



Page

nb

letters today are on terry donnelly's column, dale drever's cartoon, donald duncan, student loans, and historical homes.

# letters

Thank you Mr. Donnelly! Now that you have expounded your pearls of wisdom on the economic ills of the automotive industry, perhaps you would do well to take a deep breath and take another "brief pass" at Unsafe at Any Speed, this week.

For any future technical criticisms you may plan to write, it might be a good PR idea to mention your "somewhat maximal qualifications for the job." You might even condescend to quote a few "technical experts" to back up your weighty, considered judgments of a man of Ralph Nader's stature.

Jeffrey O'Connell and Arthur Myers, in Safety Last describe Nader as a "young man of independent means who devotes himself to good causes." They state he was determined to do something about the apparent insulation afforded the automakers in the courts.

"Over the past few years he has worked almost full time on automobile safety, helping lawyers prepare cases against manufacturers and working with national and state legislators and acting generally as a gadfly."

Not exactly out of keeping with the usual activities of a concerned lawyer? Would you believe it, Mr. Donnelly? Your nonchalant claim that Nader's book is "written for the purpose of profiteering on the excitability of the public," sort of pales into insignificance when one momentarily ponders the annual traffic death toll of 100,000! Ho hum, what else is new?

You sound like someone crying in his beer when you loudly bewail the crushing blow dealt to the auto industry. Really, Mr. Donnelly, let's face it, the auto industry has enough financial means at its disposal to protect itself against slander.

Now that you have done your honorable deed and defended the auto giants against the ogre, you no doubt live for the day when you can proudly relate this feat to your grandchildren—that is, if you manage to avoid a fatal auto accident.

Your Quixotic feat brings to mind the story of the mouse and the elephant crossing a swaying swing-bridge together. After crossing safely, the mouse, with chest expanded, says to the elephant, "Boy, we sure shook that bridge!"

You appear to swallow the automaker's line about safety, hook and sinker included. Blame it on the driver, the road, a tree or a power pole. According to Stonex, the GM safety official, these hazards must be removed or improved. No mention of making the car more crash worthy. Can you imagine, the cost to the U.S. taxpayers for renovating the millions of miles of highways to render them safe?

The American Association for Automotive Medicine defines the issue this way: "It is much simpler to design around human frailties than to redesign the human body." The moot question arises, "Is man made for the machine or the machine made for man?"

The auto industry spends about \$3.9 billion annually on model changes and about a quarter billion on advertising. Compare this with the amount they spend on safety engineering. Better still, take a

close look at the annual "improvements" in the safety design of the modern automobile.

It may well be that a group of knowledgeable technologists might well agree that your article (about which the author waxes irate) to be a pile of crap from an authoritative literary point of view. The unfortunate thing is that many people may take your article seriously enough to sell their GM stock!

It is a sad thing indeed when an industry can become a multi-billion dollar concern and not be able to shake the firm foundation of an honest man like Ralph Nader standing on the principle of right before might!

helmut b. hoffman  
ed 2  
journeyman auto mechanic  
automotive instructor

Get to Gateway! Then die, CORSAIR? I hesitate to engage in combat with the honorable cartoonist, for it is said the pen is mightier than the word.

Yet still I lief cry "Resurrection," for we have been buried in Page Four, and the wielder (of the shovel) is putting on the dog!

You, sir, may "tag" the NDY as your Messiah, but I feel that 'twould only make it a dog in the manger.

(Hark! my quivering heart beat you courser? Resurrection, ah, that should get "arise" out of him.)

If you see a Duncan upon the top (by the back way, observe), wait but until March when the cold, dark Chivers flows.

Counter-attack if you will, for you may be in the right, but I am in the Right, and shall capitalize on that! Await but awhile, and the heat of your emotion shall cause the "chunky atmosphere" to rise again.

We are not dead, though perhaps slightly faded away. The strain, sayeth thou, (notice the wallowing in the past) may be showing on this gatherer of Parliamentary lost sheep, but never shalt thou say: "The Whip has cracked!"

Lest it be said that this ecriture occupies space which is a vacuum (untrue, by science!), I shall find it meet to conserve my energies and "loin my gwards" (silent 'g' ('w?'), old English, old pal). Say it not I was rambling, ros-y as it may appear. Lower, you're gaunt-let—let it not be!

The duel is dual!

your local extremist,  
samuel edward konkin III  
chairman, confederacy of  
responsible student and  
individualist right

The Jan. 18 issue of The Gateway carried an article which alleged the New Democratic Youth had failed in an attempt to establish a precedent by charging admission to the Donald Duncan meeting. The allegation is without foundation.

The plan for Duncan's appearance originated with the students' union external affairs committee and was subsequently referred to the U of A Vietnam action committee, due to the fact that the external affairs committee had outgrown its financial resources.

On application to the president for approval, Dr. Johns said three objections—that UAVAC was not a recognized students' union club (it is interesting to note that UAVAC had applied for registration early in November, but for some reason or other, the application still awaits processing), that the meeting was to be co-sponsored by an off-campus group (the Edmonton committee to end the war in Vietnam), and that admission was to be charged.

At this point the Vietnam committee requested the NDY to sponsor the meeting. The NDY (a recognized students' union club—due to some slip-up, no doubt) requested the president's approval, offering to take a collection as an alternate method of financing the Duncan appearance.

This was also unacceptable and, as reported in The Gateway, Dr. Johns "felt reluctant to see university facilities used by any political party to attack the foreign policy of a friendly power."

