

# FORUM FIVE



Board's actions and he chose not to stay. If this constitutes a "kangaroo" meeting, then the defect lies in the By-Law and not in the Board.

S. Allan Low  
Chairman, DIE Board

## Fee referendum

As one of the 1133 students who voted "NO!" on the fee referendum, I object strongly to Harold Kuckertz' characterization of me as a "beer-voter". (Editorial, Feb. 7)

There are two aspects to the reasons for my negative vote: 1) for the \$31, I am currently paying, I get essentially nothing. This is, in essence, the proverbial consumer rip-off, and, given this, one can hardly expect me to vote for the privilege of paying even more. This, in itself, is merely an irritation and is not sufficient inducement to make me go to all the trouble of voting. My second reason is much more important. 2) The money is taken from me against my will. I have no opportunity to say "Yes, you're doing a good job and I'll gladly pay you \$31 to continue it." I have no opportunity to negotiate which services I want and am willing to pay for, the money is simply taken from me. I call such a practise "theft" and the people, who carry on such practices, "thieves". Others call them "politicians" and the people "politicians" or "the government" (I think the widely recognized corruption in politics, in general, and "Watergate", in particular, indicates which characterization is closer to the truth.) I have not, and never will, aid and abet an act of theft, (especially against myself), so I voted NO.

What implications can be drawn from the fact that 1565 students voted in favor of the referendum, 1133 opposed it and some 15,000 or so students didn't vote at all? I don't think it's unfair to say that only 1565 students at this university see the students' union as being worth an extra \$3/yr. Immediately, you're going to come back at me screaming (non-apathectically) that the reason the referendum lost is because those 15,000 students who didn't vote are simply the apathetic "Silent Majority" and would have voted "YES" if they could have generated enough enthusiasm to do anything. I can't buy this as a legitimate argument. Yes, these students couldn't care less whether the Students' Union lives or dies. Does that indicate the prevalence of that horrible attitude "apathy"? I don't think so. Then why aren't they "concerned"? There is a cost involved in being "concerned", and being "socially aware", and all the rest of the mumbo-jumbo, these amateur politicians feed us. The cost is high: it involves time and thought and a commitment to an ideal

most people simply do not hold (in practice, if not in principle), specifically that society (and consequently, social awareness, activism, etc.) is not as important as the individual (i.e., the person who has made this choice, him or her, self).

Time spent being socially aware reduces the time available for studying and working and just enjoying oneself. A commitment to "society's problems" diverts attention from what the individual sees, from HIS perspective (the only one that counts) as THE important commitment; a commitment to getting an education, to passing courses, getting a degree and acquiring the tools necessary to survive in this god-damned world which the socially-committed people have fucked-up so badly. And this I contend is a noble ideal.

So the charge of apathy doesn't hold water. What you call apathy, is really a commitment, a commitment to an ideal which you can't understand. And what you can't understand you strike out blindly at, hurling insult and derision - thus the implied charge of apathy.

Back to the implications of this enormous non-voting faction. What this all means is that the Students' Union has utterly failed to recognize the needs and desires of students, and address themselves to these. The S.U. offers little of

reader comment

## A consideration for study

In May of last year I met with Dean Ross to discuss the possibility of

- Unscheduled lab. hours
- Pretaped seminars and help rooms.

My proposal for unscheduled lab hours, suggests that there be no fixed hours in your timetable for you to attend that week's lab. I have personally experienced difficulty in completing some of my labs in the 3 hour period. Some labs have natural breaks which would allow you to work for part of the 3 hour period then come back and complete in at your convenient time during that week. The labs could in most instances be open from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. with a TA present. Better lab manual instructions would also be an integral part of this more open atmosphere. The lab write-up probably requires a uniformity in classes where there are several lab sections.

I find most students do their assignments and studying after 6 p.m. No help is available to you if a problem should arise. I propose that help rooms, either with a TA or pretaped seminars be available until 11 p.m. This would eliminate the need for those problem display windows in the Chem wing. An example: If at 9 p.m. you are working on a problem or concept that your notes and text do not satisfactorily explain, for your understanding, you would be able to go to the Help room and have a TA help you, or there would be a list of ready references handy and possibly a videotaped seminar regarding that problem or concept. Each faculty or department would have one of these rooms. (i.e. math, biology, physics, geology, and chemistry).

The Dean of Science and the related departments have discussed these proposals. Math has permission to pilot a similar scheme in one of their courses. I have just received a letter dated Jan. 29, that asks the other departments to consider setting up such schemes. In some labs you will be given a questionnaire as to how you, the student, would like these programs. This should serve as a background. How you answer may affect some courses you take next year. Please give it careful consideration.

Ted Shandro  
Science Rep, G.F.C.  
Student's Council

value to students, and S.U. doesn't intrude too seriously into student's lives, so can you blame them for not caring whether S.U. gets their \$3 or not.

