

Home births are a right

I was absolutely appalled to hear this week that the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta has forbidden its members to perform home births. I will not dwell on the subject of risks and benefits of home births, but

Season's warnings

Please have the following notice published in the next edition to remind staff and students of fire safety practices relating to Christmas decorations in University buildings:

*Natural Christmas trees are not to be used because of their potential fire hazard.

*Artificial Christmas trees and tree decorations should be of the non-combustible, flameproof type.

*Christmas tree lights must meet C.S.A. (Canadian Standards Association) requirements. Old sets of lights should be inspected before using. If age or condition of lights are questionable, replacement should be seriously considered.

*Tree lights should be unplugged when the area is not under surveillance. This practice eliminates fire risk and saves energy.

Additional information, questions and concerns regarding Christmas decorations can be directed to Mr. Sid Smith, University Fire Marshal at 5614.

G.A. Bulat
Director,
Physical Plant

Editor's note: Oh, well, better late than never!

simply refer the reader to almost any issue of *Birth and the Family Journal*, and mention that the country with the lowest infant mortality rate (Holland) also has the highest percentage of home births.

Instead, I will dispute the College's right to such an action. A cancer patient is not forced to have surgery; it is the doctor's duty to explain to him the risks and benefits of each possible course of action, and then the patient decides what is to be done. What right does the College of

Physicians and Surgeons have to deny pregnant women this same obligation? It is the parents who have the right to decide for, or against, a home birth, they should not have that decision forced upon them by a group whose concern for public health is mixed with an interest in doctors' welfare.

If we don't stand up for the right to home birth now, soon we will find ourselves being double billed for unnecessary caesarean-sections.

Andrew Chamberlain
Commerce II

It's a dumb dumb dumb dumb column

This is in response to last issue's "Chopping Block," in which our upcoming "It's a Third Third Third World" Film Festival was dismissed as "sentimental left-wing bilge." We feel a response is called for.

The Film Festival was organized by the Edmonton Cross-Cultural Learner Centre and provides an opportunity for U of A students and the general public to become more aware of problems and issues that affect the poorer countries of our world and the connections these have with our own lives.

To this end, we have pulled together a variety of film forms: documentaries, feature films, and cartoon shorts for a weekend of continuous film.

The festival is also being co-sponsored by:

- the U of A Students' Union
- the Lister Hall Students' Association
- the International Students' Office

• U of A CIDA Co-ordinator.

All of these are well-known fronts for international terrorism and are probably on General Haig's "hit list."

There are of course a number of films in our line-up that might give rise to some "sentimentalism."

One might be moved on seeing the joy of Peruvian peasants as they learn to read and write ("Peru: Literacy for Social Change"). Or one might even become excited about the potential for decreasing literacy while watching a brigade of young teachers involved in a country-wide literacy campaign ("El Brigadista").

And there is the sad case of third world babies malnourished on infant formula so that companies like Nestles can earn greater dividends ("Bottle Babies"). Or the systematic attempt to commit genocide against the Bolivian Indian population through an American-

Pitch fails; homosexual lifestyle still unpalatable

What the pro-homosexual people are doing represents the epitome of the "Let's make a better hamburger" philosophy of the late 70s and early 80s. This philosophy advocates the mechanism of collecting up 100 percent rotten, grade D beef, grinding it up, and then trying to sell it as a better hamburger. In fact, all they are really doing is making a better advertisement and sales pitch.

In the same way, the pro-

homosexuals are taking a 100 percent rotten, grade D way of thinking, grinding it up any which way possible, and then presenting it as a better sexual burger for all to gobble up. The fact of the matter remains, that the pro-homosexual product is still the same old, rotten patty it has been since its inauguration years ago.

Let us quit this promotional scam.

Brent E. Kassian
Physiotherapy III

assisted "birth control" (i.e. sterilization) program ("Blood of the Condor").

Indeed, there are many problems in the third world countries that do elicit sentiment and concern — and hopefully some action towards some solutions. That is part of our objective in putting on this festival.

The "left-wing" label is much over-used (especially by admitted fascists) and often serves as a red herring.

People in many third world countries suffer from underdevelopment — insufficient health care, food and education. And, all too often, they suffer insufficient control over their own lives — ruthless, military governments more interested in earning foreign exchange than in helping their own people.

Any factual presentation of these conditions can only conclude that change is necessary and urgent. A small "f" fascist might

well define that as "left wing."

We have put on this festival so that people can be exposed to some of the realities in our world today, while at the same time providing some light relief from the "heavy issues" — continuous cartoons, day care, feature films. As well, a dozen community groups and development education organizations will be setting up information tables for people interested in becoming involved.

We hope that students take advantage of this opportunity in spite of the somewhat dubious warnings by some *Gateway* columnist.

Ross Ealey
Film Festival Co-ordinator
Nick Smirnow
Learner Centre Co-ordinator

What was that name?

It seems Huey and Louie have a friend in the SU. Philip Dewey Soper? Yeeoow!

And you thought Milhous was bad!

Larry Curr
Arts IV

Even our shirts suck

I must object to your ongoing advertisement of "It's news to us" T-shirts. Surely you are aware that this phrase is a North American slang expression of utter ignorance. As such, it perpetuates an image of University students as uncaring and unknowing of what goes on around them.

