

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press

Editor-in-Chief - - - - Don Sellar

Managing Editor Bill Miller
News Editor Al Bromling
Asst. News Editor, Helene Chomiak
Sports Editor Bryan Campbell

Associate Editor Doug Walker
Page Five Linda Strand
Fine Arts Editor John Thompson
Photo Editor Neil Driscoll

EDITORIAL: CUP Dateline Editor: Ginger Bradley. Desk: Jim Rennie. Cartoonists: Dale Drever, Peter Bassek. Production Manager: Joe Will. Office Manager: Peter Enns. Editorial Board: Don Sellar, Doug Walker, Bill Miller, Linda Strand. Editorial Assistant: Carole Kaye. Librarian: Lois Berry.

STAFF THIS ISSUE:—Staffers plotting a revolt Tuesday night were Lorraine Allison, Ralph Melnychuk, Andy Rodger, Marg Penn, Ekkehard Kottke, Eugene Brody, Lorraine Minich, Rose Mah Toy, Marion Conybear, Richard Vivone and yours truly, Harvey Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published semi-weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline (including short short items): for Wednesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday: advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager: Alex Hardy. Office phone—433-1155. Circulation—8,300. Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1966

a lamentable mess

If the debate regarding the Murray-Williamson tenure dispute gets much hotter, we'll have an early spring.

Accusations, counter accusations, and accusations of accusations have been flying thicker than platitudes at election time. And amid all this noise, the dispute, which has been raging for nearly eight weeks, is still unsettled.

From the beginning, an atmosphere of "dignified silence" was supposed to pervade the conduct of this case. We have doubts about the validity of such a procedure, but nevertheless we have tried, in our news columns, to maintain this principle inasmuch as it is compatible with our responsibility to the students of this campus. It is to be noted that up to this week, the three persons most directly involved in the case, David Murray, Colwyn Williamson, and Professor A. M. Mar-diros, did maintain this silence.

Certain students and members of the philosophy department saw fit to send us letters expressing their opinions of the case. We printed them all. However, both professors Murray and Williamson felt the issues were now so clouded they were compelled to make public statements.

Mr. Murray most poignantly suggested that in all the furor which has been stirred, the main issues seem to have been forgotten. Everyone seems more interested in "whispering campaigns" than in hard facts and issues.

Open discussion of such problems as a tenure dispute is a good thing, especially insofar as students are concerned, for students have a greater stake in the development of the philosophy department than do any of the persons directly involved in this dispute.

But when these discussions descend to vicious and unsubstantiated attacks against the morality and personal conduct of individuals, any atmosphere of openness and conciliation which may have existed at the beginning of these proceedings is obviously destroyed, and the university community is faced with an extremely ugly situation.

We were formerly under the impression that the educated and intelligent men in the faculty and administration were perfectly capable of settling such difficulties as a tenure case in a calm, just, and rational manner. It seems now that this is not to be the case.

On the basis of shortness of notice alone, we feel that Mr. Murray and Mr. Williamson are justified in asking for a one year's extension of contract.

In the present, highly emotional atmosphere, it appears that a rational and impartial settlement is not likely to be reached.

Thus we suggest that an investigation committee from the Canadian Association of University Teachers be called, so a speedy end can be put to a lamentable mess.

that parking problem again

Campus parking, without a doubt, is a serious problem at this university. Just how serious was demonstrated this week when a teachers' convention forced student cars from the Jubilee Auditorium parking lot and on to the already crowded streets in the university area.

It is simply a question of too many cars—there are more than 4,500 student cars registered now—being forced to compete for too few parking places.

University and student authorities, slow to come to grips with the problem, now openly admit its gravity. However, little concrete evidence of any attempted solution is as yet apparent.

But we do not wish to appear hypercritical of what is essentially an

impossible situation. It is unreasonable to expect the university administration to provide parking spaces for all students bringing their cars to university. The number of registered cars could easily exceed 10,000 when the university reaches its maximum enrolment; and, to put it simply, these are not the University's responsibility.

But this does not mean the university should wash its hands entirely of the parking problem. Land could easily be made available, particularly in the North Garneau area, for the construction of a large parkade.

If a student can afford to operate a car at all, he should be able and be prepared to pay for parking services. If not, he should be using public transportation facilities.



reprinted from the ryersonian

could co-operatives save canada?

by h. c. pentland
reprinted from canadian dimension

Foreign long-term capital investment in Canada was about \$7½ billions in 1930, and varied little from this during the next twenty years. But, since 1950, it has climbed continually and enormously, and is somewhere above \$25 billions, or more than three times as large as it was fifteen years ago. Over 80 per cent of foreign ownership is held by Americans, and more than half of it involves direct ownership and control of Canadian factories and mines by foreign firms. This is concentrated in the most strategic and profitable Canadian industries; so much so that petroleum, automobiles, and rubber come close to being foreign monopolies from which Canadians are excluded; but foreign ownership and control is massive in many others.

My own greatest objection to this is that foreign ownership robs us of independence: I think that an economic colony will also be a political colony, and that Canada's frequent subservience to the United States follows largely from our status as an economic subsidiary.

I think also that the inflow of foreign capital far from being essential to Canadian growth, has often hindered it. In the 1940s when there was no net inflow of foreign capital and we depended entirely on native investments, employment was high and the country leaped ahead. Since 1956, in contrast, we have had both an enormous inflow of capital and the most depressed business conditions since the 1930s. Only very recently,

when the flow of foreign capital has been much lower than before, has Canada taken on a prosperous look. But the flow will likely rise again, if unchecked; and may again displace native capital, lower our incomes, and push us into further depression. Yet, the ordinary operations of private business show no signs of checking it or increasing Canadian ownership. I can detect only two instruments that could do these things, our governments and our co-operatives.

Governments are obviously the more powerful and important. Unfortunately, though, we cannot at present count on much government action to check foreign ownership, either. We may hope for some future government that is strong enough and willing to take decisive action to restore native control of the Canadian economy.

Co-operatives provide the one form of ownership, other than by government, that can be trusted to remain strictly under Canadian control and responsive to Canadian needs. They offer the small man a means by which he may share in the ownership and direction of firms that market his products or supply his needs. If strong and numerous, co-operatives can establish a healthy check on private monopoly and monopoly prices. Co-operative ownership provides an alternative to government ownership and, thus, to the concentration of power that would go with a great extension of government ownership. Co-operatives then are exceptionally suitable agencies through which to regain and guarantee ownership of Canada by Canadians.