

Vp accused of naivete

If politicians wrote letters-to-the-editor every time they disagreed with the media's portrayal of them, newspapers would have to start going twice-daily to handle the flow.

Ken McFarlane, vp academic, is a case in point. His half-page letter describing just what a good guy he is served only to make me wish I'd never voted for him, despite the fact that his letter could easily double as a campaign speech.

McFarlane is mod. There's no doubt about it. Thus, peaceful

demonstrations would appear to be an "outmoded style of student activism," to him. True, we do live in a "fairly conservative society," and the reason we do is because of people like Ken McFarlane.

I'm glad to hear that "many" of McFarlane's friends attended the picket against the differential fees (some of my best friends are black, too) even if there was a "poor turn-out" of approx. 200 students. This "poor turn-out," according to our vp, indicates a lack of support for "this sort of tactic." Perhaps the fact that

there was such a poor turn-out at last year's SU elections indicates a lack of support for this sort of student election, and thus for Mr. McFarlane as well.

God help us all if Mr. McFarlane continues on in politics. If he does, he will no doubt carry with him his belief that "any government which responds to such duress would only appear weak in the eyes of the electorate." But those students are part of the electorate. And the government is there because the people put it there and its job is to

respond to the electorate.

Nobody at that picket thought it was going to cause an overnight disappearance of differential fees. They all knew it was simply a statement, so that "grass roots" politicians like Bert Hohol wouldn't forget that not everyone in Alberta is racist.

As for Mr. McFarlane's vague claim of having been approached by "at least two organizations" (was it two, or not; was it almost two, or less than two?) who "hesitate" now to take a stand on this issue because of media accounts of the picket is a ridiculous statement at best. You either tell us who they are and how many they are or you don't mention them at all, please, Mr. McFarlane. Because, of course, I have been contacted by at least ten organizations and 55 people whose decision to speak out on the issue was based on media accounts (but I can't tell you who they are).

And, if it is not "nice" to question the motivations of politicians, student or otherwise, well then I saw all power to not-niceness. We could have refused to consider the motivations behind Watergate and swallowed Nixon's proffered reason — that it was for the good of the country. You are unbelievably naive, Mr.

McFarlane, if you believe that a politician does not open him/herself up to such questioning the minute after election results are announced.

Just one more thing. Mr. McFarlane says he has "heard it mentioned on campus" that Gateway staff and "certain members" of the Equal Access to Education Committee only oppose the racist differential fees so they can bitch at the government. And worse, these "certain" people are all-wing their philosophical beliefs to get mixed up in a political issue. (Ye Gods!) Everyone knows that one's philosophical beliefs have nothing whatsoever to do with political beliefs. Come on McFarlane, your 'moderate and rational' thought has left you painted into a corner here.

Is it too late to ask you to switch your major from Poli Sci to Zoology, Mr. McFarlane? I feel certain that in the future you would be able to do less harm to the public, if you would make that switch. Since you seem to have, at your tender age, already lost any idealism or belief in responsible government (if you ever possessed either) who knows what you'll be like in 20 years?

E. Thompson
Education III

Luckhardt lucks out — twice

With regards to your newspaper (sic) issue of March 29 I would like to take exception to comments of Mr. Luckhardt in his letter to the editor. As one of those "persons who intentionally entrapped Mr. Grude," I would object to your statement, sir. Our reasons for objection were not accurately conveyed by Gateway. Even if they were, you reflect in your own letter several of our concerns. The "sudden concern" for the Helsinki agreement is no more sudden than the concern for South Africa. The "well documented" motion you refer to was less than adequate, again as we suggested in our "ad hoc, flippant arguments." The movers were unaware of several studies on the issue "documenting" Canadian and International capital investment in South Africa.

Surely if we were concerned

with the Rothman's corp. we should also be concerned with Cadbury, U.S. Steel, and other connections to South Africa maintained by Canadians. Lastly but certainly not least if we object to the "pro-Nazi" regime in South Africa then how can we not object to Pro-nazi regimes in the

I would like to comment on the letter by Ken Luckhardt in the Tuesday, March 29th issue of the Gateway. The letter concerned the boycott of Carling O'Keefe products proposed by Jan Grude at a recent Students' Council meeting.

I do not see how, by threatening the livelihood of Carling O'Keefe workers in Calgary, one can possibly have an effect on the apartheid system in South Africa. Should beer sales drop, the workers will simply be laid off, and the com-

pany will absorb the loss. Therefore, I agree with the Council decision to leave the boycott to personal discretion. While I drink, and enjoy, some of the Carling O'Keefe products, I do not agree with, nor do I feel I am directly or indirectly contributing to South Africa apartheid. So, don't cut off Carling O'Keefe products at Students Union outlets, leave the choice to the consumer.

Kevan Warner
GFC, ESA former Council rep.

Arab world, in South America or the numerous military dictatorships in the world, the Indian situation in Canada? If we do not object then have we not committed the same hypocrisy that we are condemning.

