



NOT INTELLECTUAL!

Dear Omnipotent:
Your editorial (Nov. 28) "Lewd Lunchers Amused" strikes a cruel blow to freshmen debaters, if not to the Debating Society and its president Dave Parsons. Gateway should realize that most of the debates this term are practice debates for the Hugill trials. The undersigned have had but one debate (and we did considerable research on our topic) which was far from good, but we are intent on learning the art. How are we to learn if not by practice before a live audience? We agree that some of the topics are not intellectual, but again we say these are only practice debates. Moreover, perhaps the Editor should read the "Rules and Suggestions for Hugill Debaters" if HE things "gag lines" and "clever little jokes" are part of debating procedure. It would be appreciated if Gateway would show a little more patience with freshmen debaters; the audience does!

Hector Williams,
Bruce Elkin

MISSING THE POINT

To The Editor:
The debating society, now as it seldom has before, could use constructive criticism and advice. The problems resulting from its recent growth are evident, but few benefit from the poison pen attitude used in the recent editorial in The Gateway. A great many people have seen these same things, that the editorial writer saw, but few would be able to conscientiously overemphasize them, or misconstrue the reasons for them as he has.

It is first pointed out that the recent debates were superficial and not of very good quality. But he fails to inform the readers that these are practice debates and that it's the first time many of these persons have ever debated. It is very difficult for most of these people to even stand before a group and speak, yet the editorial writer expects them to take a difficult resolution and crush their opponents with sheer brilliance of thought and analysis." The editorial goes on to point out that "topics are prostituted" and questions the use of "provocative" subjects.

One of the real tests of debating is the ability to debate provocative subjects in a convincing manner. This is hardest when subjects about race, religion, and morality are used.

If embarrassment, resentment or anger is the result, the debaters have failed to convince very many. This is born out in that the McGoun topic for this year is on morality, similar to those which have been debated recently in the West Lounge. Beginners usually have to learn this skill and, thus, the criticism is mainly that the editorial writer is being subjected to novice debaters.

Even though this editorial was void of constructive criticism, the writer did manage to stumble on some of the important problems facing the debating society, but in his youthful eagerness he failed to recognize them. Thus he left them dimly in the background as he sought to create the work of sensationalism that resulted.

We have greatly appreciated the publicity and coverage that The Gateway has given us, but are sorry that The Gateway does not seem to be able to see the causes behind things that are happening on this campus. Also we will be happy to not unjustly criticize your beginners who are trying to learn how to write editorials if you will refrain from unjust criticism of our beginners who are trying to learn to debate.

Yours truly,
Walter Stanford,
President of Debating Society

Ed. Note: The debaters, who are apparently also learning to read, have missed the point.

An editorial is rebutted with a heart-wrenching plea that The Gateway cease criticizing students who are learning how to debate. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The Gateway commends those who are learning the noble art of debating (one of the few worthwhile activities on campus). In fact, this year for the first time in the history of Hugill debating, The Gateway is sending reporters and occasional photographers to cover the previously ignored Hugills.

The editorial was directed at the debating topics chosen by the debating society executive. The society's main goal appears to be drawing crowds. The topics are, consequently, most trivial or centered upon "sexy" motifs. The result is that the noble but unlucky beginners are forced to compose debates filled with "gag lines" to conform to the topics.

As for constructive criticism: isn't a recommendation that the debating society cease prostituting its topics constructive enough for the society?

ZACH'S FAN

To The Editor:
My previous feelings of disgust and abhorrence have now melted into tears of pity. Maybe eight years is just too much for dear old Zach. Or maybe its because of too many outside interests, such as writing occasional, small, last page, space-fillers (November 17 issue), or the latest—photography (November 12).

Fear not Zach; keep a stiff upper lip; I think I understand your dilemma. You probably regard your demigod editors as intelligent and capable scholars and leaders, not requiring (heaven forbid) proofreading.

Alas, you are sadly mistaken. If you will refer back to the November 21 issue, you will see the biggest foot-in-the-mouth-job since Lou Hyndman kicked Bob Scammell in the teeth. For here, on page two, the editor, in his harassed attempt to rebuke your truly for my, "... insult re: our noble proofreaders...", spelled especially with two S's (ESPECIALLY)!!! This editor has no business writing comic strips about Mamie Yokum!!! Jenkins, (sigh) how did you ever get out of grade three?