That the campus paper should perpetuate this stereotype is beyond belief, for not only does it label the paper's staff, but also, by association, all students. Desist, sirs! Not only is this expressed ignorance not common on campus, but there is no excuse for it in your offices. You can always get the news from the *Bridge*.

Pamela Jane McLean
Engineering III

New improved T-shirts

Get one of our new slang-free "If it happens on campus...we'll race to cover it" T-shirts. Hurry before they're gone!

Special rate for people who spell ignorance with an 'e.'

READER COMMENT

To those graduates of the University of Alberta who consider themselves Progressive Conservatives;

And specifically to Joe Clark, Peter Lougheed, Merv Leitch, Lou Hyndman, and many others:

The last year saw another in the tedious and recurrent disputes over North Garneau, which current university plans schedule for almost certain destruction as a student neighborhood within the next decade. Decisions may be made at the beginning of April which will replace the old (and still structurally sound) houses of the district with walkup-style apartment complexes, and fundamentally subvert the traditional aura of the neighborhood, which has bordered the U of A campus for its entire history.

The new walkups are, it is true, designed as student living places, and are most definitely needed. Space for approximately 650 students is planned. They are to be tied in with accommodations for the World Student Games, and will be financed in large part by provincial money, occasioned in support of the Games.

But current university planners insist on using North Garneau as the site for the new construction. Owned outright by the university, it consists of four city blocks with houses dating from 1912, nearly all of which are still functioning as student housing — housing which the university admits is most desirable. But the neighborhood is to be "developed" anyway in spite of the fact that two other university-owned sites within ten minutes' walk of the central campus are available, and could accommodate the proposed residences with no destruction of existing student housing.

Student response to our campaign to save Garneau was encouraging. In less than two weeks, a grass-roots petition circulated by Garneau residents gathered signatures amounting to over 10% of the university population — students, faculty and staff — a petition urging the neighborhood's preservation.

We flooded the campus with a leaflet which, while brief, decisively rebutted all of the Administration's pitifully few rationalizations in behalf of its case for the policy it has put forward, which will in effect destroy North Garneau.

We called on our support to show itself in a public manifestation of opposition to the planners' schemes, spelling out our reasons for disagreement. We invited the University (or should we say *shamed* it?) into what was virtually its only public discussion of the issue, when President Horowitz decided (after initially declining) to speak to us on the steps of University Hall on the 5th of March.

At that point, President Horowitz told us that he *too* wanted to save Garneau. Beyond that he didn't elaborate, except to tell us what we already knew, that the final decision lay with the Board of Governors. He didn't dissociate himself in the least from the existing plans emanating from his administration, nor did he tell us whether these plans were acceptable given his understanding of "saving Garneau." Nor did he answer the Students' Council President's points about alternate sites — surely a necessary contribution to any discussion of our community's future — and generally seems to have endeavored to evade, rather

than resolve, the issue by an exchange of ideas.

Small wonder, then, that the student body's attitude toward the Administration plan is extremely sceptical and usually pessimistic. Small wonder that many students we spoke to and asked support of responded with a shrug, and a "What's the use?" response. As they see it, Canada and Alberta face an inexorable trend: a move toward the increasing homogenization of urban life, an erosion of the individual and exceptional, an ignoring of the worthwhile, the distinct and noteworthy, even in our universities.

It was sad to note during our campaign a small but vocal knot of both students and faculty who seemed to take great pride in asserting the worthlessness of an old community, and ridiculing our concern with this part of our past, as something backward, and ignorant. The fact that this sort of argument was at all common is a cause for alarm among all those who see the maintenance of a meaningful contact with the past as a matter of concern for serious members of the community.

Surely the metaphysics of mechanical "progress" have a number of monuments on our campus, not the least of which is the Lister Hall complex, the brainchild of previous bold visionaries of progress who thought that the road to the future consists of nothing more than new plans, more committee reports and expanding acres of concrete and glass, steel and plastic with a cost-accounting of every issue in naked dollars and cents.

This is the way the issue has been encapsulated by the planning functionaries at the U of A. Even

by Laverne Booth
and Robin Hunter

Dr. Horowitz — the chief of the bureaucracy — a humanist, evaded the issue when he *could and should* have addressed it. The issue now lands at your feet.

You call yourselves conservatives, and your name implies you think conservatism can be reconciled with progress. Here is an issue: it's not earthshaking but it *does* affect a community; that community was yours once, and it's ours now.

The existence of North Garneau and its preservation will affect the quality of life at the U of A. Socially and physically, it's one of our last and best direct links with Alberta's past. People from every town in our province spent time here for a significant part of their lives. Most of them are still alive; whether they rented rooms in Garneau or not, they spent time here, and it touched their lives. You couldn't find as few acres as these, anywhere else in Alberta, that mean as much to as many living people. If the word "heritage" means anything at all to conservatives, it is surely in Garneau.

Break your silence, as conservatives and citizens! We don't ask that you use your official positions and legal powers. We ask of you to speak as individuals. Come to Garneau, check out the facts, and see, as we do, that there is literally no justification for the elimination of this part of your and our heritage — unless the university has been hiding something from us.

And if you agree, as we believe we can persuade you, that they have no case to destroy Garneau, which is what looks imminent from what has been made public, then throw your voices into the scale publicly. Act as conservatives, on this issue at least.