Not that a Student's Union couldn't be of value, It's just that it isn't. They're bloated, self-serving and arrogant. So wither up and blow away students' union, I don't need you.

Brent Bissell  
Commerce 3

I have a question to ask, comrades, if we are to believe in our Students' Union may I request Why? Then on a question of such importance as the recent referendum why could not the wording be less biased? Moreover if, as claimed, the increase was essential to OUR services how can OUR REPRESENTATIVES justify THEIR salary increase. If you want our money take a little out of your own pockets.

Murray Franc  
Arts 1

I'm getting rather tired of repeating this - Council voted AGAINST a salary increase January 18, 1974. A.C.

## Help!

Lord, where did we go wrong?

We followed your instructions exactly:

We multiplied--maybe too well. (3.5 billion people on earth-how many can it take?)

We certainly divided. (We are the haves--what have the have-nots got?)

And we are very good at subtracting from other's--to add to our own.

Oh, yes, Lord, we've gone one step further--we can compute. (We all walk around like programmed computers.)

Isn't this what you specified?

Please verify in your next commandments....

After all, we've proved that we obey and follow you--

Only, well, it sounds a bit silly, but we need your help! If you can imagine!!

Forgive us....

Ruth M. Lister

## editorial

# Election Candidates

After following the progress of the election campaign to this stage, and attending Wednesday morning's rally, I feel it necessary to make an editorial comment on the election and the candidates.

First a brief comment on Wednesday's rally. Many of the candidates found it quite difficult to get their point across effectively and this was not at all surprising as they were subjected to paper airplanes gliding about the podium and the stage. This incident was predictable to a certain degree but it certainly would not have gone to the great lengths it did if a few people had exercised maturity, judgment, and applied a touch of class. I am talking specifically about George Mantor, your current SU President, who initiated the deluge by aiming a paper airplane at the first presidential speaker. Mantor's crass and childish behavior was then followed by a great many students, indoctrinated no doubt, to follow the example set by their president.

Moving on to the candidates, I would like to start with board of governors. I feel Gary Draper has shown that he could do a very capable job. Paul Ferguson lacks Draper's experience.

For the position of Academic vice president, the only two who made any sort of impression on me as far as ideas and their ability were concerned were Lawrence Dubois and Ray Friedman. I would tend to think that while Friedman and Dubois both have some good ideas, Dubois would be more capable because of his class and his polish. Dubois also appeared to be the only candidate who knew exactly what his policy will be.

For vice president services, the two major contenders are Doug Elves and Tony Melnechuk. While Elves did not acquit himself too well at the rally, his abilities are excellent, as he has proven in the excellent handling of SU Forums this year. He and Melnechuk have many common plans, but I feel Elves is more capable than Melnechuk in fulfilling the responsibilities. Indeed, an eloquent measure of Elves' suitability is evidenced by the fact that Elves was first choice over Melnechuk on the McGhie slate. Elves declined to join McGhie and is running as an independent.

For Executive vice president, I would have to say Allyn Cadogan. I was at first reluctant to voice my support because it might be misconstrued by Gateway readers as the editor using the paper to get elected, but anyone who attended Wednesday's rally could easily see that she was the only candidate to offer anything constructive.

Jack Redekop, of course, is in by acclamation as vice president Finance and Administration.

Now we come down to President. Of the candidates, the strongest ones would appear to be Joe McGhie and Ron Stewart. McGhie has a great deal of knowledge about student affairs while Stewart seems more down to earth, someone who will work on a one to one basis with people. They both have some excellent ideas and all I can really suggest is to examine their platforms carefully and make your choice.

In the final analysis, though, I would give a slight edge to Stewart.

I think that if the voters exercise serious judgment in their selection, we can come up with a great executive.

Satya Das

# The Gateway

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. It is published by the Students Union twice weekly during the winter session on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Contents are the responsibility of the editor, opinions are those of the person expressing them. Letters to the editor on any subject are welcome, but must be signed. Please keep them short, letters should not exceed 200 words. Deadlines for submitting copy are 2 P.M. Mondays and Wednesdays. Main offices are located in Room 282, SUB. Phone 432-5168, 432-5750 or 432-5178. Circulation 18,500 Subscription \$5 annually

editor-in-chief ..... Allyn Cadogan

production ..... Scott Partridge photography ..... Doug Moore  
managing ..... Carl Kuhnke arts ..... Walter Plinge  
news ..... Satya Das sports ..... Paul Cadogan  
advertising ..... Lorne Holladay features ..... Greg Neiman

Staff this issue: Peter Best, Rick Bilak, Fred Bischler, Sandy Campbell, John Kenney, Harold Kuckertz, Jr., Larry Saidman, Margriet Tilroe, Brian Tucker, Garry West, Barry Zuckerman.