

People, not parking

This letter is in response to the charade which occurred during the last Council meeting on Nov. 15. As a participant in this dramatic opera, I would like to clarify my position as a Council member in this distasteful event. There was a series of antagonistic and unqualified remarks made to and about Len Zoeteman and his fellow executives. These comments were directed towards Len's controversial proposal to the Board of Governors regarding the future plans for the south end of Corbett Hall.

This is not an apology, it is my opportunity to express respect for Len's decision. I do not consort with the concern that Len has in the future of this campus. But, as an individual and as a representative of the students whom I represent, I personally disagree. The disagreement I voiced was not one, out of lack of respect for him or his fellow executives, it was one based on a personal belief that his choice was a correct one.

The motion passed was not intended to veto Len's vote or make him personally look foolish. It was inadequate for his job, for he was far from either. I feel personally responsible to the students whom I represent, and it is my duty to protect their interests. That was my sole reason for the disagreement with Mr. Zoeteman, and not a personal opportunity to admonish him or his executive.

Doug Agar
Education Rep

release its clutch on Corbett Field.

I feel it is necessary that strong demands be made by both students and faculty to recind this dangerous precedent of turning our limited green space and playing fields into black asphalt for parking.

Are workmen immune to car pools and public transit? What is next, the announcement of the Varsity Stadium and Quad Car Parks?

Mike Hanna
Rec Admin III

As a member of the student body of this university I believe that everyone should give our esteemed president a boot in the rear! Especially if he believes he is representing the wishes of the student body in the Board of Governors in regards to the Corbett Hall Parking Lot. I have several small but important points to make.

1. If the hospital is feeling the pressure for space now, they will be in even greater need for that space five years from now.

2. Educators are just now discovering the great benefit that a healthy body adds to the ability for students to learn. Yet you are

prepared to give up one of the few places on campus we can obtain outdoor recreation experiences.

3. There is provincial government legislation allocating that a minimum of ten percent of developed land be left as open space. The removal of this well used playing area could very well lower the university area below that legislated level. Park standards suggest that this level be ten acres per one thousand residents.

4. If the hospital is considering returning this land to the University as a playing field are they prepared to pay the costs of reclamation? They are phenomenal! All of the top soil must be replaced; it will take at least one year for growth and another year or two to make it into a playable surface. It is doubtful if the area could be reclaimed really to its original state. The net result is a loss of the area for seven to eight years. The cost in today's prices would be approximately \$18,000.00 per acre to reclaim the land.

So fellow students write a short letter to the B of G and let your feelings be known. We want people not parking.

Joyce Wright
4 yr. Recreation Admin

Poli Sci profs tell Pied Piper Peter his policy is "unacceptable"

To Peter Lougheed:
It was with some alarm that we read the statement you made in the Legislature saying that you intend to "talk to the U.S. ambassador to Canada, the Canadian ambassador to the United States, to governors, to congressmen, to Senators ..." and "use everything I can" to change the position of the government of Canada on tariffs affecting agricultural and petrochemical products.

It was your emphasis on outside forces that caused us concern, for whatever the substance of the debate with the federal government we feel that it is totally unacceptable that any provincial government in any way encourage a foreign government or members of that government to intervene or feel that they might be able to use their influence to support that particular

province's position against the government of Canada.

We believe that while regional differences within Canada should be the subject of legitimate debate between all levels of government in Canada, that the decision-making process is a strictly domestic one. Under no circumstances should the process include the involvement of a foreign government.

Statements by Canadian provincial leaders which seem to encourage other states to think that they might find openings for using their influence in the allocation of Canadian resources greatly damage Canadians' ability to effectively control their own future by the application of Canadian values to the solution of Canadian problems.

It is our hope that you, and your government, will clarify the policy basis underlying the

We aim to please, so will you AIM too, please?

Over the recent years I have been confronted on several occasions on the issue of Indian involvement and commitment to the American Indian Movement (AIM) both in Canada and United States. This, together with the latest article in Maclean's magazine (October issue, pp. 26-40, concerning the background and events leading up to the "martyrdom of Nelson Small Legs), and a fund raising event in which the proceeds went to the "Nelson Small Legs Memorial Fund," (Oct. 24, McEwan Hall, U of C), has prompted me to write this letter with hopes that it will clear up any misguided or nebulous abstractions that seem to be prevailing within the host society.

Even though the general public has heard of the AIM group, there exists questions such as, "Who does AIM represent," and "How many committed supporters do they have?" In the following paragraphs I will answer these two questions.

At the outset of the AIM "movement," many of the "intelligensia" within the Indian Circles were attracted to this organization simply because it represented a spirit of change that is so drastically needed amongst my people. However as the policies and ideologies of AIM apathetically began to transform itself into a body representing a radical arms movement with a defective leadership elite, the majority of the "intelligensia" was lost. What remains is the minimal remnants of a sincere effort. Unfortunately, these "remnant elitists" are detached from reality, and have been creating an unreal vision of what our people's needs really are. Therefore what we have is history moving in one direction, these same elitists moving in a completely different direction; the result being that they offer absolutely no effective leadership nor alternatives.

Essentially what I am stating is, that the AIM group does not now have the committed support of the "educated" or the "intelligensia" within the Indian community. As we observe the various poorly planned events that have haphazardly taken place over the past years, we must come to the ultimate conclusion that the AIM movement is attracting only those frustrated and uninformed hopefuls between the ages of 14 and 19. Even though a few limelighters over the age of 20 seem to crop up with infrequent regularity.

If we were to tally those people who are genuinely committed to the AIM "movement" both in Canada and in the United States, we could do so on a fifteen-cent calculator. Yes, the American Indian Movement represents the frustrations of most Indian communities across Canada and United States and that there does exist a spirit of change. No, they do not have the undivided support of the majority of informed, concerned, and responsible native Indians.

Clarence Nyce
U of C Indian Student

For those of you who don't know, early last week the Board of Governors reversed its Oct 1st decision not to turn Corbett Hall into a parking lot for UA Hospital by a 7-5 vote.

It would appear that the University Hospital and Board of Governors have decided that parking for workmen is more important than preventative medicine. Doctors are constantly advising us that improving ones' general level of fitness is the best manner to reduce the probability of both minor and major illness. The hardtopping of Corbett Field will severely reduce the opportunity for U of A students to improve their fitness levels through popular Intramural Sports Programs.

Corbett Field is heavily used for Flag Football in the fall and football during Spring and Summer Sessions. With increased enrollments in spring and summer sessions the demand for and participation in Intramural Softball is high, approximately 300 players. Corbett Field contains 2 or 3 softball diamonds located on campus. The U of A is rapidly becoming a year-round campus, and spring and summer students deserve the same opportunity of Intramural programs as Winter students.

The effect of losing Corbett Field is devastating to an already overflowing flag football program, and its 1,955 actual participants, both male and female.

It seems as if the Board of Governors was not acting in the best interest of the students when making this decision. (In particular, our own Students' Union president Len Zoeteman, who supported the parking lot.)

As for the rider that the land returned to its original state in a maximum of 5 years, one would have to be pretty naive to have faith in its fulfillment. On a campus already feeling the constraints of space it is unlikely that the Hospital in five years time will



Gary Delaine, Gerry Rassmussen, and Bub Slug (l to r) congratulate John Guthrie Science 2, for his winning entry in the Gateway Halloween coloring contest.