Lubicon life destroyed

The Lubicon Lake Indian bapd face genocide. To date, both the federal and provincial governments have sat back and let it happen.

The Lubicon Cree have tried to settle their land claim for forty five years. In 1940, Ottawa recognized that the Lubicons were a distinct band, and recommended that they should have a reserve complete with mineral rights, calculated at 128 acres per person. With a land membership of 127, the Lubicon Cree were to receive about 25 square miles. The reserve boundaries were drawn on a map. But a ground survey was required and was never completed because of World War II. The Lubicon Cree are still waiting.

The federal government began actively working against the interests of the band in 1942. A Crown agent arbitrarily struck 90 names from the band list, because he felt they were not pure blooded Indians.

During the early fitties, the province was willing to grant the Lubicon Cree a 25-square-mile reserve between Lubicon and Little Buffalo Lakes, Pressured by oil com-panies, Alberta issued Ottawa an ultimatumin 1954—the status of the Lubicon land claim had to be clarified within thirty days or the area would be considered provincial Crown land. Ottawa refused to reply.

Crown land. Ottawa refused to reply. The ensuing stalemate Isset until 1973 when the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that native groups who had not settled treaties were entitled to a land settlement based on aboriginal claims. The former federal Liberal government acknowledged that 37 Lubicon Cree were entitled to a reserve. But Alberta's Native Affairs Minister, Mill Pahl, argued that there were only a dozen Lubicon Indians and refused to negotiate. Instead the province established a municipality at Little Buffalo in order to undermine the land claim by integrating the natives into mainstream Alberta society.

undermine the land claim by integrating the natives into mainstream Alberta society.

While negotiations have dragged on, oil exploration has decimated the Indians' traditional life based on hunting and trapping. The province receives \$1.2 million aday in oil royalties from the area, but the Lubicon have no fulfilling means of supporting themselves. Tuberculosis has broken out amongst band members. TB is caused by poverty prior living conditions, and stress.

Firstandel Tube Nague Islaem their case to the United

Frustrated, they have taken their case to the United Nations; it will be heard this month. Both federal and provincial governments have recently announced nego-tiators to settle the claim before international criticism creates an embarrassment at the Olympics.

creates an embarrasment at the Olympics.

In the last few years the province has said it would concede 25 square miles of land based on the 1940 agreement. However, the Lubicon Cree have now almost 400 members; they want 69 square miles complete with mineral rights. The compensation they demand seems little in comparison to their lost way of life. Soon the whole world will turn its eyes on Alberta. Let's hope these eyes see the tragedy of the Lubicon Cree.

The Gateway

Edinorin-Chief: RHODERICK (ROD.) J. CAMPBELL, Managing Edinor: SHERRIN RTCHIE News Editors: ROBERTA FRANCHUK, KEN BOSMAN-Entertainment Edinor: ELMAN EOSTRY Sports Edinor: ALAN SMALL, Photo Edinor: BRUCE GARDAVE Production Editor: JUANITA SFEND Production Editor: JUANITA SFEND Crudation Manager: CURTS BEAVERORD Media Supervisor: MARGHET TLROG—WEST Adventising: TOM WRIGHT

CONTRIBUTORS: LLOYD ROBERTSON, ROB JOHNSTONE, SMITA SHARMA, PAT MANDIN; ROB JOHNSTONE, SMITA SHARIMA, PAT MANDIN; DOUG JOHNSON, HEATHER HOGG, THERESA MAH, J. DYLAN, DRAGOS RUIU, RANDAL SMATHERS, BEM MCCAFERY, LISA HALL ROSA JACKSON, DAVID GATES, MIKE SPINDLOE, CATHY DUONIG, SANDY STIFT, GORD STECH, CAFLLYM ANEY, ROB GALBRAITH, PAUL MENZIES.

The Gateway is the newspaper of the University of Alberta students. Contents are the responsibility of the Editor-in-Chief. All opinions are signed by the writer and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway. Copy deadlines are 11 am. Mondays and Wednesdays. Newsproom. Rm. 282 (ph. 425-1668). All photographs printed in the Gateway are for sale. Call the photodirector at 425-1689 or control of the Call of the Call



The real Tupper speaks

Re: The political cartoon debate

Re: The political cartoon debate
Two weeks ago, Isubmitted a motion
to Students' Council designed to address students' concerns about a cartoon which appeared in the October
22 issue of the Cateway. Since that time,
debate has ensued about the place of
censorship in a free and democratic
society. It has, however, become obvious that the intent and object of the
motion have been misunderstood.

motion have been misunderstood.
Elected officials of a representative body are responsible for ensuring that the concerns and grievances of their constituents are fully articulated. This representation is the single most important quality of a democracy. Our Students' Union does its best to follow such democratic principles. Each faculty elects councilions that serve the such as and address issues important. students and address issues important to them. I was endeavoring to fulfil my role as Arts Councillor when I sub-mitted the notion requesting an apol-ogy of the Gateway.

ogy of the Cateway.

