

The Gateway

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. It is published by the Students' Union twice weekly during the winter session on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Contents are the responsibility of the editor, opinions are those of the person expressing them. Letters to the editor on any subject are welcome, but must be signed. Please keep them short: letters should not exceed 200 words. Deadlines for submitting copy are 2 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays. Main offices are located in Room 282, SUB for Gateway, Room 238 SUB for Media Productions. Phone 432-5168, 432-5178, 432-5750. Advertising 432-3423. Circulation 18,500.

Editor - Kevin Gillese
News - John Kenney
Features - Lindsay Brown
Arts - Beno John
Sports - Darrell Semenuk
Photo - Don Truckey
Graphics - Craig McLachlan
Advertising - Tom Wright
Production - Loreen Lennon and Margriet Tilroe-West
Circulation - Jim Hagerty
CUP Editor - Cathy Brodeur

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Brian Gavriloff, David Oke, L. Torrance, Gordon Turtle, Wayne Kondro, M. Brown, Rasmussen & Delaney, Rishie Thakur, James Richardson & Sons, Gary McGowna, DAX, Keith Steinbach, Sue Michalicka, Mary Duczynski, Carol MacKay, Nancy Brown.

editorial

And the great debate begins. Did Students' Union president Len Zoeteman sell out the students when he cast the deciding vote at a recent Board of Governors meeting to give the University Hospital the playing fields south of Corbett Hall for a parking lot? I think he did. Hospital officials argue they require 300 parking stalls before they can begin construction of the first phase of the Health Sciences Centre in March, 1977. Their argument: unless workmen are provided with parking stalls, the union will not begin construction. But is that really a valid argument? When construction takes place downtown or in other areas with congested parking, shuttle services are made available to workmen instead of parking facilities. Even if what the Hospital officials say is true, doesn't it make better sense to give university parking space away than to encroach on one of the last open recreational areas used on campus?

As Joe McGhie, student rep on the B of G pointed out at the meeting, the question is not merely one of making the space available and solving an immediate problem. It is a question of philosophy. Do people and their recreational pursuits mean more than institutions? McGhie argued they do. I agree. President Gunning responded by saying the discussion was not about a "cold institution" but an institution which will serve all Albertans and hopefully bring top-level medical research facilities to the province. But what Dr. Gunning confuses is the fact that a vote for the Corbett playing fields is *not* a vote against the Health Centre. It will still be possible to put the workmen elsewhere - even if we have to reserve half of the Jubilee Auditorium parking lot to do so. There are many possibilities for shuttle service or other transportation arrangements - as other Board members argued. The situation is not as bad as the Hospital administration has made it out to be. But at all costs we should preserve what little recreational area we have on an already-cluttered concrete campus.

One of the other arguments advanced was that the parking lot would only be temporary (for a time of three to five years). And the stipulation by the B of G that the lot be returned to the University in its original condition may ensure that is, in fact, available for recreational purposes at that time (the Health Sciences Centre will have 600 underground parking stalls and thus the need may not be as pressing - for that, we should look skeptically at the promises). Regardless, the loss of that valuable land for even five years is too long.

At the same time the fields will be made into a parking lot, construction of the Health Sciences Centre will disrupt Student Health Services, a situation which will only further diminish the quality of university health care. First recreational areas are removed, then Student Health is taken away (and disrupted during the construction period, etc.).

It's all well and good for the university to lobby the government and obtain a massive research complex to add further prestige to our university. But what good does it do when it destroys the well-being of the university community and adds yet another ugly block of concrete to our muggy horizons? **by Kevin Gillese**

Lucely woven web...

Great Caesar's Ghost!

So thought council last week during a confrontation with senior mandarins of the advanced education department.

Seeking to diminish pressure on their own classically inept performance, council attacked the mandarins as "being out of touch with real events, working with an antiquated system, and using archaic language which is difficult to understand."

Characteristically, colorful deputy minister Octavius Seneca did not take such charges lying down.

"Quo quo, scelesti ruitis?"

demanding he with a classy blend of hauteur and arrogance, riposting: "Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur!"

Council's confusion was heightened at this juncture by the entry of Antarctic penguins dressed as oil-rich benouins, apparently left to wander around campus pretending to be comparative literature majors.

Nonetheless, council lambasted the administration of the advanced education minister, drawing a further rebuke.

Admonished Seneca: "Ira regum semper gravis."

Hank Luce
Graduate Studies

BUB SLUG by Delaney & Rasmussen



Biting the hand that types you

I am both amused and concerned by the kind of nonsense Mr. Gillese spouts week after week in his editorial.

Mr. Gillese's continual prattle about unfortunate renters, deprived students, exploited workers, and uncaring government is unending. He does little else than convince the public that university students are a collection of inexperienced, isolated, ill conceived, bad mouthed know-it-alls who in their post-adolescent utterings indicate their ignorance about the real world. That view may be accurate in terms of such people as Kevin Gillese, of the "Edmonton 61" but is inappropriate in terms of the vast majority of rational university students.

The vast majority of students don't have the time, nor the desire to waste on namby-pamby far flung escapades as does Mr. Gillese. Most students concern themselves with such practical things as getting a good education in order to function as good, constructive citizens.

Of course, I know that Mr. Gillese would label such views as reactionary, right-wing propaganda that typifies unthinking, apathetic, blockheads such as myself. Unfortunately though, we "reactionaries" have got more important things to do than run around bleating about every matter in our society that on the surface seems unjust. Only Mr. Gillese would have the time to track down and pronounce judgment on the evil, the unenlightened, the apathetic and the uninformed. Thank goodness for Mr. Gillese - our very own underdog superhero!

In one sense, it would be refreshing to see Mr. Gillese use some discretion and common

sense before hurling his profanity ridden chastisements. In another sense his performance is little more than amusing and at least provide comic relief. I am tempted to treat it as just that, keeping in mind that those outside campus will probably have

the good sense to dismiss Gillese as the oddity he is. Please Mr. Gillese, stop amusing, forget the 1960's and join the 1970's before we all laughing.

David Spr...

Speaker speaks out on council clashes

Recently, Dale Janssen (Commerce rep) wrote a letter to the Gateway in which he challenged Len Zoeteman to a verbal duel where the loser was to be a recipient of a cream pie facial. He mentioned quite emphatically that he had been called down by Len in a council meeting for a letter which he (Dale) had penned. Just to keep all the facts clear in this matter, I would like to submit the following excerpts from the council meeting minutes of October 25, 1976.

(From Announcements section)
Len read a letter to the Councilors that was published in the Faculty Association Newspaper describing basically the role of the Executive and Council. In his opinion he stated that the role of the Executive is to take a lot of criticism but it reflects on the Student Council badly more than it does on the Executive. His reasoning was that an article such as the one that appeared reflects poorly on the degree of credibility of the Council. Len pointed out that it was difficult to do as many things as the article pointed out but that the simplicity of it lay in the article of criticizing. (and from the Question Period)
Dale Janssen provided a number

of areas of input into the question period and started it off by stating that he was the Councilor who had written the letter Len was referring to in the Announcement Period. He then said that he was open to any questions any councilor may have on the matter. Dale was then directed to request to Jan asking if there were no areas of controversy within Council but sad to say the controversies are ones of misinterpretations which are of dubious sources. I suggest that councilors take a bit more care reading their copies of minutes before making public statements which may spread further doubt on their credibility as responsible representatives.

Deb Cent...

SC Spea...

Gateway
Staff Party
Saturday
Details
Rm. 282 SUB