



## editorial

### Nothing ever changes

Quite a while back, I chanced to meet the then-campus beat man for the *Journal* Bob Remington strolling through SUB with movie and TV critic Keith Ashwell. As I approached them, smiling congenially like any job-hopeful would smile at a pro, Ashwell tossed, with some visible measure of disgust, a copy of *The Gateway* onto a nearby desk.

Somewhat piqued, I asked him why (he didn't know who I was then - most likely he still doesn't). He said he'd been reading an editorial about SU dabbings in our budget priorities and "freedom of the press" had been mentioned.

"I've been on student papers before," he said, "nothing ever changes."

Every year its the same old thing. Every year its the same old issues. Nothing ever changes.

I guess nothing ever really does.

I attended an election forum today in the Education building. Not counting the organizers present, this was the second time *Gateway* reporters outnumbered the rest of the audience at a "public" rally. Marilyn Zuber and I were in attendance. Nobody else.

But I was lucky I went. I managed to get four letters-to-the-editor out of the election candidates. If I hadn't gone, there wouldn't have been enough letters-to-the-editor for this issue.

What's the matter with you? Have you no opinions? Have you no interest in anything happening today that you could share with your fellow students? *Is anybody out there?*

I was pissed-off when Ashwell chucked the paper onto the desk. But just the same, maybe he's right. Maybe nothing ever changes. Maybe students will be mute, blind, deaf, and dumb forever and ever. Amen. I thought an upswing of interest was on its way when students massed for the tuition rally, and then the general election, but I guess the change was an illusion.

About the only thing student apathy is good for is that it exercises the imagination. We're always trying to find a new way to describe it, denounce it, kill, or bury it. In fact it's been that way from the inception of *The Gateway*. I think I've just discovered a new adaptation to Apathy Editorial 8B from our files. I'll call it the "Nothing Ever Changes" approach.

My thanks to Keith Ashwell.

by Greg Neiman



## letters

### E.S.F.A.S. fence

The E.S.F.A.S. (Engineering Students Female Appreciation Society), being concerned with the calibre of women entered in the Agriculture "Queen of the Silo" contest, has taken it upon itself to raise the competition standards by eliminating from competition one Alice Chalmers.

The reasoning behind this move is inherently obvious to all who have met Miss Chalmers, so I hope we can expect full

cooperation from all faculties in seeing that our hostage is kept out of sight.

Unfortunately a renegade engineer revealed to the Aggies that she is being kept in the Dean's Office on the fifth floor of Mech. E., but we have taken steps to see that entry to the building is strictly enforced.

A fence is currently being erected around the Mech. E. building, and it is hoped that the incredibly bad shade of 'forest green' that it is painted will scare off any would-be rescuers.

We realize that this may not be enough to keep the Aggies away from 'their Alice,' so we issue this warning: If anyone so much as pokes their nose into Deen Ford's office without authorization, they will be automatically entered in the Mech. E. 360 Planetary Soft

Lander Vehicle Design Project. Needless to say, the plunge from the sixth floor of the East Wing will occur without the aid of a parachute.

Hugh Packard  
Eng II

### QXFGIP?!

I would like to complain about all the typing errors which I find in your newspaper.

It seems to me that if you can't find anywon to profred ye errors, then yxo mixht as wa geve xh the rnnn.

Ferther, xs't abhgt lkime sogk? Rfnct!

fssnrow sswored  
med. lab. scd

more LETTERS, on next page

## Land use forum reveals a nightmare of incompetence

Nightmares of Tomorrow. That's the feeling I'm left with as I read through the Alberta Land Use Forum's three hundred and thirty page report. This is one time when Grant Notley and I agree whole heartedly. That is, we agree the report fails to begin to realize just how critical the seemingly small land use problems of today become, especially when projected into the future; the near future I might add!

The nine issues to which the forum was to direct its attention are most certainly a representative cross-section of the controversial issues which have plagued government agencies in the past. However, I note an air of inadequacy, complacency, and hind-sight as I read through the report. The report's recommendations fall far short of any so-called "readily available" or "realistic" steps by concentrating on a wishy-washy and political "yes man" structure. This leaves the only possible outcome to be that of uselessness. We are left with a paper written to allow government to say, "We had an inquiry into the area of land use and the initial claims put forward by the critics were shown, for the most part, to be unjustified."

### READER COMMENT

Hog wash!

These issues are very real and I would like to give you some instances which will substantiate my claims.

In quoting from the section on the "Ownership of Land" the forum states, "It is generally accepted by all citizens, including landowners, that man has a responsibility to maintain and improve land during his stewardship and the law provides penalties for those who fail to meet minimum standards. In order to fulfill his responsibilities, an owner must have the right to manage to his perceived best interest... of course, within the law of the land." The report then proceeds to explain that due to a gradual erosion of these ownership rights, today they consist largely of the right to buy and sell, the right of possession and some control of trespass, with certain circumstances giving rights to compensation.

I would certainly argue that the abovementioned rights are grossly oversimplified. Depen-

ding on the title that an owner may have, he may possess mineral rights to such natural resources as oil, gas, and coal. He has certain water and surface rights which include the right to sand and gravel. Also, he can claim, in a majority of cases, the air space about his property and protection from trespassers.

Equally he has the right to be free of nuisance such as seismic waves interfering with his water wells and sonic booms, creating disturbances to his livestock. I am inclined to wonder if the proposals put forward in this area of the report, i.e. land ownership, along with the basic summary pertaining to the existing situation, are not a violation of the Human Rights Act.

The forum was instructed to determine what foreign ownership of agricultural land, if any, existed in Alberta. They reported that only 1.2% of agricultural land in Alberta was foreign owned, and completely rejected the absolute prohibition of aliens purchasing farm land. There is however no mention of how this figure was arrived at, and whether this 1.2% of land was in the best or poorer soil regions.

Statistics can be made to say anything and in this case I would be inclined to wonder if densities were considered or just gross percentages. Further of this, they recommended that due to the danger of retaliation by other countries in which Canadians buy land, we should not stop foreign ownership in Alberta. All I can say to that is that if a stable and more economical business climate existed in Alberta agriculture, Albertans would not be taking their money elsewhere. The forum went on to reject the concept of basing ownership on residence as has been done in Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan, stating that such actions do nothing to build a united Canada.

Well if foreign ownership builds a united Canada, I'll eat my hat. How can you contribute to a nation when you don't even live there?

Another area the forum reported on dealt with the right of the owner to control trespassers on his land. They stated that this was necessary for him to discharge his responsibilities to care for and protect the land, and thus protecting his livelihood. The question of allowing free passive recreation

on all agricultural land was then discussed with their view being in the affirmative. This was based on a study conducted in Europe where in some countries "of high population" this has been conducted effectively. The key here is the degree of population concentration.

In Europe farm land, let alone recreation land, is scarce at least in comparison to Canada. Therefore, due to necessity, legislation has forced farm land to fulfill two purposes. Here in Canada I doubt there are many farmers who would not allow passive recreation to take place on their property, providing permission was obtained first. This allows the farmer to check what you are planning to do, i.e. picnic, bird watching, and thus co-operate with you by giving you directions to suitable areas and also allowing him an opportunity to request that certain areas be left undisturbed, (i.e., newly seeded pastures, crops, cattle herds, etc.). However, to remove this farmers' right of choice could only be justified if all urban dwellers opened up their backyards to the same.

Why would you upset an

continued on page 6