Ewen Nelson
Science II

Edmonton 97 plead continued day care support

This letter is in response to the article entitled "U of A Governors vote to Cover Day Care Deficit" which appeared in the Edmonton Journal recently. The article devoted most of its attention to the dissenting opinion of a U of A Board of Governors member, Peter Savaryn. Mr. Savaryn was quoted as opposing the extension of funding to a day care centre located in HUB in order to cover their operating deficit in 1976-77. Mr. Savaryn made the following comments: — "Mothers should educate their children at home" — "Spending on the day care center would take money away from education" — "When mothers have children they should make a choice either to educate themselves or their families" — "It is better for a child's development to have the mother at home."

We feel that it is indeed unfortunate that a person who holds such an influential position adheres to such an archaic and callous point of view. As law students we are keenly aware of the difficulties, financial and otherwise, faced by our fellow students who have children. To deny these people adequate day care facilities means denying them an education, and in some cases, denying the entire family a chance at a better life. Mr. Savaryn's opinion denies a mother's right to an education, but in many cases a father's as well. In order to afford law school, the spouse of a student must often work. If that spouse is also a mother, according to Mr. Savaryn, she should be at home with her children.

We take issue with the viewpoint that mothers must choose to educate themselves or their families, not both. An educated

mother can provide a more intellectually stimulating environment for her children. Furthermore, both parents owe a duty to their children. The onus on the mother should not be greater. We believe a healthier family atmosphere develops where both parents take an equal interest in the children and both parents have an opportunity to achieve some of their personal goals.

We recognize that where children are of pre-school age, it may be desirable for one parent to take some time out of his or her career to take care of them. But this is simply not economically feasible for many parents. The full-time wife and mother is fast becoming a luxury in our society. Two incomes are essential for low income families as well as a rapidly increasing sector of the middle class. The high cost of housing and the basic necessities of life often ensure

both parents will always have to work.

Single parents are also faced with the necessity of finding suitable day care. Would Mr. Savaryn prefer that single parents stay at home, accept welfare, and remain an economic burden on the province indefinitely? Education is the quickest way to break the welfare cycle. We believe that single parents should be given help, through government funded day care centres, to upgrade their education and support their family in the future.

In short, the HUB Day Care Centre provides a much needed service on this campus. We hope the Board of Governors will continue their support for its operations.

Barbara Horner Howell
Deborah Miller
Catherine Morris
and 94 other signatures

anything has been done. The last time, it was about the lack of eating facilities for non-smokers. True, we have the so-called 'non-smoking' area in CAB cafeteria, but it is very cramped, its boundaries are very uncertain and totally ineffective, and people smoke in it. We need more than one location on a campus the size of our.

I am more than a little tired of smoke pollution — it is found everywhere, including in some classrooms and the libraries. Last term, I even encountered it during some exams. Non-smokers object not only the presence of smoking around food, but also to having our clothes smell of it, and to having to inhale it. I have been experiencing difficulty finding an unpolluted spot in which to eat my lunch, so will probably resort to eating and drinking in the libraries, although one is not entirely free of the problem even there.

This smoke pollution is not my only 'beef' at U of A, but it is one of the most consistent problems, and one which I hope will be less of one next year.

Alison Read
Arts I

JOE MUTTON SPEAKS OUT

YOUR MAN IN LACOMBE



Premier Lougheed's annual St. Patrick's Day party turned out to be a real gas, thanks to the premier's executive assistant Joe Hutton, who was charged with organizing the event.

Hutton requisitioned 150 litres of nitrous oxide (laughing gas) from the University Hospital, the day of the event, with the intention of releasing it during the party to "liven things up a bit."

Unfortunately, government workers responsible for administering the gas accidentally hooked the tanks up to ventilation ducts leading directly to the legislative chamber, which at the time was involved in a question period.

Reporters on the scene say something strange started to happen about 2:30 p.m. Says CBC correspondent Alan Hustak: "Attorney General Jim Foster was responding to a question by Bob Clark ... and had just agreed that it was wrong to

release deviants from mental hospitals, so that they might ravage and terrorize the citizenry, when he began to giggle."

"We were all very confused by this behaviour," admits Hustak, "but when Foster fell to the floor clutching his stomach and laughing as he cried 'Help, help! I can't stop!' ... well, we were truly shocked."

As Foster was being carried away by pageboys, NDP leader Grant Notley stood up and remarked that everyone enjoyed a good laugh once in a while, but he thought that perhaps the Honourable Minister's behaviour was both inappropriate and irrelevant to the business at hand.

A smirking Premier Lougheed replied: "to tell you the truth greaseball, I don't care what you think. In fact I doubt if anyone else does either!"

The entire assembly exploded into uncontrolled fits of laughter at this, and a chorus of "The wet-head is dead!" and "out

with the left-wing loser!" echoed throughout the chamber. Soon, a struggling Mr. Notley was being forcibly removed by certain MLA's, as he vehemently cried "I'll get you for this! I'll get you all!"

A party atmosphere prevailed for some 35 minutes after this, when a Tory backbencher rose and enthusiastically shouted "C'mon guys. let's pass some laws!"

In a news conference yesterday, a very sober Mr. Lougheed announced that the full attention of the assembly will be devoted to doing something about the legislation passed that fateful day, though it's agreed that it will take some time to rescind all 37 bills.

"First we've got to get all the Indians to come back out of the hills," a worried Lougheed said of an amendment to the provincial Indian Act which essentially calls for a reintroduction of a sizable bounty on native scalps.