

THIS S FORUM I V PAGE



Me and the boys at the pub weren't born nude or with long hair!

I think that it is only right that the management of a certain "Boston Pizza" has taken the attitude that they have shown in their recent scuffle with the pinko-leftist activists who attend university. These kind should be put in work camps to find out what it means to earn a dollar. They wear long, unruly, unkempt hair: why if God wanted us to have long hair he would not have created barbers. Their kind and their morality, humbug! If God wanted us nude we would have been born that way. I applaud the

stand of "Boston Pizza" and wish more establishments and the government and police of Canada take a hard line on the "long hairs." I mean, this is a democratic, free country, so that gives me the right to persecute and oppress who I want. Me and the boys at the pub are hopin' ya give the silent minority a listen too.

Thomas Sperling
arts 2



As you probably know by now, the Faculty of Education Council voted Tuesday afternoon to adopt 'in principle' the recommendations of the B.Ed. and A.D. Programs Revision Committees. They are going to further discuss these matters in their February meeting. As well, a revision of graduate programs is probably going to be discussed. If you have anything to say on these matters, or on anything else, inform me sometime this month. If not, you can go to Hell and I'll represent myself.

Winston Gereluk,
Graduate Student Rep to
Education Faculty Council.

Farewell to that golden, insane era

The weekly meetings of the day-care centre alias students' union may never be the same again.

With a speaker to keep order we may be robbed of those scenes which delighted students' council goers earlier this year.

Never again will we hear cries of "Hey, what are we voting on?" from confused council members. Never again will we be able to watch as Jeff Caskenette flies his paper airplane into the point on Dennis Fitzgerald's head, and never again will we hear Fitz's laughter - provoking reply, "Get off my back, Caskenette."

At least the new speaker hopes that these insanities will come to an end.

He must be wondering right about now if the \$35 is worth the job. He should at least be getting hazardous duty pay. Anyone interrupting councillors to tell them that they are out of order could be seriously wounded, at least verbally, by those who back the person speaking.

The job will require a tough skin, and a strong master-at-arms would certainly be an asset. I would advise Mr. McCallum to

pay up his life and medical insurance as well. If the verbal mis- sives don't kill him, they could put him on the road to Eccedrine headache number 29.

A strong stomach and a high shock threshold will probably be more of an asset than a thorough knowledge of Robert's Rules of Order, for a speaker who will be faced with councillors claiming to

By
Charles
Lunch



PHOTO BY SHOILEY

want to speak on a point of order, and then presenting their views on the question at hand.

Parliamentary procedure may prevail in council under the new speaker, but it may take some strong gavel pounding to get councillors in the mood for it. Some of the gavel pounding may have to be done on a few councillors' heads.

A second opinion - Anderson should do his homework and tell it like it is

I'm concerned by the implications made by Bob Anderson in his "... one man's opinion" column in Tuesday's paper.

I'm not disputing Mr. Anderson's right to voice his own opinion. What does disturb me is that several insinuations he has made are not based on fact. He has misconstrued the situation with his own emotional feelings and has, as a result, slandered the character of Golden Bear hockey coach Brian McDonald.

Mr. Anderson says, "... McDonald's control over his players is minimal." That's because he treats them like men. These players aren't being paid to play hockey, so why should McDonald be a combination of "Big Brother" and "Daddy."

As for the team's taking an increasing number of cheap penalties, Mr. Anderson should have done his homework and compared this year's team with some of the others in the last five years. This team is a bunch of patsies in comparison.

Granted that the Hohol incidents were regrettable, but it is not fair to say that Clare Drake would have handled the situation differently. Hohol's been pulling the same stunts for the last five years, whether his coach was Don Hunt, Clare Drake or Brian McDonald.

Mr. Anderson says McDonald grinned with approval at Hohol's antics. Hasn't he ever heard the expression "grin and bear it"? Only a fool would openly remind an individual in front of 2,400 people. If Mr. Anderson had bothered to go into the dressing room after the game, I'm sure he would have learned whether or not the coach took action.

It's amazing that Mr. Anderson, on his infrequent trips to the dressing room, has learned that there is "internal strife" on the

team. Perhaps he read it in The Journal.

Mr. Anderson said: "Several of the veterans are upset with the unpopular McDonald, and the explosive situation could get worse as the season goes on." This is an out-and-out lie. I challenge Mr. Anderson to name one player who has a personal beef with the coach and who figures he is not being treated fairly.

As for McDonald's being unpopular, this is ridiculous. I've known Brian McDonald for six years; firstly as a player, secondly as The Gateway sports editor, and currently as a business acquaintance. He is one of the fairest and most likeable individ-

uals with whom it has ever been my pleasure to associate. I defy you to find anyone who doesn't share this view, outside of yourself.

Sure, the Bears should have beat UBC. The Minnesota Vikings should have beat Kansas City too, but they didn't; and I don't hear people yelling for Bud Grant's scalp.

I suggest Mr. Anderson take his finger off the panic button and use it to block up his constant flow of verbal diarrhea. I'm sure if the Golden Bears played hockey like Mr. Anderson writes, the team's record would be 0-5.

Bill Kankewitt Alumni
Gateway sports editor '68-'69



"Why do you all want to play left wing?"

Stone-hearted women should save children, not Rutherford houses

The numerous articles on the restoration of Rutherford House are just too much to bear. Most shocking was to see the amount that the UCW is prepared to spend. Let it be clear that I do appreciate historical sites and have no political motivation for this letter.

I can never condone the willingness of the UWC to spend \$30,000 plus to save the building. In this city I have personally seen families living in dwellings with rotted floors, sanitation nearly absent and little heat. How will Rutherford House help these families?

How many families could be spared from these deplorable conditions! With this money how many children can be given clothes and blankets—here as well as on Indian and Metis settlements? Is this child to die because we prefer to have Rutherford House?

Maybe I am square and sentimental but I do believe that the life of one child spared from death or suffering is worth much more than ten Rutherford Houses. It is really sad when we are prepared to save the life of a building and forget those whose lives are miserable or in danger.

What the hell do you ladies of the UWC care for children who must sleep on an unheated floor? Do you give a damn for a child who must die for lack of funds? Can you not see that these might be your children? How can you inhuman stone-hearted women justify money for Rutherford House in the face of this suffering and deprivation? I suppose that as long as you have Rutherford House and live in comfort nothing else matters.

Larry Ciejka
sci 2

