

## About your picture, mate

The Editor,

Congratulations to the people who did such a magnificent job in laying-out that excellent publication which is called the Telephone Directory.

After waiting impatiently for this year's masterpiece and after having made several trips to SUB only to be told "Well, maybe they'll be out in a couple of days" on several occasions, I finally got it. Imagine the ecstasy of perusing those pages of beautiful faces and expectantly looking forward to the treasures each succeeding page would bring forth.

So what if many faces, especially on page 1, are blacked out? Who wants to see detail anyway—it only causes eyestrain.

So what if I discovered that boys can look like girls and even have girls names and vice-versa. But wait, the names are switched about (page 2). Either that or some mother is going to be shocked to find out that her child has changed drastically after entering those hallowed halls.

But imagine my shock when I discovered that one girl had sprouted a moustache and beard! Could it be? What fickle gods have had their sport with her? Relief!

Investigation proved that the preceding row of pictures had been repeated, thus omitting the mug shots of seven people (page 39).

But I'm most grateful that the phone directory has undertaken to fill the gaps in my education. Contrary to what my grade 1 teacher has taught me, the directory tells me that "t" comes before "h". Don't believe me, eh? Well chickadee, let your fingers do the walking through the white pages to page 140 and then explain why Stewart comes before Short.

But hell, who am I to com-

plain? I am only one student who is concerned that my money is being used to promote inefficiency. And so what if I have to spend hours finding a misplaced friend who probably can't even find herself in the mix-up. I have plenty of time.

Sure, there are damn good reasons for omitting the undergrad pictures from the yearbook. But I have two bones to pick. First, Miss Wendy Brown, director of Evergreen and Gold, stated in The Gateway, Oct. 11, that "faculty representatives were requested last March to find the students' opinion on this idea of deletion".

Yeh? Well, where the hell were they holding the interviews—in the darkest recesses of some isolated corridor of Corbett Hall? Also, re: the cost of the yearbook, Miss Brown stated that students are not willing to make up the deficit of \$2,000 on printing.

On what basis has she made that statement? Conversation with many friends and students has shown that most would be more than willing to pay an extra buck or so to get that yearbook with their pictures in it. And those who wouldn't probably wouldn't care less about picking up their yearbook anyway?

Errors are inevitable, but this is ridiculous. Oh well, what's the money. The \$28 I and every other undergrad student have paid to the Students' Union has gone to a good cause: to promote a Regina firm that is terrific at making mistakes. And it's all in the name of progress.

Sylvia Batiuk  
ed 2

EDITOR'S NOTE—for what it's worth, Students' Council expressed displeasure with the directory also and there is a good chance the Regina firm will receive a nasty letter from the Students' Union. It is also expected that the Students' Union will not do business with this firm again.

## This is page FIVE

Those sexy, sweet, sharp, sadistic photos in what has been termed the Telephone Directory (it looks more like the San Quentin Rogues Gallery) is in for it this time.

We have several brutal letters but decided, because we are so objective, to allow just one per issue. There may be space to run more in later editions of The Gateway.

There is a bit of bitching about the smoke fiends who persist in getting a few puffs while the lecturers fume.

Peter Boothroyd writes about the Senate. They met here last week—that was the reason for the long lineups in the SUB cafeteria, and probably the reason for the steak dinners too.

One young lady thinks the world is really neat and she says so in writing. It's nice that civilized, intelligent lectures such as Dick Gregory come here and tell us how great the world is. My my.

Send contributions to The Editor, The Gateway or bring them to SUB 282.

—The Editor

## Divine right of smokers?

SCENE—any classroom

A cough is heard in the background. One person down the row is noticed blowing into space in an effort of what appears to be something more than a whistle.

1: Hey, how come your lighting up again?

2: What do you mean? You know I haven't broke the habit! Just can't seem to quit. The prof doesn't care.

1: Yea, but look. Over on the wall in big letters. You're not supposed to smoke here.

2: So what! I told you the prof doesn't care.

1: Well, there's a guy there that doesn't care for your second hand smoke. I think he is inhaling more than you are.

2: Big deal. If he doesn't like it, let him take up smoking and he won't notice it.

This is a necessarily a hypothetical case, but none the less occurs on campus in some degree or other. I note the correspondence between 2's conversation content with what I call "The Divine Right of Smokers" (taken from older concept of the Stuarts of England). This concept is manifest in such a situation as above cited, or may be substituted in the general formula: "I'll smoke where and when I want to, irregardless. Hier steke ich. Ich kann nicht anders (Luther at Worms)".

