



editorial

- LEDE -

When an inauspicious beginning for our move towards establishing an industrial economy. Witness last Friday's Board of Governors meeting at which it was decided to grant "quota faculty" status to the Faculty of Engineering. Let's limit the number of engineering students and increase their level of education, right?

Sure.

Here in Alberta we have constantly bemoaned the fact that Eastern Canada (meaning Ontario) has always been the wealthiest part of the country because of their secondary and tertiary economic bases. As soon as we grasped some oil money in our hot little hands, we immediately began bleating that now we too would take a share of the wealth. Yessiree, it's time to go industrial, we said. No more non-renewable resources sell-out! No more primary economic base! No more Central Canadian or American domination!

Uh huh. So what do we do? Instead of training our own people to advance the technology in pace with an "expanding" industrial base instead of training environmentalists to research new means of extracting and utilizing resources with minimal impact on the environment, we say to hell with it. Sure, let's cut back research grants. Let's limit enrolment in our engineering faculties. Let's limit academic expenditures to an 11% increase (even if inflation uses that up immediately).

And we keep on foolishly boasting of the progress we're headed for.

So Lougheed and Hohol and the rest of the Tory government still tell people we're on our way to heaven. "And don't listen to any of the foolishness being spread around by radicals, we're keeping Alberta's head above water and as free from outside domination as possible."

Meanwhile, a decade down the road, if our industrial base has indeed become established, we'll discover we haven't got enough qualified engineers to fill our positions. Where will we turn? The place we always turn - to the Central Canadian and American labour markets. They'll know our situation well.

And when we discover we're making a mess of our environment and want to change that, we'll find out that environmental research just hasn't been able to keep pace with applied technology - except in places like the United States or Sweden or Germany. If we want to buy that environmental technology, we're going to pay through the nose. Believe it.

Not that I blame the Board of Governors for their latest move to chop enrolment in the Faculty of Engineering. What are they supposed to do? Dean Ford told the Board that his faculty has the lowest staff/student ratio of any of Canada's engineering faculties, and listed many examples of over-crowding. Okay, let's grant that students in Engineering are not getting the highest level of academic training possible.

Does that mean, then, that we limit the growth of the Faculty and limit the number of qualified engineers we'll have available in the future? Or does it mean instead that the government should step in and say the situation warrants increased expenditure because of the long-range labour forecasts in the province?

I don't think it takes too much in the way of brains to look at the situation logically and come up with the right answer. Why is it that the Lougheed government is incapable of doing so? Why does the provincial government try and make the Engineering Faculty and the University of Alberta the scapegoats for its blind, nonsensical educational policies? Where is the money from the Heritage Trust Fund to be spent if not for training the future labour resources of this province?

See the premier for his answers. I'll bet he's not telling.

by Kevin Gillese

A testimonial fricassee

Editor,

We find Thursday's (April 1, 1976) Gateway a sad comment on the quality of our campus communication media. The obscenity that was displayed on the cover can not even be seen as a joke in poor taste. Surely in your desperation to fill up space you could have found something that credited your readers with intellects a little better than that of animals. It is our feeling that our university newspaper should contain items that inform and interest rather than disgust and offend its readers. It is to be hoped that the vulgarity that was displayed will not be repeated and that the Gateway will try to raise its goals out of the gutter.

Sincerely,

- Kelly Strong Sc 1
- Kent Spackman Med I
- Shirley Feenstia IV Arts
- Al Hindeman
- Jane Feenstia Ed II
- David Hinm
- Robert Augerine Ed II
- R. Stan Smith Phy. Ed.
- Marion Shields Ed. 3
- Scott E. Allen Com.
- Val Hirsche Ed IV
- Michael Bennett Dent I
- Karren Hudson IV Arts
- Sandra Knight Ed. 3
- Cathryn Bell H. Ec. 3
- George How Sc. I
- Rick Smith Sc. IIV
- Bob Carson Dent 2
- David Hamilton Dent 1
- Thaine Olsen Arts II
- John Mattson Sc. II
- Frank Stanford Arts II
- Monte Court Arts
- Sue Fulk Rec. 3
- Gayle Hamilton Ed 4
- Ireta Dahl Nu I
- Bruce Hudson Comm 2
- Murray Christenson Sc 3

Dear Sir:

The undersigned wish to thank you for the artistic photo on the cover of your last issue. We feel that you have waited long enough to give us straight facts and hard-nosed journalism, and we hope that in the future you will continue to publish items which will interest all university students.

