

## "Subtle Speaker" Replies

To The Editor:

I enjoyed the comments of Owen A. Anderson about Hooke, myself, Gateway. Like the minister he defends, Mr. Anderson appears to be a thoroughly entertaining fellow.

But let me correct an impression Mr. Anderson has (I am sure quite inadvertently) made in his remarks. I quote him:

Undoubtedly they were content with the facts as they heard them from Mr. Matthews (that subtle public speaker!)

Feeling that the staff would appreciate the opportunity to secure at least some accurate statements, I arranged an interview with the Minister involved.

I agree with Mr. Anderson's kind comment that I am a subtle public speaker. That fact is surely evident to any man of reasonable taste.

But Mr. Anderson suggests that my facts were not accurate. For shame! And he suggests Mr. Hooke would provide "at least some accurate statements." Double shame!

I laid out a number of issues. The charges I made in every case were not empty but thoroughly documented. The Gateway's pages were open to reply. The Editor even suggested reply. *There was not one reply. I suggest there could be no reply.*

I invite Mr. Anderson to abandon the Social Credit tactic of general insult and smear. I invite him to return to the page I wrote and to answer point by point the remarks I recorded there. If he can prove me wrong or ill-intentioned, I shall happily learn from him.

Until then, I am afraid I must reply to Mr. Anderson with the epithet which he seems quite reasonably to dislike.

Put up, Mr. Anderson, or shut up.

Your truly,  
R. D. Mathews

## Library Damage

To The Editor:

Damage amounting to \$500 has been done to the Cameron Library.

How was this done? Somebody was slashing chairs.

What could be wrong with a person who would do a thing like that? Psychology students would likely say he had some sort of complex. As for myself, knowing nothing at all about psychology, I am much more tempted to attribute these ridiculous actions to the fact that this particular person (or persons?) has no I.Q. whatsoever. None at all. None.

The party that slashed the chairs would probably be just as ready to throw rocks at old ladies or hide in a ditch and run out to snarl and snap at tires on passing cars.

Students seem to be constantly complaining about being treated like children on campus. For most of them, this is a valid complaint.

However, there are always a few retarded jerks around who can't seem to act even a little bit grown up. I wouldn't be surprised if they put their shoes on the wrong feet. It is this very small minority that must be completely erased from campus before any student will be treated as an adult.

There are two obvious methods of getting rid of these benumbed nurslings.

A moron-squad could be formed and a mass extermination of the morons could be executed. This would not be very practical though.

A second, much more reasonable solution to the problem would be for all the clods to carry out a minute search of the insides of their skulls and see if they can discover, in some dark corner of their witless little minds, perhaps a small touch of wisdom or judgment.

To those (or he?) who slashed the chairs, if you can read please take note. Anybody can act like an ignorant halfwit. Even if you're not grown up why not try to fool people and act that way at least a little bit?

Noel McNaughton

## Viewpoint Writers Attack The Editor (What's New?), Rewrite Eliot's "Lovesong", Subtly Reply To Mr. Anderson, And Allude To Press Manipulation

### Premier Manning Bans Reporter

## Time Story Upsets Sacred Leader

To The Editor:

I believe your readers may be interested in an event last week which smacked of control or manipulation of the press.

I should point out, however, that the Edmonton Journal and the other news media in the city—for reasons known only to them—did not bother to bring this event to the attention of the public.

On Tuesday, Feb. 2, I was informed by Russell Sheppard, executive secretary to Premier Manning, that I was banned from the premier's future press conferences.

#### PREMIER REQUESTS ACTION

He said the action was being taken, at the premier's request, over an article entitled "Revival on the Right" in the January 22nd issue of *Time*.

As *Time's* Edmonton correspondent (for the past 3½ years) I assisted in the compilation and preparation of this article. It explored the political realignment proposal advanced by Manning and Robert Thompson, National Social Credit Leader.

The opening paragraph—which caused all the fuss—stated:

"On his Sunday radio program, Canada's National Back to the Bible Hour, Alberta's Social Credit Premier Ernest C. Manning has lately been evangelizing for a "national revival" to mark Canada's 1967 Centennial. To lead one himself, the silver-tongued Manning, a radio bible-basher for 34 years, would only

have to carry out his long-standing threat to give up politics and—as he tells friends—join the Billy Graham Crusade for Christ as a fulltime evangelist. But Manning is also toying with the nation of leading a political revival—by leaving Edmonton to head a new national political movement of the right. So far, the thought is no more than a toy, though Manning's junior colleague, Social Credit's National Leader Robert Thompson, is having a fine time playing with it."

#### RESENTED IMPLICATION

Sheppard said the premier resented the implication that he was using his radio program for political purposes and also strongly denied the statement about the Billy Graham Crusade.

The premier's secretary said Manning was extremely upset by these implications and called it a "scurrilous attack." He added that I would not be permitted to attend Manning's press conferences until *Time* had apologized or issued a retraction.

As I told Sheppard, I agree that the premier has the right, as a citizen, to complain about any story which appears in the public press. If he feels he has been maligned, there are sensible courses open to him to get satisfaction.

However, I DO NOT believe Manning, as an elected servant of the people, has any right to stop any qualified newsman from performing his duty. Surely the premier subscribes to the premise of democracy. And, surely he must agree that a free, unfettered press is democracy's greatest bulwark (although Social Credit did not think so when it tried to enact a press gag law in its early years in Alberta.)

