

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing editor ..... Ronald Yakimchuk  
news editor ..... Miriam McClellan  
assistant news editor ..... Glenn Cheriton  
casserole editor ..... Elaine Verbicky  
sports editor ..... Bill Kankewitt  
photo editor ..... Chuck Lyall

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—Unlike the Bears, the Gateway snake survived the weak end (sic). Here with another rip-roarin', back-rubbing, bed bouncin', bite-em-on-the-ass issue were Lynn (chubby legs) Hugo (best of luck to her and Bayer who decided to cut the habit together), Elizabeth (still at it) O'Donoghue, Patty "short-short" Gilhooly, Ina van Nieuwerkerk, Dan Carroll and Brian MacDonald, our make-out . . . er up artists, K. J. (initially yours) Bailey, Hiroto Saka, Judy (three times puts her asleep) Samoil, Marvin Bjornstad and me, Harvey "Nylon-game" Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1968

## Editorial

### Bye, bye College Bowl . . . and good luck, Bisons

The University of Alberta was unlucky two years because they couldn't get rid of a hockey championship game in which their own club was not involved. That was in 1966 when the Golden Bears hockey team, rated a top club, was beaten by the University of Saskatchewan who, in turn, represented the Western Canada Intercollegiate Athletic Association in the Canadian championships held at Varsity Arena during Second Century Week in March, 1966.

The result, of course, was a marked decline in attendance. Ed Zemrau, athletic director, moaned about the funds lost and not recovered. Fans figured there was no point in going to a hockey game in which their team was not a part. And they for the most part stayed away.

This year, the Western College Bowl was scheduled for Clarke Stadium. The game would match the football winners of the WCIAA and the Ontario-Quebec conference which Queen's University of Kingston won last week. The game would serve as a semi-final for the Canadian College Bowl which has been permanently placed in Toronto. The second team in the championship would be the winner of the Atlantic Bowl—teams would be the champs in the Bluenose Conference and the Ottawa-St. Lawrence conference.

Sometime last year, the brains who rule the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Association instituted this new structure and decided to let Edmonton have the first Western Bowl.

The reasoning perhaps was that Alberta were defending champs and deserved the right to hold at least a semi-final in their town. This is good thinking if you are a clairvoyant. Unfortunately, the great thinkers in the CIAA are not.

Their calculation that the Golden Bears football team would repeat was faulty. The Bears were beaten by Manitoba last Saturday and relinquished their title.

This left a number of people in a dubious position. They had spent

a fair amount of publicity and even went so far as to arrange a dinner commemorating the game—a dinner sponsored by the Government of Alberta and the City of Edmonton no less. With the Bears drawing an average of more than 5,000 per game, the affair had signs of extravaganza written all over it.

The one variable was the football team. They lost a game which is no sin.

But the committee still had this game and they knew Alberta fans would not turn out in droves to support any other but their own. And when something is just getting off the ground, the worst think that can happen is an opening day dud.

So what do you do with it?

Some great thinker came up with the best idea in years. Something the Shrine Bowl people and hockey people have not yet given serious thought to. This piece of thinking was that the college bowl could be shifted to Winnipeg where it just might draw a few people. And it could be played in a stadium where fans are roughly familiar with one team at least.

If calculations are to take on tones other than monetary, the decision is even a smarter one.

Football fans who support a team all season have the right to see that team in a championship game. Since there is absolutely no chance of even getting the Canadian College Bowl in the west, fans have to settle for the semi-final. The winning club in the west should get that game every time. There should be no second thoughts of this. There should be little advance planning needed to stage the bowl in any one city.

A game such as this does not need the intricate publicity a regular league game requires. Careful preparation during the year would make fans aware of the benefits of a league winner.

Happily, it is people on the college scene who first had the guts to take the necessary steps to keep college football on the lofty level it now occupies.



Oh, we could have won the elections  
but we of Student Power don't support  
the establishment like that.

## What we need is a responsible approach

By Brian Campbell

Last Friday I wandered into the SDU—SCM teach-in on manipulation and student council and witnessed yet another example of the animalism of campus radicals.

Jon Bordo was in his usual form and gave a rambling denunciation of anything that crossed his mind to start the noon-hour festivities. And for awhile there was an uninterrupted parade of activists who lectured the deeply serious crowd.

Then Rich Price decided the debate should be a little more even and asked for replies from any council members who might be present. So Jack Bennett, the engineering rep, took the floor.

Now don't get me wrong, or anything, because I back freedom of dress all the way; but freedom to look like a boor does not mean freedom to act like one. But to the point, Bennett started defending student council through the usual separate faculties, separate interests, argument.

At this point Bordo and the rat pack took over.

It seems that Bennett once voted against a certain anti-discrimination clause in the proposed student bill of rights. It did not seem to matter that the rest of Mr. Bennett's contentions can be dealt with on a rational level, or that Mr. Bennett's philosophy (and I personally disagree with Mr. Bennett) is held by a majority of students, or that Bennett's reasons for voting as he did were an honest articulation of what lies behind most discrimination around here.

At least it did not matter to Jon Bordo and his friends.

So Bordo decided he would tar Mr. Bennett with a racist brush rather than waste valuable time analysing his stand and attempting to change, through persuasion, Mr. Bennett's position.

Bordo, in his wharf-rodent, revolutionist, union-suit took the microphone and screamed racist and tried to make Mr. Bennett look like a fool. Victory for the self-appointed intellectuals amounted to alienating and embarrassing the opposition.

Even though I disagree with Mr. Ben-

nett, it seems he has something Bordo lacks—courage and decency.

But the animal act wasn't finished, for we still hadn't seen Rolly Laing, another council member, get his teeth marks. Now Rolly Laing is one of the more humane members of council. He did not claim council was perfect. He did not claim changes were unnecessary. He did not claim council was totally relevant. He did not claim council could not "learn a lesson" from the meeting the activists had organized.

But Marilyn Pilkington wasn't there, so Laing had to serve as the nearest available punching bag for the revolutionaries' frustrations, and it didn't make any difference whether he was taking a conciliatory position or not.

The spokesman for the left was a mouse-blond girl with thin-rimmed glasses in the middle of a row of the fathers of social change. Now this screaming bitch of the revolution decided that Laing was dishonest and by shrieking insults and innuendo managed to stop Mr. Laing from giving the audience the least understanding of what went on in council.

Greg Barry, education rep on council, told me Laing was one of the most understanding and liberal members of council. I wonder if his attitude has changed.

SDU has been the focus of dissent around this university for the last year, but I seriously question its usefulness if it maintains its present stance towards logical discussion. SDU has always claimed for itself the rational banner, but I would not like to put that claim to the test in a meeting with the faculty, administration, or government.

The sort of discussion we saw last Friday only polarizes positions and drives the university community farther apart. Because so much of the power is vested in the faculty and administration, and because they are not about to capitulate to total student control, it is obvious we are going to have to communicate and cooperate with these groups to make changes around here.

SDU is splitting the student body and no doubt, alienating the faculty. What we need is a responsible approach.