

Letters To The Editor

attacks & counter-attacks

Dear Sir:

Your last front page story on the Kent Street house is not quite accurate. You are right to state that 'Square Deal' is not connected with U.P.E.I. (except in so far as a number of University people VOLUNTARILY contribute towards the 'paper's production'). It is, however, quite untrue that Professor Baker offered the house to 'Square Deal'.

What took place is this. Professor Baker suggested that Marc Gallant and I should examine the house so as to judge whether the lower rooms could be used for lay-out of potential University publications. He said, at the time, that the house was unfit for multiple occupancy, but that if Marc Gallant, alone, wished to reside in it, it was just possible, it could bear him. He said that he did not wish to use the house as a student residence because - to meet standards of student housing would involve considerable repairs, and this was an expense the University currently not afford. He did not, he said, moreover, wish to give the University the name of a slum landlord.

It was a few days before we gained admission to the House. (There was a problem of finding keys.) Eventually our impression confirmed President Baker's worst caveat. We thought that the lower rooms could be used for University publications but that the other rooms had been left in such a state of disrepair that they were uninhabitable. We, at once, contacted President Baker to deliver this opinion, adding that we had no wish to do student's out of temporary hab-

itations. Upon the entire matter, my opinion is two fold.

I think, firstly, your attack on Professor Baker was unwarranted. I realize your current editor is not responsible; but whoever was ought really have acted more prudently. I know how tempting a 'good' story is, but one really should temper in intelligence with judgment.

I am rather more disturbed that our students should be economically forced to go into promises ((sic)) so unfit for human habitation, and I dread to think what that building will look like in April next year. I do now want to tell the Student's Union what to do, but I do suggest that they seriously trouble themselves over the fact that a few of their number cannot afford the expense of decent lodgings. That is unjust.

Yours sincerely,

Reshard Gool
Editor, Square Deal

Dear Sir:

Concerning Mr. Gools first paragraph, the story stated 'First in the series of stories (of the administrations) was the house was given to 'The Square Deal'. The story then went on to state that you denied knowledge of this.

Concerning Mr. Gools second paragraph, I was unaware that Marc Gallant was offered the possible use of the house for his residence. It seems strange that the University would not like the name of a slum landlord, while forcing the students who are now renting it into something much worse than the house in question, while renting the 'Slum Tenement?' to Marc Gallant. Last year these students lived in a two bedroom, four room apartment that had floors that ran downhill. By the way, experts in the field, do not deem the house in question to be a slum tenement. In fact they consider the house to be in excellent shape.

Concerning Mr. Gools third paragraph, he states it quite well when he says we, at once, contacted President Baker to deliver this - OPINION. Mr. Gools is obviously unqualified to judge whether the house is habitable or not. He is not an expert in the field.

Concerning Mr. Gools fourth paragraph, I agree it was unwarranted after he had changed his mind. The story was written to bring pressure on Mr. Baker to change his mind. After he had changed his mind, this purpose ceased. Unfortunately, the paper was already printed.

Concerning Mr. Gools last paragraph, I find it 100% opinion. Experts have disagreed with his opinion.

I suggest that people refer to my reply to Mr. Baker, as it does shed light on Mr. Gools letter.

Rod Hildebrant

Dear Sir:

Your front page story, 'Student Housing Denied', is full of error. To begin with, arrangements for the students to use the house were being made before your issue came out. But much of what you said was inaccurate at any time.

We had, in fact, tried to put students in the house, and we had investigated the possibility. I was advised that it was not suitable in its present state, and my examination of it confirmed that it was not in a suitable state of decoration for normal student residences.

Also, as I told you, it is not clear whether the University will own the house, and I did not want to spend money on it unless it was going to continue to be ours.

Again, as I told you, the house was not given to the Square Deal. I made this absolutely clear. Of course, Reshard Gool, the editor of the Square Deal, was not aware that it was going to the Square Deal. It wasn't. I wanted to find some use for the house, and I had agreed that Marc Gallant could have some space there for various purposes, including the layout of the University publication.

Again, as you know, I never said that the house was unfit for habitation. I said that the house was not suitable for student accomodation as we try to provide it and that it was not suitable multiple dwelling. I told you, and I understand that Mr. Alex. Burke also told you, that the house was suitable for renting to a family.

I also explored with the students concerned the possibility of their getting accomodation in the residences. When they told me that they were among the few very unfortunate students who were unable to save anything over the summer, I explored the possibility of their having rooms

only in residence so that they could economize in other ways. Moreover, I asked Student Services to see if they could help them find some part-time work.

The proof of not only good intention, but action, seems to me quite clear. I did investigate. I did look at the house personally. I did make arrangements to find other space for our layout purposes and to turn the house over to the students.

Yours sincerely,

Dictated by:
R. J. Baker
President

To the Editor:

As my statement of policy in the September 9th issue indicated, the author of authors of any article are responsible for its content. As I told Mr. Baker before the September 30th edition was distributed, I didn't have anything to do with the writing of the article, 'Student Housing Denied'. A third grade English student could easily have seen that the persons writing the article were the ones trying to rent it by the slant of the story and the common use of 'We'. But since Mr. Baker raised the issue with me, I feel it's only fair to reply to it. This reply is written with no intention to degrade Mr. Baker or to drive a wedge between students and administration. It is well known that Mr. Baker is a friend to the students most of the time with their interests in mind.

FACT- The paper was off the press when I learned Mr. Baker had changed his mind concerning the renting of the house in question. I made sure that the contents of the story was well

known before the paper was printed to facilitate decision making. I also indicated to Mr. Baker about a week before the paper came out that a story would be written on the matter. It was unfortunate I learned that Mr. Baker changed his mind after the paper was printed. From all indications I have, Mr. Baker changed his mind after the paper was off the press. This is an assumption on my part.

FACT- As soon as I learned Mr. Baker had changed his mind I contacted him concerning the situation and offered him the opportunity of withholding the paper from distribution. He stated he didn't want to censure the paper. He asked me to bring him a copy the next morning, Wednesday, which I did. I offered him the opportunity to censure, with the authors of the article objecting to my feeling that it was a fair thing to do considering the circumstances.

FACT- The students Mr. Baker tried to put in the house were Home Ec. Majors, with the house serving the dual purpose of residence and practical classroom. Mr. Baker did not offer the house to students at large. It is only Mr. Baker's opinion that the house wasn't 'in a suitable state of decoration for normal student residences'. I hate to think of Mr. Baker as an Omnipotent Great White Father, but his attempt to define 'suitable state of decoration for normal student residences' for students seems to lead me to no other conclusion. The students now renting the house find the decoration to be exactly what they wanted.

FACT- Mr. Baker stated to me that the reason the University was giving it for layout purposes for University publications AND THE SQUARE DEAL was his belief that it's better to have prop-

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 11)