Perhaps it is taking exception to a trivial point, but it would be nice if smokers would exhibit a minuscule portion of courtesy coupled with self restraint. The rooms are stuffy enough.

R. Schienbein  
sci 2

## She is sick . . .

The Editor,

I am sick—repeat, sick—of reading nothing but complaints in The Gateway. Does it ever occur to anyone in this university to write about some of the great things that are happening.

I am talking about the tremendous performance of the U of A Symphony Monday night. I am talking about some of the famous people we are all able to hear speak and of inspiring lectures on important topics. I am talking about the administration who keep the parts of the complicated "machine" of a campus together and functioning.

These men have our interests at heart. Then there are the beautiful accommodating buildings that we move in and out of each day, that we treat so hazily.

Instead of criticising our war veterans, perhaps we should praise research for cancer, heart disease. Instead of supporting protest demonstrations, we could strive for elimination of poverty. And so on and on.

We are privileged to have so many wonderful things happening on the campus—and in the rest of the world. These privileges we are neglecting because we are too involved in criticizing, in revolting. It seems to me we are missing out on so much that is important because we cannot see our way clear to appreciate the good in other people.

Barbara Grey  
ed 2

Make your  
viewpoint heard  
— write to us

## The University Senate

### A haven for the "middle-class community"?

By PETER BOOTHROYD

The Senate of the university is essentially charged with interpreting the university to the community and vice-versa. Appropriately, the Senate is composed of members of the university and representatives of various institutions "on the outside."

Unfortunately, these representatives are composed mostly of businessmen and middle-class people professionally involved in bureaucratic organizations. Poor people, Indians, Metis, high school students, and grass roots union men are not represented on the Senate. When the provincial government writes "community" in The Universities Act, read "middle-class community of professionals, business men and bureaucrats."

Perhaps because of this grey-suit homogeneity, the Senate is becoming aware that it must solicit new ideas. Briefs on the role of the university have been solicited and attempts have been made to hear students on their conception of the university.

But one might easily suspect that all these meetings and briefs are a ritual, and that the grey-suit people are not hear-

ing anything being said. For instance, last Thursday afternoon four of us were asked to talk about what we considered to be the role of the university in society. Any shortcomings we saw in this university were hotly denied by the senators.

In my case, this was to be expected. I claimed that the university motto is no longer valid as "whatsoever things are true", that it should be changed to "whatsoever training and research benefits General Motors." I claimed that the universities were differentially benefitting the rich much more than the poor. Clearly, I was some kind of Marxist nut, or misguided in some equally horrible way.

It was understandable that I should be hotly opposed, but why the other three students? One suggested that the university should be concerned more with the goals of society and not just programs of implementation—that the campus should be planned to facilitate thinking creatively. Another suggested that students in professional faculties should be more exposed to broadening social ideas so that they would be better citizens when they graduate. The fourth said that more consideration should be given to graduate students. With the exception of one or

two comments, there was complete rejection of all these ideas.

When the senators were asked if they thought there were any major problems in the university, most said that they thought the university was in very good shape. One lady, in one of the few attempts to seriously discuss problems with the students instead of fighting us, suggested that perhaps the university should be developing more leadership to fight poverty. Two others hastily said that there were many problems in the university—too many to mention at the time. And thus the "let's listen to the students" session finished for this year.

I should make clear that I find many of the senators personally attractive and that I enjoy talking with them. The problems are that the senate is *not* representative of the general community; that it sees its role as public relations committee for the Board of Governors; that it meets too infrequently with the students to really get a feeling for what is going on in the university. When meetings with the students are arranged, a wet-situation immediately develops.

The Senate could play a useful role in the university. It does not have any

real power—and this is as it should be. But it could do the job it was originally intended for—acting as a liaison body. The senators could work to identify the social and political problems and the real technological needs which exist in this province. It then could present these to the university so programs could be developed to attack these problems and meet these needs. Or better, students and faculty—were they freed to do so—could spend time considering these problems and possible ways to alleviate them.

For the Senate to play this role, it would have to get rid of a few professionals and businessmen and take on more people who know first-hand what the needs are in this province. The Senate will have to take off their suits—at least symbolically—and get out of the closed chambers. They will have to start talking to students in the pubs, in the classrooms, and perhaps even in the stinking old Tory basement vending room. Instead of dining in a special section of SUB or Lister Hall, senators should eat with the students. It won't be as sedate or as important looking as the present meetings. But a hell of a lot more useful work will get done.