(Perhaps the Tory Building is in reality an ICBM launching pad or maybe it houses some other weapon which could be directed towards the White House, State Department or Pentagon; however, judging from campus mythology, the real mystery of the Tory Building is how one finds one's way around or out of it and I suggest that the confusion and frustration thus engendered is more likely to aid and abet our "friendly neighbor" by reducing her critics to the state of irrationality of which they are so often accused.)

Presumably a political party would have no difficulty obtaining approval to use the facilities to defend "the foreign policy of a friendly power" or to attack the foreign policy of an unfriendly power.

The regulation in question requires the president's written approval for all off-campus speakers but makes no reference to the levy of admission. Furthermore, it would appear that its enforcement is discretionary, subject to be invoked in a most arbitrary manner. A good many examples of prima facie

breaches come readily to mind, instances which, if not openly sanctioned, at least involve tacit approval; The Staughton Lynd meeting last spring, the presentation of the film "Mr. Pearson" (admission charged), every function where admission is charged—VCF, Culture 500, student cinema, all dances, etc., and every off-campus speaker who appears without written approval.

While I share Dr. Johns' concern as to the use, and possible misuse of university facilities, I find it impossible to fathom his distinction between partisan and non-partisan groups in this connection.

I would suggest that a more acceptable form of regulation in all instances where admission is charged would be to require full disclosure of all expenditures and receipts with any profit going to the students' union.

The sole reason for NDY involvement in this business was our concern with what, on the face of it, appeared to be an arbitrary activation and enforcement of regulations which to all intents and purposes are in obedience. Minus a satisfactory explanation and in the absence of uniform, cross the board enforcement, this remains the logical presumption.

barrie chivers  
program director  
ndy

On behalf of the Society for the Preservation of Historical Homes, I wish to appeal to each student of our university to rally and honor the founder of the university, and the first premier of our province, Hon. A. C. Rutherford.

It would be an unforgettable sacrilege by our present governments and our university administration if in this historic year, this important part of our political, social and cultural heritage is destroyed. I refer specifically to the former residence, at 11153 Saskatchewan Drive, of a man who wrote a vital page of our history.

In the name of progress, can U of A on one hand justify its department and various courses in history and on the other hand destroy the traces of Edmonton's history in the making. If, in fact, history has a place in a modern world then the processes which destroy historical sources would seem to be in contradiction to a known truth. The responsibilities of one generation to another cannot be forgotten in order to perpetuate the immediate image.

To obliterate the existing evidence of the social, cultural and economic development of Edmonton would seem questionable. We have in this home an irreplaceable rich heritage which will be easier to preserve and restore today than it will be replace and copy in later years by perhaps wiser generations.

Let us be remembered for our foresight, for our thoughtful consideration of succeeding generations. It would go down in history as a day of infamy if in our centennial year we wantonly destroyed an irreplaceable corner stone of the history of our province and our university. A plaque will never do justice to this memory.

A recent brief, from the society to university president Dr. W. H. Johns, was made with the hope that the significance of this old home as a museum would be assessed and appreciated. Amounts ranging from \$30,000 to \$1/2 million are quoted as necessary to restore the home. One has only to make a tour of the

home, speak with members of the fraternity which has resided in the home since 1941 and consult with individuals who have had estimates to restore the home, to see how utterly ridiculous it would be to even contemplate the necessity of spending large sums. The house is structurally sound. Only the main floor and upstairs need to be "restored" for a museum, and these areas are in good condition at the present time.

We have only a few homes left in our city which depict our past history. Many have already disappeared in favor of high rise buildings. These homes can be counted on two hands. Four of these will be demolished by U of A in May. It is unfortunate that these individuals who have power to preserve, also have the power to destroy; and at the same time vital decisions must be made by those who lack concern for our irreplaceable heritage.

Large sums of money are being spent to celebrate our centennial year. Many of the projects supported by these funds are temporary. But to save this historic home from demolition in just three months time, there are no funds. Since the students at the university contribute an exorbitant amount in fees, some of which goes to building more architectural monstrosities, should not the student body have a voice in saving this home which is a rose among thorns. The land involved is small, only 3 or 4 lots at a 45 degree angle in the northwest corner (112 Street and Sask. Drive) and the location is unique for a museum and park. No great skill by architect or planner is required to save this home in its present sight. We are being offered very poor excuses to say the least.

The time has come for all students, alumni and citizens to band together and sign a petition and prevent this deliberate disregard for posterity.

lila fahlman  
president  
society for preservation of  
historical homes

May I suggest that university bur-sar J. M. Whidden, might be wrong where he comments that he "would know if it (students submitting fraudulent applications for loans) were something flagrant."

I would further suggest that the practice is, in fact, a great deal more prevalent that he would care to admit.

The so-termed "periodic checks" of the student assistance board are hardly likely to reveal deceitful practices on the part of university students.

As for The Gateway's editorial Jan. 20, concerning this question of loans, it serves as another fine example of the lack of intelligent and thoughtful comment in the editorial section of this newspaper.

This is, of course, a condition which readers of The Gateway have come to expect over the course of the last three or four years. The whole editorial reeks of that mis-directed effort on the part of those students who wish to receive their university education at no expense to themselves.

Furthermore, anyone who makes the comment that the "government is so stingy with its loans," obviously has not done his homework.

raymond pratti  
arts 4

