTL and thusly be 'called home'. With finals soon upon us and papers to complete before the end of classes, being 'called home' seemed to be the only sensible alternative.

At this point we would like to indicate that we did vote for a slate that we felt would responsibly represent the interests of students on campus. So by voting for our choice and not voting for the PTL we thought we benefit two-fold. Firstly we would be 'called home' and secondly we leave secure in the knowledge that a responsible slate will be representing the interests of the student body.

Now these questions remain, when are we leaving? What do we pack? Can we take our bicycles? Is it a group excursion or private flight? We would really like to know, as soon as possible, so we can stop studying and start packing!

We are awaiting your reply. So talk to God and find out the departure dates and gates, and let us know.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
 Teri Lilledahl
 Karen Kobler

P.S. Dear God, if the PTL slate were taking liberty with our intentions, please call home anyway, as finals are approaching too quickly and we are looking too pale!

Ever Grateful Loving Daughters

Vander Zalm on mark

Pro-choice advocates writing in last Tuesday's Gateway letters page raised some serious issues. But their arguments make sense if you forget what happens in an abortion. From conception onwards, a mother's womb contains something which is human and alive. After an abortion, that "thing" is still human but not alive anymore. I thought that

a process in which a human starts out alive and ends up dead is called death, and that when such a process is done intentionally by a fellow human, it is called "killing".

Another view is that it would be criminal to cut the child off its natural life-support system.

The pro-choice advocates of last Tuesday's Gateway forgot the fetuses are living humans and also that a fetus is not part of its mother's body. As a result, one advocate complains about how Vander Zalm "has abused his authority" with his abortion policies ("self-serving actions"). Is defence of defenceless human beings at the risk of political popularity self-serving or abusive? Another writer states that many unborn children are unwanted or deformed. Are deformation or unwantedness potential qualifications for capital punishment? - wouldn't adoption be better? Furthermore, P. Englefield was not dictating "what women can or cannot do with their bodies". He was talking about what women should be allowed to do to other people's bodies, incomplete as those bodies may be.

It was stated that Vander Zalm is "narrow-minded" and a "bigot". And it was implied that the pro-choice position on abortion is enlightened and liberal. When defending defenceless human beings is narrow-minded bigotry and when allowing the killing of those human beings is enlightened and liberal, then I can only conclude that the writers were correct.

Paul Phystajecy

Oh, keep it down!

It is unfortunate that I must take up space again in The Gateway, however, I have no choice. Craig Cooper chose to address my concerns voiced last week by calling me a liar. I cannot allow someone to call me a liar publicly without responding publicly. As well, his attempt to reduce my concerns to some sort of personal vendetta is not only pathetic, but insulting. Cooper knows me well enough to know my concerns are based on procedures, not personalities. I'm now in the position of having to clarify his "clarifications".

Yes, I was Wade Deisman's campaign manager in his curtailed bid for the office of S.U. President. I am also Chief Returning Officer (CRO) for the Arts Students Association elections. As far as I can tell, there is no conflict of interest involved; as CRO I do not have any decision making powers. Under the new Representatives Bylaw, all I can do is initiate a procedure that ends with Cooper making a decision, subject to appeal to the Discipline, Interpretation, and Enforce-

ment (D.I.E.) Board. Cooper suggested that even if it wasn't against the letter of relevant bylaws, it was, in his estimation, against the spirit of them. I don't agree, and was and remain willing to ask for an interpretation from the D.I.E. Board.

Cooper appears to have a selective sensitivity to the "spirit" of bylaws. In justifying his decision to approve the "No" posters mentioning Paul LaGrange, he states that there is nothing in Bylaw 300 (of the Students' Union Constitution) that restricts campaign material. I would suggest that Section 12(c) restricts campaign material by stating:

"Each candidate shall campaign in a reasonable and responsible manner; including: ... (c) Being responsible for ensuring that practices that are unfair to other campaigns are not followed;

The point is, Cooper could have rejected the posters, and let the "No" side take him to D.I.E. Board. I'm sure that Cooper realizes this in retrospect. One should be concerned not only that justice be done, but that it be seen to be done. The negative responses of students to the "no" posters in question merely underlines this point.

Cooper's concern that I "sluff off my responsibility" by appointing a proxy to the nominating committee is invalid. In fact since I was unable to attend, I fulfilled my responsibilities by appointing someone in my stead. Furthermore, since I was still a member of the nominating committee, I have every right and an obligation to know what transpired; I am still partly responsible for its decisions, whether I attend in person, or send a proxy.

Cooper's contention that because Council ratified his appointment there is nothing irregular is somewhat suspect. The motion to ratify did not come from the nominating committee, but from S.U. President Tim Boston. That's irregular. Also, Council approved his appointment on the basis, amongst other things, of urgency respecting deadlines, under the impression that elections were to be held in late February. Since we didn't have elections until the middle of March, this urgency seems to have been misrepresented. THAT, too, is irregular.

