VGW will be missed

I would like to express my displeasure in regards to the decision to cancel this year's Varsity Guest Weekend. It was my belief that, with the transfer of its responsibility to the Board of Governors, it would be handled in an efficient manner, and perhaps even improved. But I find the proposals, along with the cancellation of VGW as we know it, an extremely unsatisfactory alternative.

Being involved with the University of Alberta Computing Society, I can honestly say that the past years' VGW was extremely successful from our point of view. Many adults, as well as high school students, (about 1500) took in the computer displays offered. Other areas, such as Electrical Engineering and Agriculture to name a couple, also had a successful turnout.

I realise that not all areas can boast of a great success in past years, but I feel that there is still a great deal to offer to the community at large by holding an "open house" over the entire university, and thus allow people of all ages to see a great deal of the university. Therefore, on behalf of myself and my fellow students, I sincerely ask you to reconsider your decision.

Fred Popowich Students' Council Science Rep

Paper ignores female sports

Every issue of the Gateway, we flip to the sports page looking for the latest news on Women's Intramurals and every issue we find, to our disappointment, two or three meager paragraphs at the end of the long article on Mens and Co-Rec Intramurals.

The Gateway of November 14 takes the cake! Garnet Du Gray's report on the Campus Superstars didn't even mention who won the women's competition.

We realize that Men's Intramurals has greater participation and more money to spend on facilities and promotion, but surely the *Gateway* can give us equal time. Come on, Mr. Du Gray, shape up!

Barb Chapman Rec. Admin. 2 Bonnie Saligo Rec. Admin. 2



Quixote

by David Marples

In August of this year, building commenced on a convention centre in Edmonton, located on Grierson Hill. The question whether Edmonton should have its own convention centre has been debated regularly since 1971. Yet according to supporters of the centre, the rationale behind the project is so obvious that it is pointless to protract the discussion further. As Olive Elliott commented in Saturday's Edmonton Journal: "its benefits are so apparent and so undeniable that opposition to this... proposal is based only on red herrings tossed in by people who know they can't oppose the concept outright."

Ms. Elliott evidently believes that many citizens of Edmonton are too ignorant to participate in discussing the future of their city. The aforementioned "red herrings" are very big fish indeed. For example, the estimated costs for constructing the centre have already risen from the original estimate of \$20 to \$32.1 million and they are still climbing. Alberta already has a convention centre at Calgary and the City of Edmonton is well endowed with suitable sites for business meetings, such as the Jubilee Auditorium, the Coliseum and the Kinsmen Field House. What then are the "undeniable" benefits which such a centre would offer?

The movement against the convention centre has been taken up by the Edmonton Voters Association (EVA). Although city council refused to accept EVA's petition calling for a plebiscite on the centre, EVA's case was upheld in court. One might note that city council's desire to ignore the expressed wishes of 16,000 citizens shows a rare degree of political high-handedness. EVA points out that four of the councillors who voted to reject the petition were actually elected to Council on the promise of holding a plebiscite on the convention centre. It seems that election promises are somewhat ethereal where big business interests are concerned.

The EVA campaign, led by labor leader Ed Ewasiuk and exalderman David Leadbeater has produced a tabloid illustrating the main issues involved. For purposes of simplication, these can be reduced to three. First, the Grierson Hill site is well known to be unstable. Second, the centre is likely to lose at least half a million dollars each year and will be a heavy burden on taxpayers. The much heralded ten per cent increase in business taxes means little when the latter are also taken from the consumer's pocket. Finally, the centre would not be used by Edmonton citizens. It would be primarily a facility for visiting businessmen and occasional tourists.

EVA's struggle to repeal Bylaw 5384 is an uphill one. To date, the campaigners have raised \$4,000. In contrast, the proconvention centre committee has amassed close to \$75,000, a figure which reflects big business rather than public support. Further as Ms. Elliott's column shows, the pro-conventionists are supported by the media on both a provincial and national level. *Macleans* speaks of a worthy project being "threatened...by a handful of protesters." Emotions rise when well-laid plans are interrupted in mid-course. One should remember that regardless of the forthcoming plebiscite, the convention centre is already booked up in advance.

My concern is that those with the least financial means are being asked to pay for a building to be used predominantly by businessmen who have ample means. The Edmonton taxpayer surely would not resent paying for projects which would truly benefit the community; public transport, road repairs, ambulance services, children's playgrounds and recreational centres, to name but a few. But the convention centre represents anegation of public interests by City Council. Should Edmonton's future belong to a minority of businessmen, or to the great majority of citizens who pay for such projects? By voting yes, to repeal Bylaw 5384 on November 28; U of A students could help to decisively answer this question