This photograph obviously expresses the view of most outsiders as to the quality of university students. It almost seems to be pointing out to us that we are sticking our noses where they don't belong, and that we should point ourselves in another direction and search for new ideas.

We should all take time out to do what the young men in the photograph are — sit and think instead of running around with out pants (and minds) at half-mast. In other words, push hard for creative thinking — let those ide as flow.

One question, though — was the picture taken at a meeting of GFC or student council? (Bob could swear the one in the middle is Brian Mason.

- Bob Brownose Law II
- Suzy Suzuki Sc I III
- Alice Chalmers Ag I
- Doug Furr For II
- Rigor Mortis Med III
- Joe Flogg B. Comm IX
- Hugh Packard Eng. II
- Adley Branflakes Sci. II
- Wally Waterass Ed III
- Bernice Mundane Arts I

Honest approach

The front page photo of your April 1, 1976 issue was in poor taste. It has done nothing to improve the image or quality of your newspaper.

- D. Zalmanowit
- Alexandra Lapko
- Susan Elliott
- H. Tymazko
- Elaine David
- Bartha Knoppen
- Sheelagh A. Ross
- John D. McCormick
- Peggy Cavanagh
- Anne deVillas
- Thomas Flynn
- P. Innes
- L. Conner
- Vedym Olson
- Eric Spinuk
- S. Bailey
- G. Johnson
- Elissa Rachue
- Rick Skeith

Sarcastic approach

As an avid reader of your newspaper and a concerned student, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your wonderful cover photo of April 1/76.

For years we students have pondered the secret of your success. We have wondered where you have been getting the material for your articles; now we know. My only wish is that you would identify the people who have given us so much. After all, we may not be able to recognize them next time we see them "hanging around" your office.

Considering the increasing cost of living, increased tuition fees and cutbacks in student loans, it is nice to see that what little money we have to offer is being put to good use. *The Gateway*, the students' voice, has been condemning the Alberta government for wasteful spending in a time of restraint. It is a relief to see that they have not fallen into the same trap.

Knowing *The Gateway* has been advocating a need for improved student-public relations, I took it upon myself to send a copy to *The Edmonton Journal*. It is my hope that they will share this wonderful expose with all Edmontonians. I am sure they will appreciate it as much as I, especially when you consider that the taxpayers indirectly support the University paper through subsidies to the university. With times such as

they are, everyone is interested in where their money is going, and as I said, we know it is not being wasted.

I was once afraid that the students would never become enlightened but now I am content in knowing that we have started to raise ourselves above the common masses. It is about time we started displaying what University and it's students are really like.

Jeff Bulland
Arts I

Shocked approach

Referring to the picture of "3 bare bums" on the first page of your *Gateway* newspaper dated 1st April, 1976.

As a parent with two students attending the U of A, I was shocked that a picture of pornographic content would grace your first page. Such trash has no place in a school paper. Some of your staff must have sick minds and low moral standards or a very queer sense of humor to publish such a photo.

I'm sure the majority of the students must be embarrassed with this issue.

As editor, it would be nice to have you answer this letter and explain why you allowed such a photo to be printed and to what purpose, in your next issue.

A Shocked Parent

Dear Shocked Parent:

With not one, but two students from your household attending university, I'm surprised, frankly, why you should be shocked. Certainly by now you'd have learned that "all types" attend university, even lascivious, warped, porno pushers.

Regarding our status as a "school paper," I've been doing my level best for a long time to deal death to the false notion that we are a "school paper." We are a newspaper. Please don't try to put those adjectives on our status. We set our policies, not the schools, not the readers, like us or leave us.

I haven't taken a poll, but I think the level of embarrassment within the student body is about fifty-fifty, hardly a majority.

Regarding our minds and morals, I don't think we're any more sick, or queer than the average Canadian citizen. Maybe we just try to hide it less than others. If you'd stick around a few press nights here, I'm sure you'd get a better idea of what our sense of humor is like, especially at 2:00 or 3:00 a.m. We're just gangs and gangs, of fun ... really.

Regarding the last paragraph of your letter, I think it would be nice for me to answer and explain. But then again, I'm not always nice.

Greg Neiman