Finally, his reason for making political statements is that "funding is an old standby promise". That may be so, but addressing the University Draft Policies is not, which were also mentioned in the February 16 Gateway edition. I am surprised that Cooper does not know the phrase, "Off the record", which is a pretty good way of controlling what statements the Gateway chooses to publish, and rather, maintains his right to a private, as opposed to public opinion. The Chief Returning Officer is a public position that is meant to be impartial and non-political.

I hope this clears up any confusion for those who care about these things (recognizing, of course, that many may not) I also hope that people refrain from calling me a liar only because they disagree with me.

Martin Levenson

Cooper all wrong

Two issues have been burning on my mind since reading the March 17 Gateway: the "hour-long" 1988 All-Candidates Forum, and classroom disruption.

I attended an hour's worth of the forum and was pleased that it was both entertaining and informative. Unfortunately, I couldn't afford to miss my 1 o'clock class, and had to leave before the presidential candidates spoke. I also missed the question and answer period, which might have been particularly informative for me. To whoever has the power to cancel classes for the purpose of allowing students to attend the forum: If the damn thing is conceivably going to run longer than 50 minutes, then don't just cancel one hour's worth of classes, I'm ticked off that I couldn't see the whole forum.

I am ticked at Marcus Schlegel and Kurt Weber's letter, "Reply to Classroom Disruption", in which they verbally abuse D. Wellock with little mercy. They begin their letter with the quote, "All work and no play makes Johnny a dull boy," in order to justify students' having conversations while others are trying to write coherent class notes. Hell, I should bring a yo-yo to class tomorrow - after all, I don't want to be dull! So what if I bruise a few note-takers, they're just a bunch of "keeners", "schoolies", and "bleeding heart sucks" as Mr. Schlegel and Mr. Weber so diplomatically describe them.

I do agree that there are good reasons for arriving late or leaving early from class. I myself was late for my 1 o'clock class after rushing out of the candidates forum. Still, arriving late or leaving early doesn't have to be a noisily affair, inconsiderate to the rest of the class.

Mr. Schlegel and Mr. Weber (hell - it took two guys to write that letter) seem to have never experienced the frustration of trying to hear and understand a lecturer while boneheads in surrounding seats babble, eat meals, and make useless grunting and snort-sucking noises. If they had known such frustration, perhaps they wouldn't have told D. Wellock to "wear blinders like a horse" or "try ignoring us", and other retarded suggestions.

Ron Lalonde

Let's Party
 FOR ALL YOUR PARTY SUPPLIES
 Disposable
 ●glasses
 ●plates
 ●napkins
 ●utensils &
 ICE 25-50 lb. BAGS
 THE ICE PEDLAR
 455-6276
 451-4380
 12136 - 121 A St.
 SEE US FIRST

E-Z MINI STORAGE
 STUDENT SUMMER SPECIAL
 SECURE FOR YOUR PROTECTION
 ● 24 Hr. on-site management ● sprinkler system
 ● regulated entry ● fire alarm
 ● surveillance camera ● burglar alarm

	Reg. Mo Rate	Special Rate
5' x 5'	\$44	\$29
5' x 10'	\$54	\$49

 ONLY 20 BLOCKS FROM CAMPUS
 RESERVATIONS ACCEPTED
 CALL 451-5252 OR 455-8943
 *Must present student ID on move-in

NOTICE TO ALL STUDENTS
 STUDENT PARKING APPLICATION PROCEDURE
 Parking Services wish to notify students of the parking application procedures for 1988/89:
Application Date
 All Winter session student parking applications will be accepted from **July 18, 1988** until 3:30 p.m., **September 2, 1988**. After September 2, 1988 applications will only be considered if space becomes available.
In Town Students
 City of Edmonton and metro Edmonton students may apply for space during the period from **July 18 to September 2, 1988**. Space remaining unclaimed by University staff and out of town students will be assigned to this group after September 2, 1988. Available parking will be assigned on the basis of a priority system mutually agreed upon by the Students' Union and the University.
Out of Town Students
 Students confirmed as residing outside metro Edmonton, may purchase available permits starting July 18, 1988. (*Metro Edmonton includes St. Albert and Sherwood Park.)
 Parking application forms are available at the Parking Services office and are also included in the Registration Procedures book. Parking rates for 1988/89 had not yet been finalized at the time of this writing.
 For further information please contact Parking Services, at Room 203 Education Car Park or Phone 432-3811.
 Office Hours:
 8:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
 12:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
 Monday - Friday
PARKING SERVICES
 February 1988

 University of Alberta
 Edmonton