

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press

Editor-in-Chief - - - - Don Sellar
Managing Editor Bill Miller
News Editor Al Bromling
Features Editor Helene Chomiak
Sports Editor Bryan Campbell
Associate Editor Doug Walker
Page Five Irene McRae
Fine Arts Editor John Thompson
Photo Editor George Yackulic

EDITORIAL: Desk: Ginger Bradley, Linda Strand, Jim Rennie. Cartoonist: Dale Drever. Production Manager: Joe Will. Office Manager Peter Enns. Editorial Board: Don Sellar, Doug Walker, Bruce Ferrier, Bill Miller. Editorial Assistants: Carole Kaye, Sue Hill.

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Six of the editors are going to Victoria at the weekend. After their plane crashes, you can pick the new ones from among those who showed up for Tuesday press night. You can choose from Janet Sims, Monica Ulrich, Sheila Ballard, Allan Hustad, Gloria Skuba, Andy Rodger, Geddes Wilson, Alan Gardner, Marion Conybeare, Dave Wright, Boston Blackie, Howard Mejer, Marilyn Fix, Carol Mackenzie and yours truly, Harvey Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published twice weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. Opinions expressed by columnists are not necessarily those of the editors. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final Copy Deadline (including Short Short items): for Wednesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager: Alex Hardy. Circulation: 8,000. Office phone—433-1155.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1965

the expropriation situation

Dean W. F. Bowker of the Faculty of Law has said this newspaper was both "premature and improper" in publishing an article about his faculty's new building, soon to be constructed in the Garneau district.

In what respect, we ask, are we guilty of these charges, in view of the fact the story was apparently accurate and confirmed by campus planning officials?

Indeed, Dean Bowker, there is to be a new law building, a structure which will rise at a new focal point in this campus's architectural design.

And rightly so. The profession of law in our society carries with it the tradition of man's respect for a system devised to govern his activities.

Surely then, the Dean of Law should be proud to announce that this institution has seen fit to construct a monument to his faculty, particularly when this monument will be the first to rise above an area previously unmarred by architectural misfits common elsewhere on campus.

Ah, but therein lies the difficulty. For if a law building is to rise in Garneau, there must also be a conclusion reached to the "expropriation situation" which now exists there.

The so-called "expropriation situation" is never a pleasant phenomenon for the parties involved. It carries with it in an amazing list of complicated questions seldom dis-

cussed in public. Here are three of the issues.

In Garneau, landowners have had their property assessed by the provincial government's public works department. More specifically, a 1964 price has been set—one which will remain unchanged for the next ten years, when the university finally begins its last massive building program. Are Garneau landowners being protected from the spectre of depreciation, or will they be unable to obtain accommodation in 1974 when they are equipped with 1964 money?

Secondly, what will happen to standards of upkeep in Garneau during the next ten years, as the university inexorably purchases all the land there and begins to build? Will Garneau residents wish to spend money on improvements when they know their homes are doomed to fall beneath tractor blades in ten years' time?

Finally, what will become of the hundreds of students who live in Garneau suites, when they must find new quarters to replace the low-cost ones they will have lost? Not all students will want to live in more-expensive, university-sponsored housing, even if adequate residences are provided.

"Now that the issue has been prematurely and improperly" raised, the answers to these and many other questions should be forthcoming.

in vino veritas

It may be we students are right now witnesses to the passing of an era.

With the announcement of a general crackdown on liquor regulation infringements in the Lister Hall residences, the traditional "residence spirit" may become a thing of the past.

No longer will the squat brown bottles be the standard objets d'art in male resident's rooms. No longer will maids reap their annual harvest from deposits and returns. Gloomy silence will replace the convivial clinks and pops once so pleasing to the ears of residence men.

An unfortunate incident is at the root of this upheaval. Some resident, forgetful of his obligations and responsibilities, particularly to those living on lower floors, dropped a bottle down a stairwell.

But in fifty years of residence drinking, "unfortunate incidents" have been few and far between.

We do not defend or condemn the use of liquor in residence. It is "wrong" in that it violates university act regulations against having liquor anywhere on campus.

But what of the actions of the men's house committee? No matter how eminently morally and legally correct, their "crackdown" may be the beginning of a serious deterioration in residence relations.

The committee said it did not make any "raid" or unreasonable searches. But in the future, if this anachronistic liquor regulation is to be enforced, raids may become expedient.

If they do, men in residence will resort to the usual dodges—posting guards, hustling suspicious bottles out of rooms, and incidentally having a lot of fun getting away with something they have been doing for more years than anyone can remember.

The house committee will have to take on itself the odious duties of roaming the corridors, sniffing the air suspiciously while listening for sounds of evil frivolity.

Surely this is not the way to run a residence. We hope the house committee will manage to effect some compromise between ideal morality and the status quo.



"Oops, wrong barrel sweetie!"

a modest era

by bruce ferrier

There is a new drink out from Washington. It is called "government-aid." It is the refreshment that never pauses.

—Marvin B. Sussman

"The Social Problems of the Sociologist"

Right now the big noise on campus is "universal accessibility," a novel idea by the Canadian Union of Students that everybody should go to university.

CUS cites two barriers to the achievement of this dream (or nightmare): social and financial. Finding the social aspects to be a bit involved, they have begun on the financial angles. And as a modest "first step," they modestly propose the elimination of tuition fees.

This "modest proposal," like Johnathan Swift's (that a surplus of Irish babies be sold for food), has the mental effect of an electric guitar played at full volume during High Mass.

It has become an accepted thing for governments to give out money in large amounts. The thinking that justifies the procedure is probably no more complex than "So what! They can always print more!"

The truth is that an expansion in government spending of the magnitude required for free university education would have economic and social effects more damaging than the situation it is supposed to correct.

In the bad old days, instead of getting money from the government, you gave it to them, usually involuntarily, in the form of taxes or large sums handed to the appropriate officials.

However, with the inevitable decline of rugged individualism caused by such frivolities as division of labor, urbanization, and the Depression, governments found they had to step in and lend a hand from time to time.

From this resulted such edifying social institutions as the Dole, the Civilian Conservation Corps, unemployment insurance, and, most recently, medicare.

Now, no one in his right mind would come out against all government support. Here in Canada our frontier economy needs all the help it can get, and government patronage is the only reason for the comfortable existence of cultural institutions that other nations take for granted.

But what about later developments—in particular, free tuition? Will later generations look on Joey Smallwood as a pace-setter or a nut?

Romantic idealists in CUS and elsewhere see the university student as the "forgotten man" of this generation. He is prey to society's economic mangle machine, a non-producing (unproductive?) consumer unable to make his way on the stormy seas of personal finance.

The grand answer to this problem is supposed to be elimination of fees.

But consider the absurdity of a student, whose parents have an income of \$10,000 a year, who makes \$1,000 over the summer, who along with his 5,000 affluent friends create our present parking problem, being handed his tuition so that he can go out and spend more on clothes.

Consider the unlikely but horrific possibility of private universities like McGill being "forced out of business" by the lure of free education at government degree-mills.

Consider the private institutions of the United States, which have been built to greatness not on government hand-outs but on the dignified support and endowments of individuals.

And then, if you're able, consider "free education."