The Phantom Phikeia
Striketh once more!

P.S. Someone please inform Chris Devans that although a little dab will do most people, a wind-blown mop like his could stand two or three... or four or five or six, extra drops.

Ed. Note: What the hell is a Phikeia?

BURFIELD BABBLES

A few days ago I was driving along 87 Avenue past the University campus and was shocked (I think that an appropriate word) to see acres of cars parked, where one would expect lawns and shady trees if the campus is to be worthy of the name.

Seeing this brought up the thought that the fate of the north Garneau area would be similar; our neighbors' homes will be demolished to become a parking area; as each home is torn down, its site will become a parking lot and the value of the neighboring property will be decreased. Eventually the main approach to the university will be through a junkyard.

It seems a dismal prospect and at first I thought that nothing could be

done to prevent it happening; you can't tell people that they must not own a car. Then a further thought came; who is paying for these cars? The answer followed; "the taxpayers of Alberta," the same people who are now to be required to buy and tear down homes to provide space to park them. Why should we?

Suppose, instead of the taxpayers supporting the University of Alberta, it were put on a self-supporting basis, making the fees sufficiently high to pay the costs; and then assistance given to needy and meritorious students so that they could pay these full fees, would we not be rid of this unsightly conglomeration? Very few students have need of a car, and the possession of one could well be construed as prima facie evidence of ability to pay the fees. That way we might well kill three birds with one stone; get rid of the mess, save money for the taxpayers, and have better students.

Perhaps my estimate of the acreage of car park might have been influenced by seeing the area surrounding the Jubilee Auditorium; this provokes yet a further thought. Is this proposed Garneau take-over a cover up for one of the numerous "goofs" our planners have made? If so, have the courage to admit it and move the Auditorium; it might be cheaper than uprooting some hundreds of homes.

F. R. Burfield
86 Avenue.

RENTIERS REPLIES

OPEN REPLY TO F. R. BURFIELD:

Mr. Burfield has stated that acres of cars are occupying space better devoted to acres of lawns and shady trees which would render this campus worthy of the name, and further that these cars ("paid for by the taxpayers of Alberta") constitute the main reason for the proposed expansion into the Garneau district.

May I begin by saying that I myself paid for my 1951 car which allows me two hours a day of study time which would otherwise be devoted to the Edmonton Transit System. This, because I live at home, a number of miles from university, as it proves more economical (car included) than living on campus and also makes room for another out of town student in our sorely overcrowded residences. Incidentally, those students that do have the good fortune to live on campus are not allowed to park their cars (if any) in the area. Further might I mention that the campus of our university has already made a rather proud name for itself due solely to the academic efforts of our students in spite of their being continually harassed by police, provincial government, well-meaning but often ignorant cranks and anyone else looking for a specific group on which to relieve their pent-up frustrations.

The university at the present time is in need of expansion not to further parking areas, but in order to make way for a number of new buildings to meet the increasing influx of students. The residents of Garneau must realize the importance of educating tomorrow's taxpayers in order that they may properly fulfill their place in Alberta's future. The Garneau property owners should therefore be willing to make the sacrifice, and move. I am sure they would be properly reimbursed for their troubles. Rather than decrease property values, the proximity of the university to Garneau and the fact of the impending expansion, have certainly served to raise the worth of this aging area.

As to the fact that lawns and trees enhance the campus, those park areas now present are buried under snow for five of the seven months of the scholastic year, and while it

would increase the beauty of the area it would also increase the area of campus and therefore the expense to the citizen.

Mr. Burfield would like to see the Jubilee Auditorium moved. Does he know it is only due to the kind cooperation of the people in charge at the auditorium that the students may utilize the parking space available there during the day to leave their necessary cars.

I would however like to thank him: the idea of moving such an enormous structure is the best laugh I've had all year.

Ken Rentiers
Science 2

OXBRIDGE ELITE

To The Editor:

Is your anonymous "Fifth Column" correspondent aware that the universities of Oxford and Cambridge are overtly typical of English universities, that their license is far from being as ludicrous as he suggests, and that the very idea of mounting a comparison between the U of A and the "traditional British university" is meaningless if taken out of the respective social, economic and historical contexts?