In my view, this ban goes much deeper than it would appear. It is not aimed at one reporter, it is an assault on the entire press corps.

In effect, the premier is holding a club over the heads of other newsmen. If they don't toe the line, and write things which please the premier, they may also find themselves on the outside looking in.

It's no secret that Premier Manning has the Edmonton Press (the Journal and the radio and TV stations) in his pocket . . . but he's finding he can't silence outside publications and this is causing him no end of misery.

As you will recall, it was papers in eastern Canada—NOT IN EDMONTON—which first revealed the questionable business deals which led to the firing of Provincial Treasurer E. W. Hinman. It also was eastern papers who told the full story about a secret meeting last fall in which a group of Edmonton men accused Municipal Affairs Minister Hooke of certain questionable transactions, and touched off a flurry of rumors.

#### PLAYS SANTA CLAUS

Jim Hume, ace Edmonton Journal reporter, was present at this meeting. But Manning used his influence to stop Hume's story from reaching the public. The reporter was subsequently yanked off the legislative beat and pushed back into the weeds, doing police court re-writes and playing Santa Claus for The Journal. He recently left for Victoria where he is covering the B.C. Legislature.

These things, as the Toronto Star's Tom Curzon say, "could only happen in Alberta."

Yours sincerely,  
Ron Hayter  
Correspondent for *Time*,  
*Toronto Star*, UPI.

### Anti-Winship et al

To The Editor:

In the Friday edition of The Gateway last week there appeared an article on the swim meet between U of A and U of S. The article termed it to be the biggest meet of the year and scheduled it to start at 7:30 p.m. Saturday, February 6. Being a swimming fan I decided to go, arrived at 7:30, found the pool dark, and learned, much to my disappointment that the meet had been run off at 2:00. Checking with the pool since then, I have found that the meet was indeed scheduled at two o'clock. That leaves only The Gateway to blast for the slight differences in time, doesn't it?

Now to proceed with a more vital subject—politics. I would like to point out some things I have observed in The Gateway.

- (1) The Gateway is definitely anti-Social Credit.
- (2) The Gateway is edited by Bill Winship.
- (3) In a recent Gateway it was stated that Bill Winship will head the Progressive Conservative party in the upcoming Model Parliament.

Draw your own conclusions, fellow students. And if you don't believe me check with The Gateway. As you know, it always states the truth.

I am not through yet. In Tues-

day's Gateway was a section on the platforms of the campus political parties. I would like to question Owen Anderson (S.C.) for saying "Eventually an unearned basic income will be a human right." Doesn't it seem logical that a person should deserve what he gets? Would Mr. Anderson wish to see a person who never intends to work and who is of no benefit to society get money? Perhaps Mr. Anderson only wants this measure brought in so that he himself will never have to work.

And finally, I would like to commend Mr. Church (Liberals) for his stand on Red China. He rightly understands that a problem can never be solved by ignoring it or by not trying to understand what is behind it.

And finally finally, the N.D.P. column was padded with so much hot air that it was impossible to understand what they want, if anything.

Questioning?  
P.S. I really doubt that you will print this before the election.

Editor's Note—There is still some doubt, my dear (I apologize if the preceding reference has in some way destroyed the anonymity you chose), who was to blame for the mistake in swim meet times. I'm told the responsible officials changed their minds after our deadline.

To proceed with a more vital

subject: granted that I am The Gateway editor, granted that I am the leader of the Progressive Conservative party, what then are we to conclude? That somehow this makes the paper biased towards conservatism, that the opinions expressed therein are somehow to be construed as anti-Social Credit? Such conclusions neglect the obvious fact that other editors have different political opinions, that The Gateway has never been directly or indirectly anti-Social Credit (you haven't read the paper very carefully lately), that criticism of three government or cabinet policies does not make one anti-anything.

I accept your statement "it (The Gateway) always states the truth" for the truism it is! However, one cannot speak in absolutes—if we sometimes fall slightly short of our goal you will please forgive us.

If I may be permitted a few observations:

- (1) you are obviously anti-Social Credit
- (2) you are obviously anti-NDP
- (3) you are obviously anti-Winship
- (4) you are obviously anti-Conservative
- (5) you are obviously wrong about me printing your letter

Draw your own conclusions, fellow students!

## Under the Gavel

by Les McLeod

with apologies to J. Alfred Prufrock and T. S. Eliot

Let us go then, you and I  
When the campus is laid out with rye  
Like a frat-man ethelized below the table.  
Let us go through several smoke-filled rooms  
The muttering retreats of restless campaign chairmen  
And their crews.  
Rooms that harbour, like a tedious council meeting  
Of innocuous intent,  
The chances of an overwhelming question-mark.

Oh, do not ask who are they.  
Let us go and make our parley.

And in the caf the kick-lines come and go;  
Not bread and circuses but Marilyn Monroe.

The yellow fog that rubs its back upon the students' minds  
The yellow fog that rubs its muzzle on the students' minds  
Licked its tongue into the corners of the campus  
Lingered upon the fools that stand in SUB  
Let fall upon its back the gems that fall from speeches  
Slipped by the ballots,  
Made a sudden leap and seeing they were soft October minds  
Curled once about the SUB and fell asleep.