



Awards for Service

Cheers for Council

Problems Beset Awards Committee

The Awards Committee has completed its meetings; it has considered the awards forms submitted; it considered as well as many of the "form-conscious" reluctant as it could track down. Those persons who were deemed worthy of awards on this basis have been accordingly notified and invited to the Color Night ceremonies to receive their commendation.

With the rings and pins there is no problem. These awards are given on a basis of merit, as a token of gratitude for the time and trouble that the recipients have given to the student body.

But what of the Golden Keys that are awarded at the same time. Should they be given on a basis of merit only when, in receiving the award, the recipient is expected to work for the Golden Key Society in carrying out the obligations and functions of that group? Or, on the other hand, should some consideration of expected contribution in future years be a part of the analysis made by the Awards Committee in considering this award.

Several factors make this latter suggestion difficult if not impossible.

1. In questioning this issue last year, the Committee took the problem to Students' Council who emphatically stated that it should be awarded for merit only. This in itself is sufficient to give the award on a work-done basis. But the reasoning behind such an action justifies further comment.

2. To avoid injustice the Awards Committee attempts to remain as objective as is entirely possible. In doing so a sliding point scale is used. This scale considers; how well the position in question was handled, the size or degree of work involved in the position, and the degree which it affects the student body as a whole. Such a scale eliminates any pettiness which might arise from within the Committee.

3. In using the objective approach no consideration can be made of an individual's motives for participating in such activities as would entitle him to the Golden Key Award. It does not matter if he is working for the Award itself, or working to eventually become President of the Students' Union, or any other form

of the now rancid expression: "Empire Building." The Committee is equally unconcerned if the individual sincerely believes that he must do that which he is doing because it is best for the student body as a whole (if such a person really exists).

By so doing the Committee succeeds in their drive for objectivity. However in doing so a rather knotty problem is created by remembering that the Gold Key Society expects service from its members.

How can the Society expect its members to continue their participation in extra-curricular activities when the award which entitles them to do so in that capacity has been given to them on the basis of merit with no consideration of their anticipated contribution at a future date.

The answer is in effect relatively simple. To be offered a Gold Key is a student's commendation for his contributions to campus life. To accept the award should be a literal commitment to work for Student Government in his remaining years on campus.

The situation then basically resolves itself to this: the Awards Committee must offer the Gold Key to everyone who has qualified themselves according to the point scale. But the onus is on the individual himself not to accept the award if he does not intend to work for the Gold Key Society or on some other phase of Student Government. Utopia maybe?

Paul G. S. Cantor

Ed. Note: Cloud 9!

Very Veridical Varsity Voice

To The Editor:

Belated congratulations on your stand in the recent farcical affair with the "santiary napkin manufacturer." In spite of the threatened suit the Gateway stood firmly on principle while lesser souls prepared to bow the knee before the over-sensitive commercial giant.

An Interested Observer

P.S. What do you intend to do with your year's supply?

Ed. Note: Become an agent and give away free samples.

President Praises Editorials

Allow me to convey my thanks to you, goode editore, for your time and effort in devoting all three of your editorials in the last issue of The Gateway to Students' Council. It is only through fair, intelligent comment of this nature that the students of this university may become aware of the hours of work performed by their student councillors.

In particular, the 16 faculty representatives toil in almost complete anonymity—how many can you name, omniscent reader?—on varied tasks.

Most of these projects are conceived by the council executive, but many come from the councillors. Of course, any member of the student body is free to add his ideas, either through his faculty representative or to a member of the executive.

However, let me refer to the three editorials individually:

1. **On by-laws.** I am particularly delighted by your point of view in this editorial: that at one recent meeting too much time was spent on a by-law discussion. This is good news to an executive that was in fear of being labelled the Great Rail-roader.

In keeping with the point of view espoused by The Gateway last term, council meetings have been kept informal, with a minimum of time wasted over procedure. Great benefits have accrued, as a very large amount of legislation has been dealt with by council.

However, thanks to your editorial, this council can't be chastised for playing down rules for the sake of ramming legislation through the meetings. And remember. No Gateway editorial has been incorrect in fifty years. So no reversing your stand.

2. **Over-worked secretary-treasurer.** This editorial was excellent. It fell directly in line with the council's re-organization plan for future councils. Members of the council, especially the executive, will not be permitted to take on the heavy committee work loads that have been the custom in the past.

Instead, action committees such as SUB expansion will be headed by members of the Directors' Circle. The executive and councillors will be required to stick more closely to their tasks as legislators. They will be expected to examine legislation minutely and devote their energies to implementing it and keeping their eyes open for hitherto unrecognized needs.

You were most fair in pointing out that the very demanding SUB expansion project has taken up most of the secretary-treasurer's time—I

would say about forty to fifty hours a week. However, in his defence, I would ask you to compare the notices he has published this year, to those which appeared last year. You will doubtless agree with me that Mr. Macdonald's were more numerous, complete and imaginative . . . particularly the election proclamation and last week's list of appointments available.

Incidentally, Mr. Macdonald's list of appointments open for next term will prove to be a great service to the incoming council. Last year no such list was published, and the present council had to resort to posters etc., since The Gateway does not publish after a new council takes office.

3. **Committee work.** Your calling of attention to some of the problems being wrestled with by council committees is most valuable. Your

questions raise those which were put to the committees concerned at the beginning of the term. I can assure you that the action you mention has either already been taken, or will be implemented before council change-over. The sole exception is liquor on campus. We have determined that a change in the University Act would have to be made by the provincial government. This is a task that cannot be accomplished overnight.

Finally, your request for a list of council accomplishments for the year will be complied with for your final edition.

D. E. Jenkins
law 3
President, SU

Ed. Note: It better be good; I have some snarky comments on the point of my pen.



I met her first in SUB, on an NFCUS exchange. She said she had belonged to SCM, YCF, TGIF, VCF. She had heard it from CUP, took the CUR and BOAC, and as soon as she had arrived the VIP's of EUS, ESS, CUS, and the ex-prexy of ASUS (RIP).

She joined the SFA, WAA, NDP, and the PPPP and PPS. She sympathized with members of ROTP, MUS, GKS, GSA, and the WCTU. She hated the BHKS, RR, loved the NMIAAC, but was perplexed by TGIF and BYOB. RSVP left her COLD.

She despised the WCIAA the DAR and MP, detested the USSR, and the UAR; waved a flag for the USA. She did a story on WURTF.

She considered calling the RCMP for CUCND activities. The WUS appeal to the UN, NATO, and NORAD was SNAFU. The P(ost) M(ortem) by CAUT showed it was SOB. (Short of Breath).

UAC, UBC and UMUS were chagrined. VGW sponsored her to appear in VV. But the IFFP was angry. IFC and all Hell broke loose.

WAUB complained to SU. YFC endorsed the complaint to have her barred from PEB. The IBM 704 was enlisted to aid the SCFC. She called on MUB in SS next but was vexed.

E and G was going to spill a FF on her. MGM wanted her to replace either BB or MM. I was going to join the COTC. The SRL lodged a complaint with ATAT. They referred the matters to LDS, LSM and DIEF's PC's.

* * * * *

The moral of the story is very EZ 2 C. Don't take out a girl from U of A.

Ed. Note: What the Hell—you forgot DIEC!

CLAUDE (not recommended)

