

How green is my cement

by Lloyd Takeyasu

On Oct. 16 Premier Lougheed will attend the official opening of the first new building on campus in many years. The Agriculture and Forestry building is finally complete after 13 years and 2 million dollars.

"It took a lot of hard work by everyone involved," said Dean of Agriculture, Dr. J.P. Bowland. He felt individual staff members got most of what they wanted and in general were satisfied with the building.

"It is extremely functional and aesthetically pleasing," he said.

The design of the building started in 1968. At that time university enrollment was increasing rapidly and it was recognized that the faculty would need more space. In 1972 the

Social Credit government halted work. It was not started again until 1975, and money was not provided by the Conservative government until 1978.

Construction began at that time and has taken 27 months to date.

Four departments are located in the new building. Previously, the faculty had been located in a dozen different areas.

"The building provides us with a consolidated and a better area — not more area," said Bowland.

From the outside the structure is distinctive because of the greenhouses on the roof.

The building may be entered from SUB through an elevated walkway.

As well as wide open spaces and lounge areas, the building also

has a terraced greenhouse containing a waterfall and numerous plants.

"I like the layout in that the people oriented areas are well lit and open, which tends to create good relations," said Assistant Dean J.B. McQuitty.

"Generally, most students feel comfortable," said agriculture student Tom Guebert. The classrooms are said to have good acoustics and lines of sight. One student said the building "represents our new supremacy over the engineers."

Members of the Agriculture Club said there were complaints of insufficient study space and inadequate lounge allocation. Rob Saik, Bar None director, said, "I'm disappointed they never consulted the students more."

Agriculture and Forestry classes will be cancelled for the official opening.



The new Ag-For center is opening officially October 16.

Court decision puts us back where we started

What does the Supreme Court decision last Monday mean to Canada? Frankly, we're just where we were a few months ago, only more so.

Everyone agrees that the federal government's moves to repatriate the constitution and add a Charter of Rights will affect the rights and powers of the provinces. That is obvious, since as a federal country our powers are divided between the two levels of government and our new rights

will take precedence over all areas.

It is legal? Both sides won on this point. Both arguments were affirmed by splitting the answer into two parts. The federal government has always said that it is legal to do what they are proposing. That is true, according to the Supreme Court. As our constitution is *written*, the feds do have the power to go to London and ask for the joint resolution to be passed. The provinces have said there is a convention, a rule,

by which we normally operate our country that isn't necessarily written anywhere, and that they must be consulted when their powers are being changed. The Court agreed with that too. So?

So, this is more likely a victory for the provinces. Conventions make up an important part of our constitution now, such as having to call elections every four or five years. If not for conventions, the Governor-General could dissolve Parliament any time he wanted to, veto any bills he didn't like, and choose whichever parties or party he wanted to be the

Government. England's Parliament could also be making laws for us. Thus, by giving convention to the province's stand, the court is giving them a powerful tool.

But, conventions are only enforceable by political means. Lester Pearson did not resign on a money bill defeat, Mackenzie King did not call an election within the conventional time, and the Governor-General of Australia dissolved their Parliament without any consent and called elections, and only a couple of years ago. If you break an important convention, the people

will defeat you in the next election. Is that a problem for Pierre Trudeau?

What all of this gives the provinces is a powerful tool to use in Britain. It is only *convention* that Parliament in London will pass resolutions from Canada regarding Canada's Constitution. And since England has no written Constitution at all, they tend to look pretty highly at conventions.

This tends to make the federal moves a lot more shaky than if the decision had gone all their way. So we'll see a lot more willingness to negotiate now on their side. Since the question is not final, the provinces will still be willing to trade some more fish and oil for rights, which the feds and Ontario have been doing all along.

And since England has no written constitution at all they tend to look pretty highly on convention. They are still prone to political pressure (Remember the Panhandle) and I think we are seeing a lot of it being exerted in Australia now.

All in all, this tends to make the federal position less justifiable than if the decision had gone all their way. Already they've lost their moral argument — the NDP has reversed itself and wants to return to the bargaining table — and there are reports that the younger members of the government are quietly revolting (no pun intended) against the risk that the old guard are taking in defying the convention and the Provinces. You can imagine how they feel now that the P.Q. had decided to run candidates federally in Quebec.

What we should be seeing now is more willingness to negotiate. The provinces can still legally be shut out, so they're still willing to barter rights for fish and oil, something the federal government and Ontario have been doing for a long time now. The Liberal Party could be in deep trouble following their stated course of action so they should be willing to negotiate. But Pierre Trudeau and his remaining wise-men appear to be more interested in their plans rather than the future of their party (some might argue the country as well).

Maybe we will see some negotiation, and maybe even make some progress. I hope so. But we could have negotiated last time, too. All the same risks were there.

Maybe we'll get a good deal out of the new found of negotiations. I hope so. But then, we could have negotiated last time, too.

K. Bushing

MATURE STUDENTS

Brown Bag Rap Session

You are invited to drop in and get acquainted with fellow mature students. Bring your lunch (coffee provided).

An opportunity to meet people and discuss mutual concerns.

Tuesdays, 11:00 - 1:30
Heritage Room, Athabasca Hall

Co-sponsored by STUDENT COUNSELLING SERVICES and STUDENT AFFAIRS.

ADMIT ONE
VALID MON - THURS

the peoples pub
THIS WEEK'S ENTERTAINMENT
"MILLIONS"

Renford Inn
10620-82 Ave. 433-9411

- Cover Charge
- Ample Parking
- Dress Restrictions

BOARD OF GOVERNORS UNDERGRADUATE REPRESENTATIVE

By-Election

Friday, 30 October 1981

The Board of Governors is responsible for the conduct, management and control of the University and all its property, revenue, business and affairs of the University of Alberta:

Nominations for Undergraduate Student Representative Close Friday, 19 October 1981. 1700 hrs.

For information/nomination forms, contact

Phil Soper, President, or Dave Tharle, Returning Officer,
Room 259, Students' Union Building 432-4236,
Room 271, Students' Union Building 432-5166.

CAMPUS SPORTS

9010 - 112 St. HUB Mall 433-0581

SPECIALS OF THE WEEK

(Ending October 10, 1981)

BAUER BEAR HUG TRAINING SHOE

(Limited sizes and quantity)

SALE \$27.95 REG. \$32.95

University of Alberta and Golden Bear baseball caps.

SALE \$4.95 REG. \$6.95

Look for many unadvertised specials

MENS' EQUIPMENT ROOM ATTENDANT

Physical Education

Required to launder towels and uniforms, issue lockers, swim tags, equipment and courts; 3 to 11 p.m. five days a week at April 30, 1982.

Salary: \$1,039 - \$1,250 per month. Apply to Personnel Services, 3rd Floor, S.U.B.

The U of A is an equal opportunity employer.