## Opinion



In the few days since Edmonton City Council went public with the design of Edmonton's new city hall, the building's cone-shaped "caps" have already become infamous. So unpopular is architect Gene Dub's design that it has earned itself facetious nicknames: the "cone dome", "Three Mile Island", and "conehead palace".
After pictures of the model were printed in the city's newspapers, the Citizen's Action Centre received hundreds of calls lamenting the design's ugliness. The number of calls in favour of it could be counted on one hand.
Since Council avoided the competition process by hiring Dub on the basis of his other designs, it would be easy enough for them to admit their mistake and send Dub (or someone else) back to the drawing board. But no, they're going to postpone the decision in order to save time.
What is the reasoning behind this ingenious plan? Councillors hope that a month of procrastination will enable them to "sell" the plan to Edmonton citizens. Once we are forced to admit that our initial shock blinded us to the design's subtle beauty, Council will be spared the hassle of finding a new one

I have to wonder: what do they take us for? Do they really believe that a model which, in a photo, has disgusted the great majority of Edmontonians will suddenly win them over in 3-D? Shouldn't Edmontonians have a say in how $\$ 35.1$ million of their money (up from a $\$ 23$ million estimate) will be spent?
Apparently, the public will be asked to fill out questionnaires after having seen the model itself, and Council will be soliciting written submissions from organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce. But it appears unlikely that in a month, Council will be willing to face further delay by succumbing to the public's wishes.

This twisted thinking shouldn't surprise us, coming from a city council which seems to be in a constant process of discussing, debating, or researching, but not passing any constructive legislation.
Coincidentally, it was announced Wednesday that Council, after 18 months of wavering, voted down the cat bylaw. Frolicking felines will now be allowed to run free, which is a good thing considering the difficulty bylaw officers would have had in curbing cats' natural instincts.
Other momentous announcements made by Council in the past year have included the decisions not to allow Jerry, the Vietnamese pot-bellied pig, to remain in Edmonton; not to settle on a new garbage dump site just yet; and not to turn Clarke Stadium into a muchneeded new ball park.
Maybe there's a good reason why city councillors seem to be the only ones who find the design of the new city hall attractive: they see themselves in it.
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## Letters

## Behold The Larch..

You've gone too far
I am very disappointed in The Gateway, which, up until now, I have always enjoyed reading and found informative. I am an open minded person, but there are limits to what one can print and expect people to take sitting down. One such breach of everything I, personally hold sacred was last week's opinion column entitled "Worship larches!"
I find it truly sad that you people can lampoon those who spend huge portions of their time selflessly endeavoring to save your immortal souls, but that isn't even the least of it. What really got me, was your ignorant, completely ungrounded assault on The Larch. It was painfully obvious to me that your staff didn't even take the time to research Larchism before endorsing your wanton, blasphemous, self-righteous mockery of what, quite frankly, is a damn serious matter. Granted, He works in mysterious ways, but I have never doubted His existence; in fact, The Larch Incarnate has visited me in my dreams. And, as a founding member of the Edmonton chapter of the Intercollegiate Fellowship of Larch Fearing People (EIFLFP), and in general, someone who is so pious it's not even funny, I think I have the right to condemn you ungodly, selfserving little philistines to eternal death, pain, and torment, and moreover, to enjoy doing it - oh, hell, let's be honest now - to really get off on it.
My only desire is to serve the sacred Larch and to make sure everyone else does too, or at the very least, to waste enough of their time so that they pretend to, in order to get me off their backs. Is this so dreadfully wrong? Do we deserve the purely gratuitous, pointed sarcasm which seems to surround us? No way. Laugh if you will, shun The Larch, worship the Douglas Pine, the Black Spruce, nothing at all, or worse yet, the Balsam Poplar. It's your soul, not mine. (Hey, wait...)
On behalf of the EIFLFP and its numerous affiliates, I am announcing the boycott of this paper until such time as you see fit to approach this crucial issue with a little more seriousness. (We'll see how your sales figures like that.) As you can plainly see, $W E$ don't kid around. I have but
one last thing to say and I quote (embellishing only where absolutely necessary to preserve the integrity of its original message) from Penguin Paperbacks' monumental collection of scripture: A Field Guide to Western Shrubbery" [Behold] The Larch... [or burn in Hell, for He shall inherit Earth]... is known for its pine-like tendency to [catch on fire and roast unbelievers like you, so watch out]..."
Palms 2:13
David McElhaney
Science

## Reform apology

Regarding the story "Reform Party revs up" which was printed in the September 29 issue of The Gateway I would like to make corrections in response to a letter I have received.
First of all, there are obviously four Western provinces, not three. Secondly, the Reform Party is not, in any way, separatist, and neither were the early Progressives. Nor does the Reform Party inject a separatist option for voters. All thirteen candidates present at the forum on September 26 will be running in Alberta during the upcoming federal election. One of these candidates was part of a western separatist movement.
I apologize for confusion caused by these errors.

Shelby Cook
Arts III

## Reader infuriated

Re: Worship larches! Oct. 20/88
I was positively infuriated to read your commentary, Mr. Ruiu, on the U of A's religious organizations, particularly Campus Crusade for Christ. I'm not exactly thrilled that the Students' Union is supporting a paper with an editor who chooses to limit his representation of the student population as such. Good journalism informs its readers; The Gateway chooses to slander theirs.
I attend $U$ of $A$ full time and frequent SUB, HUB, and CAB as much as the next person, yet I don't find myself plagued by religious "nuts". Why so malicious, Mr. Ruiu? Is "No thanks, I'm not interested" such a difficult response? It may surprise you to find out that not everyone is as narrow-minded as you
are about religion and certainly many are not going to take too kindly to your addressing Jesus Christ in such a sarcastic manner.
You don't sound completely ignorant in the matter so if you'd take a moment to come out from behind your larches, you'd realize that these people are genuinely concerned with all of "filthy humanity", even you. You say you're bored with those who choose to "use religion as their social crutch." Well, I'm bored with those who see the faithful as handicapped, fanatical, pamphlet-pushing zealots.
You say you're too busy worrying about your current life to be concerned about the next one. Here's a timesaving hint: stop writing such garbage. Meanwhile, we'll pray for your next one.

Bonnie Bober
Arts II

## Ruiu "pissed off"

Re: Dragos Ruiu's editorial titled "Worship Larches" in the October 20 Gateway
Frankly. I expect better things from Mr. Ruiu, who I always thought was a progressive yet rational journalist. Instead, he sounds just plain pissed-off at the "zealots" and their "rot", who seem to be bothering him most of the day. While I am no campus Christian, I do believe in their right to express themselves, and if that means occasionally handing out pamphlets (which every other interest group on campus seems to do), so be it. Remember, no one forces you to read or listen. Furthermore, not everyone is as lucky as Mr . Ruiu, who is editor-in-chief of his own newspaper, and thus is able to spout off whenever he wants. Finally, about the constant harassment poor Mr. Ruiu faces as the zealots try te save another "one of those drugged up rock-music degenerates that man aged to survive the cluster suicides", 1 have to feel empathy as the Christian radicals actually have the nerve to show concern or caring for him. Frankly, sometimes Mr. Ruiu does not seem worth the effort.
P.S. If Mr. Ruiu keeps screaming about trees, maybe Forestry will make him their poster-boy.
B. Macedo

Science IV

