

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief ..... Al Scarth

managing editor ..... Ginny Bax  
news editors ..... Sid Stephen,  
Peggi Selby  
short shorts editor ..... Beth Nilsen  
sports editor ..... Bob Anderson  
layout editor ..... Joe Czajkowski  
photo editor ..... Dave Hebditch  
page forum five ..... Jim Carter

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—Due to the fact that the Engineers are a revengeful bunch, I Harvey G. Thomgirt refuse to relinquish the names of those who were present at press night, in order to protect the innocent.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for Tuesday edition—6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Thursday prior; for Thursday edition—6 p.m. Wednesday, Advertising—noon Monday prior; for Friday edition—6 p.m. Thursday, Advertising—noon Tuesday prior; Casserole—copy deadline 6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Friday prior. Short Shorts deadline, 3 p.m. day prior to publication. Advertising manager Percy Wickman, 432-4241. Office phones 432-5168, 432-5178. Circulation 13,000. Circulation manager Wayne Box.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1970

## Responsible government?

by Judy Samoil

Students' council has done it again. The first time they might have been forgiven by their dotting electorate, but the second time students will be wondering just what is going on. Remember the old campaign speeches of this time last year? How these people, if elected, were going to be different—they would truly represent those who voted for them.

It's hard to remember the promises by now, especially after the timely yearbook issue at the first of the year. Perhaps it set the pattern. This time it is SUB expansion.

With the yearbook, councillors might have claimed they didn't know for certain if students were in favor of keeping it. While this leaves them looking a bit confused and uncertain, as public officials tend to be, it did save them from being cast as deceitful student reps. This time they have no such saving grace and it is blatantly obvious some of those reps don't really give a damn about who put them there in the first place.

Uncertainty about student opinion is one thing, but it is extremely difficult to understand how these reps could ignore the overwhelming majority who voted in favor of the proposed SUB expansion, on the understanding that there would be a fees increase.

The argument that students from the professional schools will be getting the raw end of the deal doesn't hold water at all. Many of them spend as much time in SUB as students from other faculties, if not more. If and when the Pub In SUB becomes a reality they'll probably find reasons for being around much more.

Their additional conjecture that they are on campus longer than most undergrads also sounds like little kid talk. In case they haven't heard, a three-year B.A. doesn't get one very far these days. Anyone who doesn't spend five years at university is almost considered undereducated. In the long run everyone is on campus longer than the "average" student.

It is unbelievable that a conscientious councillor would leave it up to his judgment to decide what is good for his electorate, especially after they had already voted the exact opposite. If this is to be the style of future student representation, there is little wonder that apathy is getting more and more of the vote on campus.

The law rep seems to be one of these indecisive councillors. In commenting on the SUB expansion fee increase he said, "he did not think the professional schools, as a dissenting minority in this situation, had to follow the mandate from the rest of the campus" (Feb. 6 Gateway). In the same paper, he was also quoted as saying, "his mandate as an elected representative forced him to abide by the wishes of the electorate." Which electorate he's talking about is questionable.

Student councillors should wake up and realize they are taking part in responsible government—note, responsible. This implies that they are not to play God and decide above their electorate's choice. Democratic representatives should be merely the tool for those they represent, and should remember why it is they are there in the first place. It is unfortunate that student government has fallen prey to symptoms similar to those in civic jurisdiction. The corporation here is much smaller, and if democratic processes won't work on this scale there can't be much more hope for them on a larger one.

# Pollution and population explosion pose as greatest threats to mankind

Although I was pleased with the issue of pollution brought to light in the Casserole of Feb. 6, I was concerned with some of the simplifications implicit in the articles. For instance, Mr. Stephen states that pollution overshadows the population explosion as a threat to the human race. This implies that these two problems can be separated and dealt with individually, in turn. In fact, however, as the title of the article states, "People are Polluters," the more we have, the more we pollute.

When we speak of pollution control technology, it must be realized that we are capable of reducing pollution, but not eliminating it. It is simply chemically, physically, and economically impossible to entirely purify all effluents and so, like Ivory Snow, they must be only 99 and 44/100 per cent pure. This does not *have* to pose a major problem to the environment, since Nature herself is known to pollute with volcanic eruptions, etc. However, the problem arises when the volume of effluent overwhelms Nature's capability for degradation. For example, phosphates are essential for the existence of life and are therefore a necessary constituent of our environment. But, when they are introduced into our lakes and streams in overwhelming quantities, they become a serious biological problem. So, it is not simply a case of the phosphates being a despicable chemical, ruining our environment by its very presence, but a case of too many people using too much detergent.

Replacing phosphates with a substitute will likely create a new problem, simply because too much of it will be released into the environment. Although there are countless other examples such as carbon dioxide, ozone, etc., which become a problem only when present in excess, phosphates illustrate the point adequately. The environment will be able to tolerate even treated industrial and municipal wastes only in limited volume. Thus, all the pollution control technology in the world may as well be flushed down society's toilet, unless it is accompanied by extensive social and economic changes affecting every individual on this planet, and that means you, me, and your dog.

You cannot tell the engineers to develop some miraculous cure-all for pollution and then forget it while you propagate large families and borrow money to buy snowmobiles, color TV sets, and bigger cars. You can curse those nasty corporations until you're blue in the face, but they couldn't survive for a week if we didn't all demand more technological goodies requiring more raw materials and producing more industrial wastes. So, if you are in economics or sociology or law or whatever, don't

try to pass the buck to science. We cannot bail the world out of the mountain of garbage without your help and your sacrifice.

Steve Hruddy  
mech eng 4



"... and now we'll hear from the industry representative for their side of the pollution problem"



## The ins and outs of a television repair business or How you are screwed without really knowing

Just a friendly warning regarding TV repairmen:

Whenever you entrust your set to a TV repairman, be sure that you get an itemized bill and all the dead parts (tubes, etc.) returned to you. Then if you think you have been overcharged, or possibly defrauded because the store has replaced (or not replaced but charged you for anyway) parts that were all right, you can bring old parts, set, and bill to a reputable dealer and get the truth. You see, even if the returned parts are bad, an expert's examination of them can sometimes reveal whether they were originally in this condition or destroyed at the shop while your set was being "repaired."

If you find you have been swindled, write a letter to the Better Business Bureau, 206—10182-103 Street, stating exactly what happened, and send a copy to the Attorney General's Office, Legislative Building. If all the people who, because of an unduly high bill, suspect they have been cheated would look into the matter and report probable fraud to the BBB, the crooked dealer would soon be put out of business.

If you don't know it—for your own protection there is an Electronic Service Guild which guarantees all work done by its members. Advertisements



in the Yellow Pages will tell you which stores belong to this guild.

Why have I taken the trouble to warn you? Because we are new in town, didn't know our way around, and so took our TV to a shop that overcharged us, for tubes we didn't need and labor that wasn't done.

Come on consumers, band together and put the bad guys out of business!

J. D. Kennedy  
Department of English