Gateway

Member of Canadian University Press

Published twice weekly by the University of Alberta Students' Union in the Gateway Offices, Room 282, Students' Union Building.

Volume LXVI, Number 38 February 10, 1976.

SENIOR EDITORS

Editor: Greg Neiman News: Kim St. Clair Features: Kevin Gillese Arts: Lindsay Brown Sports: Darrell Semenuk Graphics: Craig McLachlan CUP: John Kenney Footnotes: Marg Reed Photo Editor: Brent Hallett

STAFF

Michael Amerongen; Robert Austin Brian Gavriloff Nancy Brown Trish Mahon Brian Bergman Janet Russell Mary MacDonald Keith Steinbach

CIRCULATION

Circulation 18,000. The Gateway publishes on Tuesday and Thursday during the Fall and Winter Sessions. It is distributed to the students, academic, and non-academic staff on campus.

Subscription Rates: \$10.00 for 67 issues

issues
Circulation Manager: Jim Hagerty

ADVERTISING

No mats accepted. National and local advertising \$.28 per agate line.
Classified Ads, 10¢ per word. All classified ads must be prepaid.
Advertising Manager: Tom Wright 432-3423

PRODUCTION

Ad make-up, layout and typesetting done by Media Productions, University of Alberta, Room 238, Students' Union Building.

Production Managers: Loreen Lennon Margriet Tilroe-West

FOOTNOTES

Publicizes campus events or those of interest to students, without charge. Footnote forms available at the Gateway office and should be submitted before 2 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays.

LETTERS

Submit all letters, typed and doublespaced to the Editor, who reserves the right to edit copy. Regular copy deadlines apply.

Opinions expressed in the Gateway are those of the writer, and are not necessarily those of the Gateway.

GRAPHICS

Submit all graphics, cartoons, and illustrations to Graphics Editor by normal copy deadlines.

COPY DEADLINES

Monday noon for the Tuesday edition; Wednesday noon for the Thursday edition.

TELEPHONES

Editor's office: 432-5178 All Departments: 432-5168 Media Productions: 432-3423

teffers

Hyenas, etc.

Despite their emphasis on the need for a democratic Gateway, the Edmonton Student Movement, "a wing of the Communist Party of Canada, Marxist-Leninist," has contradicted itself by challenging Tom Baker's right to contribute to the newspaper. "Running Dogs", etc. Jan. 29. They suggest that the Gateway is not serving the best interests of students at the U of A because a Trotskyite has written an article.

Well, Tom Baker is a Trotskyist. But it is unclear how this fact is related to the CPC/ML's concern about a democratic *Gateway*.

The Young Socialists are also interested in a democratic newspaper. This can be achieved precisely by ensuring that everyone has the right to write articles for the paper. The Young Socialists encourage all interested individuals, regardless of political affiliations or sympathies, to express their views by contributing to the Gateway. We feel that the CPC/ML's letter to the Gateway represents an attack on the democratic rights of all students to publish articles in the student newspaper. This attack on democratic rights is particularly disturbing when viewed in light of two other

On the evening of January 28, six members of the CPC/ML forcibly evicted a member of the Young Socialists from the Tory Lecture Theatre Lobby. He was dragged up the stairs and

thrown to chants of "down with fascist scum". His assailants objected to his selling a socialist newspaper outside the meeting of M. Mawema a representative of the Zimbabawe African National Union.

This incident occurred just couple weeks after Richard Poulin, a student leader at the University of Quebec in Montreal, was told by a member of CPC/ML that they intended to 'Break his legs" if he continued to oppose their political views on campus. Francoise Roy, a CPC/ML member added that he was "lucky to be warned in advance." When students who had witnessed the threats raised the issue in an interdepartmental student meeting. the CPC/ML members not only refused to repudiate their threats against Poulin but also extended threats to anyone who opposed their views.

The U of A Young Socialists calls upon the CPC/ML to repudiate its antidemocratic actions and publically oppose the use of violence by political groups on the campus. We encourage the CPC/ML and other campus groups to publish their views in the Gateway.

U of A Young Socialists

Health

Why should student health services be mandatory?

In the January 20th and 29th editions of Gateway, several arguments in favor of mandatory fees were presented, viz...

1) some people use the services without paying the fee

2) the students who do not belong now tend to be freshmen, supposedly unaware the service exists and its advan-



tages

3) the majority pay for it, so why not make it mandatory4) this action will prevent the

 this action will prevent the raising of the fees for the present.