One could hardly describe "the European notion of education" as revolving around "the coffee shop and the sherry party." Refutation of this misrepresentation is unnecessary, as your correspondent must surely concede. It would even be inaccurate to see the life of the majority of Oxford undergraduates in these terms, whilst the tutorial system, which assumes a responsible student body, is certainly not accommodative to indolence.

Oxbridge's identity is even more emphasized in the wide range of criticism levelled at that institution on the grounds of elitism. By various methods, Oxford and Cambridge continue to skim the cream from the whole range of English secondary schools. Further, Oxbridge is so much a part of the Establishment that for many it has become a question of Oxbridge or nothing. Social policy should surely not encourage elites, although societies inevitably generate them.

Sincerely,
Stewart Raby,
Graduate Assistant,
Dept. of Geography

BACKING DOWN

To The Editor:

Last week Messieurs Parsons and Hays challenged the Social Credit Club to debate the following resolution: Resolved: that Model Parliament should be held in the legislature.

After due consideration, club members decided against accepting this challenge.

Frankly, we are disappointed that in times which abound with serious issues of national concern and worthy of serious debate, we should be asked to argue over as trivial a matter as the building in which Model Parliament should be held.

Nevertheless, we remain as always to partake in any serious discussion of issues warranting public concern.

Helo Avokyhs
Campus Leader,
Social Credit Club

SORE OF EYE

To The Editor:

I would like to publicly congratulate the Department of Fine Arts. I didn't think they could possibly find an exhibit worse than the first two

(Continued on page 7)

THE GATEWAY

Member of the Canadian University Press

Editor-in-Chief - - - - - Davy Jenkins	Associate Editor - - - - - Jim Richardson
News Editor - - - - - Branny Schepanovich	Features Editor - - - - - Bentley Le Baron
Sports Editor - - - - - Owen Ricker	Editorial Assistant - - - - - Ralph Bat
Sunday Editor - - - - - Al Smith	
Tuesday Editor - - - - - Bernie Cartmell	
Copy Editors - - - - - Pete Brewster, Betty Cragg	

EDITORIAL—Iain Macdonald, Bill Somers, Sheldon Chumir, Richard Mansfield, Chris Evans, Cliff O'Brien, Bev Woznow, Richard Kupsch, Robin Higham. **CARTOONISTS**—David Winfield, Don Wells, Ken Rentiers, Bill Salter, Gordon Young.

NEWS—Bob Hall, Don Robertson, Eugene Brodie Lyn Irwin Jon Pettersson, Shella Clark, Gordon Walker, Jennifer Ehly, Harriet Stone, Wendy Brinsmead, Zachary T. Peabogartus Winterbottom, Ralph Bat, Catherine Ford, Jon Whyte, Don Thomas, Collin Fraser, Norma Boutillier, Carol Treffry, Doug Florence, Evelyn Kitaguchi, Norma Boutillier, Gord Kurio, Linnet Hocking.

FEATURES—Violet Vichok, Kathy Showalter, Dave Parsons, David Winfield, Carol Anderson, Lynn Greason, Ed Thiessen, Jennifer Bolch, Angela Sawchuk, Penny Meisner, Shirley Greene, Lexy Dryburgh, Wolfe Kirchmeier, Ezek Essien.

SPORTS—Barry Rust, Bill Winship, Doug Walker, John Neilson, Wendy Dahlgren, Gerry Marshall.

PRODUCTION—John Taylor, Dave Bowes, John Whittaker, Editors. Dieter Buse, Pete Barford, Dave Fleming, Jamie MacKeage.

PROOFREADERS—Ellie Van Oene, Jenny Main, Ray Huot, Z.T.P.W. Esquire, Linda Clendenning, Susan Gathercole.

PHOTOGRAPHERS—Con Stenton, Editor. Al Nishimura, Carl Nishimura, Fred Mannix, Eric Abell, Harvey Elbe, Tom Stibbard, Allan McClelland, George Hallett.

Advertising Manager - - John Whittaker Business Manager - - - W. A. Dinwoodie

FINAL COPY DEADLINES

For Tuesday Edition:
News, Notices 6 p.m. Sunday
For Friday Edition:
News, Notices 7 p.m. Tuesday
Advertising 4:30 p.m. Monday
These deadlines will be strictly enforced.

Opinions expressed by columnists in this paper are not necessarily those of The Gateway or members of its staff. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein.