

The Gateway

member of Canadian University Press

STAFF THIS ISSUE

Well it's another late press night, especially since half the staff isn't working too hard after that debilitating Saskatoon conference this weekend. Those that pulled their weight tonight were Rick Grant (who didn't pull anything), Dawn Kunesky, Ross Harvey, Bob Blair, Karen MOeller, Ken Brown, Dennis Zomerschoe, Elsie (I can't write this editorial), Frans (censor's dept) Slatter, Reta Hohnson, Beth Nilsen, Bob Beal, Fiona (a nickel?) Campbell, Winston (long winded...) Gerulak, Dennis Windrum, Ed (our janitor) Reid, Jerry Slavic, Don Ryane, Bud Joberg, and last, very last, straight from Saskatoon, I, Harvey G. Thomgirt (victorious over bureaucracy).

Departments: editor-in-chief - Bob Beal (432-5178), news - Elsie Ross (432-5168), sports - Ron Ternoway (432-4329), advertising - Percy Wickman (432-4241), production - Bud Joberg and Ron Yakimchuk, Photo - Barry Headrick and Don Bruce (432-4355), arts - Ross Harvey, and last but not least, publisher - Harvey G. Thomgirt (432-5168).

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students of the university of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Short Short deadline is two days prior to publication. The Gateway is printed by North Hill News Ltd., Edmonton.

Indians Boycott Education

Since September 13, 1971 the Cold Lake and Kehewin bands of Indians have been withholding 412 children from federal and provincial schools as a protest against the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for their indifference toward our repeated requests for new school construction in the six southern reserves of the Saddle Lake-Athabasca District. These requests have been strongly emphasized during the past ten to fifteen years, and during the last two years, in particular, we have made very vocal appeals for improved reserve educational facilities with necessary improvement in water services, feeder roads and adult education centers. To bolster the educational advancement of our young people, we have cited the critical need for economic development in the reserves. Convinced that our voices are largely being ignored, we had to resort to civil disobedience to catch the attention of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and gain public support for our objectives.

Under the provisions of the federal Indian Act, we have no legal voice in determining the course of Indian education in and out of the reserves. Other persons and groups, such as the Minister of Indian Affairs, provincial Ministers of Education, provincial school districts, religious groups and charitable organizations all have the legal right to administer Indian education. We are thusly reduced to subservient Indian subjects who are supposed to be always receptive to the mixture of Indian education discharged at us. Contrary to what the Hon. Jean Chretien said in Thunder Bay, Ontario on September 17, 1971, that Alberta Treaty Indians can sit on provincial school boards, it is not true. The present Alberta School Act does not allow for it; however, there are several Treaty Indian persons on the Northland School Division Board (under a special legislative provision of the Northland School Division Act). For three years our efforts to get the Alberta School Act favorably amended have resulted in nothing but frustration and failure.

The central issue involved in the now heated controversy is one of self-determination in all matters concerning Indian school construction, operation and administration. By the terms of the treaties (No. 6, in this instance), and in keeping with the modernization of treaty commitments, funds allocated by Parliament for Indian education are rightfully ours. On the strength of this, we should have the innate right to make all important decisions relating to the education of our children, including: setting of general educational objectives, arriving at priorities for school construction as they relate to location and size of operation, hiring of administration and teachers operation of bus routes, curriculum developments, etc.

We are in our present confrontation situation because the Minister of Indian Affairs and a host of senior educational administrators in Ottawa still question whether we have the primary right and competence to make judgements about our future in Canada. Our task of re-educating the general public and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Education Branch to believe that we, like any others in our multi-cultural society, have the unquestionable right to chart our own course, bears heavily upon us. Perhaps the Hon. Jean Chretien would be more understanding and sympathetic towards our aspirations, if it were not the case that his senior bureaucrats in Ottawa are in effect setting most of the Department's operating policies. Those bureaucrats are insensitive to the appeals of the Indian people. They are inadequate advisers to the Minister because they fail in their communication with the tribes. They conspire against us by deceiving the Minister. They covet our budgets like paternal masters, much to our detriment.

Educational progress, in short, must be related to the social context of the Indian people. We are the sole persons who have the wisdom and impartiality to judge the effectiveness of all educational programs affecting our children. Reforms are in order, but we are learning that reforms require more than ordinary attention and persistence, since our past pleas have fallen too often on deaf ears.

The above is a summary of the present Indian situation in Alberta by Harold Cardinal, president of the Indian Association of Alberta.

Frans Slatter Sorts It Out

Dear Bob,

I was very interested to read the first sentence of your editorial in Thursday's paper ("I can't talk to student's council anymore") as it seems to hide a certain frustration that I myself have felt on occasion. You have trouble communicating with the 25 odd people on council, and I have trouble communicating with the 20,000 odd people on campus.

The mystical "everybody" knows that "Students' Council doesn't do anything". I feel that a lot of students have a right to make this assumption as the major means of communication on campus (that's you, Bob) never tells them what the Students' Union is up to. The truth is that the Students' Council has a significant effect on the social and academic life of the students on this campus. The Executive, who are paid a salary, (something that very few of the students are probably aware) works hard and does its best to do their individual jobs correctly. The people that elected us will probably never know if we ever show up at all, and if we do, whether we do anything correctly while we are here.

It would appear that the Gateway does not think that Council is doing a good job and you are welcome to that opinion. However, it is unfortunate that your method of attack so far has been to call us names, write slanted articles about the actions you disapprove of and to ignore everything else.

We don't demand that you agree with us on every issue. We ask that you allow the students

to make up their own minds on Council's effectiveness by at least letting them know what Council is doing. The problem in the past has been that when Council members run for re-election, the students have no way of evaluating their past performance.

I am the Treasurer of the Students' Union, "Everybody" knows that the Treasurer is a tight fisted, cold calculating, son-of-a-bitch. If anyone should happen to drop into my office (259F SUB - the door is always open) they will be surprised to notice that I am a people just like they are, and not a position in a bureaucracy. But then 20,000 people not going to get to my office and it is going to be very difficult for me to get out to all of them, so why shouldn't I become a stereotype. When the Gateway attempts to convey what Council is like by using such meaningful terms as "power hungry people" and "lifeless bodies" it is not surprising that the average student falls back on stereotypes. Rhetoric doesn't help the Gateway, the Students' Union the Council or the students.

I personally ask you (implore you) to hang around my office and see what I'm doing. Make me justify my opinions. Ask me what I'm doing for the students. Make sure I'm at least attempting to do the job. Tell the people that I'm a bad or good Treasurer and why. You might get hold of a copy of the platform that I ran on and ask me what hasn't been done and why. If you don't like what I'm doing, get off your ass and tell me why. It's hard to "serve the students" with no feedback or constructive criticism and very frustrating to try. Telling everybody that I have the "wrong

" opinion is not good enough anymore.

Yours sincerely,
Frans Slatter

Treasurer. P'S' I would like to make a few comments on the Gazette issue: 1) In your Thursday editorial you express the philosophy that the Gateway is an independent club responsible only to the students, and that Students' Council is only related to you as a money bag. Further you seem to imply that the Council has a moral obligation to give the Gateway the money it requests, no strings attached. Council is responsible to the students. Since you are responsible to the students and we are the elected representatives of the students, it would seem that you should accept the decision of the majority of and publish the Gazette as required in the bylaws. Everybody gets on the minority end of a Council decision once in a while, but we all accept democratic process. If you don't believe in democracy then what do you believe?

2) Your second major argument for not working on the Gazette is that you are volunteers and should not be forced into anything that you do not want to do. The editorial is very misleading in this regard, whether by intention or by accident. As far as I can see the only people that would have to work on the Gazette would be the Editor, the News Editor, the Layout Editor and the composer operators, since the copy would come in already written. You know as well as I do that all these people are paid staff members, and I think you are being dishonest when you imply that volunteers will be forced to work on the Gazette.



Don MacKenzie should have a book going to press in the near future. Published by Wayne and Schuster, it will be entitled *My Years as a Politico*. The most interesting thing about the book is, that even though it is 683 pages long, it is completely blank. Which sums up Don's career as a politico quite nicely, but makes rather dull reading. And because its selling for \$2000, (which happens to be, coincidentally, roughly Don's income), it doesn't pay to buy it as a notebook.

— FIVE —

Berry Wes Gateway

News From the Usual Unreliable Sources Dept.: A best-left-unnamed Theology prof is facing at least five, and possibly seven paternity suits. The complainants, all of which are nursing students, lodged cacharges after riding the elevator with the aforementioned professor, from RATT to the main floor of SUB, a distance of some seven floors. Since the journey usually takes about five months to complete, there is little or no doubt of the girls' delicate position (definitely not "69"). Signed affidavits by each of the seven nurses state that, upon entering the elevator, each girl was "virgo intacto". (Hint to students of a quite obvious faculty - consider going into theology is you can't make it with the nurses any other way.)

I was approached by a member of 'Womens' Lib last week. Which is certainly an unexpected change.

Despite the following statement, and, at the same time, of course, not questioning either the integrity of myself or of those who come to me seeking to know why, I find myself in the uncomfortable position of being unable to relegate my feelings and personal observations into acceptable cause/effect categories. Certainly, I myself feel that, though a very definite amount of perceptual error may be involved in converting the experience into subjective terms, it would be wrong to gloss over the facts and treat them as though they were mere superficialities, since in doing so, I would, in effect, be severely hindering any qualitative discussion of the subject that might take place in the near future. Therefore I feel that I must confine my thinking on the matter to only those aspects which are, at the very least, conditionally relevant, in order to make the task a proportionate degree easier for all concerned.