Sk students had approached me and sepressed distate with the cartoon, asking if Students' Council would respond. I have never been approached by so many people about any issue before, including tuition increases and student fees. People seldom complain, and when one person asserts an opinion to a representative it is a safe assumption that many people share his views. The complaints by six people, therefore, were significant. No matter what my own personal views on the cartoon were, these individuals and the people that they spoke for were entitled to representation.

The motion stated, "resolved that

titled to representation.

The motion stated, "resolved that Students' Council inform the Gateway that the cartoon was in poor taste and request an apology." Censorship, as has been noted in previous letters, is undesireable in a liberal society so I in so was desired to setticit the freedom. undesireable in a liberal society so I in no way desired to restrict the freedom of the press. Instead, the motion was intended to simply express the distaste of the students who had talked to me. A request for an apology was made of the Cateway, and not a demand. The Cateway would have been free to comply with the request or to ignore it, just as it can comply with or reject the demands of any Letter to the Editor. The cartoon appeared two days prior to midterm week and students during

this period often do not have time to eat, sleep, or breathe, let alone write a letter. Students' Council was acting as letter. Students' Council was acting as an easy, accessible medium through which student displeasure could be communicated. Just as the Gateway had the right to publish the cartoon, so too did the students have the right to object in whatever manner they found easiest. The complainants were not ignorant and uninformed; they were search of fineded. The motions there. simply offended. The motion, there simply offended. The motion, there-fore, attempted to guarantee the free-dom of expression of the students without compromising the integrity of the media through censorship.

One further item appears to need clarification, and that is my supposed ignorance about the cartoon, sex, and satire. Aspersions have been cast on my abilities to understand all three of these abilities to understand all three or these subjects because of a remark I made in prefacing the motion. I commented that at first I didn't understand the cartoon. I made this statement with tongue in cheek to relieve the tension of the meeting. I did, however, understand the import of the cartoon and the settings desired in it. My licher see settings desired in it. My licher see actions depicted in it. My jokes are sometimes flawed, but I'll do better at the next meeting.

I hope that this letter has clarified the Inope that this letter has clarified the intent of the motion. If anyone has any further questions or comments about this issue or any other issue, please call me at 465-6720. I always enjoy sitting down over a few drinks of whatever kind and talking about anything. Without communication, there can be no representative. representation

David Tupper Arts' Councillor

Athletics values

Re: Athletic Cuts

Re: Athletic Cuts
As a former Track and Field and
Cross-country Panda, I was shocked at
the news that these teams had been
dropped from the varsity athletics
program. With so many successes and
numerous positive aspects of these two
teams, I can see little if any justification
for this seemingly arbitrary cut in
support.

University track and field serves as a preparatory ground for many potential international stars. Unlike some varsity sports (ie. gymnastics) where, by University, the athlete is already past their peak, varsity track and field and cross-

country served the crucial function of bridging the gap between high school athletics and major international and national competition. It seems quite hypocritical that the Phys Ed depart-ment would support a bid for the 1994 Commonwealth Games and yet cut the central sport of the games from their own I binorich. own University.

It is well known in the University athletic circles that the two afore-mentioned teams commanded a very small percentage of the monies allosmall percentage of the monies allocated for varisty competition. Since the U of A is one of only two Western Conference schools to have indoor competition facilities, little travel expenses were involved. Furthermore, the same coaches were responsible for both the men's and women's 'teams—none of which were employed fullime by the University. Perhaps these two successful teams were cut because politically, it is much easier to dismiss non-full-time staff! If this is the case, these teams were put in a position of

pointcailly, it is mucre easier to oismiss non-full-time staff! If this is the case, these teams were put in a position of double jepoardy. Not only did the teams recieve less support when the did exist, but because of this, they were the first teams to loose all support. Abest this would be a questionable criteria for dropping support.

Perhaps the most disturbing issue to come to light is the lack of common ourtesty and respect the department of athletics has shown for its athletes and students in general. When news of the decision leaked out, a group of athletes, coaches, officials, profs, and parents rallied together to discuss what had happened. Representatives from the athletics department were invited