

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - - bill miller

managing editor—ralph melnychuk

associate editor—lorraine minich

casserole editor brian campbell

production manager jim rennie

makeup editor joe will

photo editor neil driscoll

co-sports editor don moren

cup editor darla campbell

co-sports editor lawrie hignell

executive assistant sheila ballard

EDITORIAL—Desk—Doug Bell, Frank Horvath, Gordon Auck; Cartoonist—Dale Drever, Alan Shute; Editorial Board—Bill Miller, Ralph Melnychuk, Lorraine Minich, Brian Campbell.

STAFF THIS ISSUE—The following loyal souls watched the plumbers display their creative (ugh) talents: Maureen Gunn, Senator Bobbie Jacobsen, Bernie "boom-boom" Goedhart (another winning goal), Elaine Verbicky (looks sharp, feels sharp, etc.), Steve Rybak (better late than never), Rae Armour (first-class trophy craftsman), Lorna Cheriton, Dave Applewhite, Charlie Lyall, Iain "fuzzy" Robertson, Al "spas" Yackulic, Derek Nash, Marion Conybeare, George Barr, Terry Donnelly, John Thompson, Sue Hyl-Dombey, Jon Whyte, Canada's unemployed, and yours journalistically, Harvey Thompirt.

The Gateway is published semi-weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline: for Wednesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, short shorts—5 p.m. Friday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior; short shorts—5 p.m. Tuesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising Manager: Peter Amerongen. Office Phone—433-1155. Circulation—9,300. Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

PAGE FOUR

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1967

we only get what we deserve

We were pleased to hear the general faculty council last week passed a resolution establishing a committee of faculty and students to examine methods of study here.

The committee will have two main functions:

- investigate curriculum studies, methods of presentation and methods of study at this and other universities, and
- propose, as a result of this investigation, some experimental courses and/or course structures to be implemented when feasible.

At a time when students, socialists, radicals and other useless appendages to society are waiting to high heaven about how irrelevant the university is and how useless the lecture system is, such a committee stands out as a light in the darkness of bureaucratic fumbling.

We should not expect to change the whole system overnight just because we now have a committee investigating some relevant changes.

But we should make the most of the opportunity we have been given. Presumably this committee will be

doing many of the things the students' union's academic relations committee is theoretically doing now. We hope these committees will work closely together to provide the best results for this university.

It is only reasonable to expect that the personnel on these two committees will overlap to some extent. It is also reasonable to expect that students' council will recognize the importance of this work and appoint intelligent, capable and responsible students to these committees.

This will be one of the most significant tasks facing the next council. All potential candidates in next month's students' union elections should be considering this matter closely.

And all persons interested in improving the quality of education at this university (and that should be all of us) should be seriously considering applying for positions on these committees.

If these positions are not the most widely applied-for jobs on campus next year, we don't deserve to get better education.

where has all the parking gone?

The new services tunnel now under construction has raised controversy over the matter of aesthetics versus practicality.

The original route for the tunnel went north of the agriculture building where now stand "some of the finest elm trees in Edmonton."

After many complaints from the University Grounds Department and various aesthetically-minded, "save the trees, please" people, the department of public works has agreed to re-route the tunnel.

The new route avoids cutting down five of the trees, but instead it cuts into "A" parking lot.

With the present parking shortage on campus, the cutting of "A" lot is ridiculous.

The public relations office says that because of the tunnel, students are advised to avoid bringing their cars to campus.

It has also been suggested that students will need extra time to walk to classes because the new route will block off many familiar routes.

A proposed solution was to "mole" the tunnel instead of using the open ditch method. This would have avoided the problem of cutting parking lots or destroying trees.

But the open ditch method was chosen because it is less expensive and, according to the campus landscaping department, "there are too many natural elements involved."

The controversial trees might have to be cut in the near future because they may interfere in the building of the new biological sciences complex.

The immediate problem boils down to either a parking lot or a bunch of nice trees.

We prefer the parking lot.



"we've finally found a way to save the trees—it calls for the demolition of the ag building, rerouting the river, and moving the Tory building to the north side—of course it may cost more."

ralph melnychuk

free tuition-- a revisionist view

(First of two parts)

In the past couple of years the subject of free tuition has been widely discussed here, not only among the self-designated student elite who consider themselves the voice of students, but also among the "lowly" student masses who are more interested in passing their courses than beating the drum for "student interests".

Ronald Reagan's recent firing of University of California's respected president, Clark Kerr, along with his recent statement suggesting tuition-exempt California students should pay part of the high cost of their education, has once again brought the subject to public attention.

The advocates of tuition-free higher education rightly claim that post-secondary education should be available to all who have the intellectual ability to obtain it, regardless of their financial condition, social background, race or religion.

Elimination of tuition fees is seen as the first step in achieving the admirable goal of universal accessibility to post-secondary education.

But the crusaders have apparently failed to consider the possibility that tuition-free education would create more problems than it would solve.

I am thinking specifically of recent student concern for a voice on certain faculty and administrative decision-making bodies.

It is essential that students, who are either benefitted or harmed by the system used at university, have a voice (not control, but a voice) in the formation of the policies which will affect them.

There is an old cliché—he who plays the piper calls the tune.

If we do not pay part of the price of our education, how can we expect to have a voice in determining what sort of education we get.

The more idealistic among us will claim that in justice, we should have such a voice anyway. Perhaps. But will not the attitude of our beloved bureaucrats be rather: "We are giving you a gift . . . we will determine what you get . . . be thankful you are getting anything?"

Can anyone doubt this when even now we have professors and administrators who openly claim all students are a bunch of uncultured slobs? When many of our professors are second-rate dogmatists?

If we cannot effectively lobby now to remove some of the more obvious evils in our system, how can we expect to be listened to when our financial contribution to the system vanishes?

Under the present set-up, most students here are paying a token fee. I have talked to students across the country who have laughed at the paltry \$334.50 I pay in the Faculty of Arts. But I still have the ability to approach my honors supervisor or dean and tell him why I am not getting my money's worth. The powers-that-be may not regard everything I and my colleagues say as gospel, but I have proof that some (though inadequate) consideration is given to our comments.

If we have no financial stake, we will have to trust to the desire of those in authority to do the best job possible. And this is a precarious trust.

Friday: The philosophy behind free education and individual subsidization.)