Unfortunately, not one of these arguments are convincing. If students are using the service without paying, it is the fault of the staff and administration. Students' cards are already set up to indicate if one has opted for the plan and those who register late could be charged for the so-called administrative difficulties incurred and issued with special cards. Likewise, if freshmen are unaware of the service, the fault lies in poor administration. The explanation of the service in the registration booklet leaves much to be desired in the way of information and explicitness. Furthermore, students who are

so simple minded they cannot decide for themselves or fill out a registration form properly do not belong at university.

Some people opting out of the plan may do so for good reasons (Helath Care already exists in this province).

Finally, what is good for the majority is not good for all (ie. at one time a majority may have smoked cigarettes). Why not see just how beneficial these services are: raise the fees and leave it optional. If support is not forthcoming, the service should be abolished. One medical service already exists in Alberta, a second one is alright provided it does not have to leech off the bucks of others.

Administrative convenience for administrative ineptitude is no reason for refusing people the right to choose.

Desi Kilgannon Psychology



editorial

\$40,000 - cheap news

Well, the *Journal* figured that they got a representative survey with 365 replies to their questionnaire about the Oilers. That's with a readership of about 500,000. We've received 65 replies to our questionnaire and we've got a readership of about 30,000. It's hard to say whether we really had a random sampling, or even a representative one.

But for the staff of this newspaper, the conclusions we drew are heartening indeed.

We wanted to know just what sections of the paper are being read, what kind of job the readers felt we were doing in each area of the paper, and how and what you wanted improved.

We'd like to show you the specifics first, then move on to the general comments you gave us, and the general conclusions we drew from your replies.

First: who answered? Of the 65, there were eight staff members, one paid subscriber, and two grad students. The rest were undergrads. Almost all said they read the paper regularly, mainly entire stories that interested them, which is what we expected. It is unlikely that people who just skim the paper or read it irregularly would reply to a questionnaire. Thus the conclusions we draw must be tempered with the assumption that only the interested percentage of the reading population has given us information. Sociologists expect that kind of thing.

Of those who replied, 80% ranked the editorial section as either first, second, or third in their choice in the paper. The news section came next with 77%, features with 57%, footnotes and classivieds 40%, sports 35%, arts 25%, Hot Flashes 18%, and photo essays 16%.

Ranked fourth or fifth most-read sections news had 18%, editorials 18%, features 31%, arts 23%, sports 18%, photo essays34%, footnotes and classifieds 26%, and Hot Flashes 30%.

Sixth, seventh, or eighth choices were given as

follows: news 5%, editorials 2%, features 12%, arts, 52%, sports 47%, photo essays 50%, footnotes and classifieds 34%, and Hot Flashes 52%.

First read sections were: news 38%, editorials 20%, features 14%, arts 12%, sports 18%, photo essays 2% footnotes and classifieds 13%, and Hot Flashes 2%.

Ranked as last read sections: news 0%, editorials 0%, features 2%, arts, 16%, sports 33%, photo essays 4%, footnotes and classifieds 9%, Hot Flashes 14%. Whew!

What do these percentages mean? Well, they could probably mean a slight coronary for the arts and sports editors seeing as these sections were ranked below classified ads in some places, but we didn't want to draw these types of hard conclusions.

Of far more importance, we felt, would be your comments on what areas we were not covering thoroughly enough. But examining the replies, only the following general comments could be gleaned. In news we were told in many cases to expand into community events - others felt we should concentrate more on campus itself.

Arts coverage suggestions included space for poetry, features on people in the arts, and more campus arts coverage. Sports department criticisms said we should contain more intramural sports and should publicise upcoming sports events. There was scattered criticism to "Big Three" coverage - most recommended less concentration only on the Bears

But these were only those who replied by way of criticism; they were (believe it or not) in the minority. Most replies were monosyllabic: "Yes," said most, "we're satisfied." Gratifying for us, but not very conducive to change.

But the real clincher - the hard core issue in our hearts - was the money question at the end. And let us say right off that we love you.

Almost all (and that means with the exception of only six!) replies said they'd be willing to pay more; some two or three - some as much as ten - dollars for a year's supply of *The Gateway* (Right now it appears you'll still end up by paying only a dollar.) Well! We'll certainly let those nasty bookkeepers in the cloistered general office know about this 59-member league of support!

One reply especially caught the eye of the editor and thus he felt it deserved a quote: "I look forward to picking it up on Tuesdays and Thursdays. There is much improvement over last year, editorially in particular. Keep it up, Greg."

Love it, love it all to heck.