



Law rep denies Gateway editorial's claims of confusion, irresponsibility

In your editorial of February 10, entitled "Responsible Government?" I was criticized as being 'indecisive' because I had seen fit to oppose the application of the \$3.00 SUB expansion fee to students in the "professional" faculties and to law students in particular. It was suggested that I was less than conscientious regarding the interests of my electorate, and indeed that I was confused as to who my electorate were. I resent these suggestions, and feel that these criticisms are unfounded.

Under the Students' Union Constitution, each Student Councillor has the responsibility to ensure the adequate representation of the group of students by whom he is elected. I was elected by the Law students in order to protect their interests and to voice their opinions to Students' Council. When the question of SUB expansion came up, I felt that our interests would be adversely affected by a full \$3.00 increase; instead, I advocated a \$2.00 increase, based upon the ratio between our present Students' Union fees (\$20.00) and those paid

by undergraduate students (\$27.-50). As I pointed out at last Monday's Students' Council meeting, it was not my intent to frustrate the entire SUB expansion project; had it not been for a group of Councillors who voted with me for motives of their own, my compromise proposal would obviously have failed. I do not understand how I can be faulted for voicing the objections of a small group of students who could not hope to influence the outcome of a campus-wide referendum. There was no other way that our viewpoint could be advanced; I doubt The Gateway advocates the silent acquiescence of a minority whose rights and interests are adversely affected by the vote of a majority which does not share those special interests.

The same editorial suggests that I am unsure of the nature of my "electorate" in the light of my statement regarding the much-maligned Law and Order Committee. I said that my status as an elected representative forced me to abide by the wishes of the electorate. On that occasion I was

speaking of the entire Students' Union, and with good reason. I was elected by the Law and Order Committee by the Students' Council, and thus indirectly by the Union as a whole. It is ridiculous to suggest, as The Gateway has done, that the only student interests which I have the duty to represent on that committee are those of the Law students. I am very much aware of my responsibilities to my "electorates", and I suggest that a little clear thinking by the editorial writer would have solved the supposed conflict between my "questionable" statements.

At last Monday's meeting, a students' council member was quoted as saying that he was responsible only to himself, since he had warned his electorate at the start that he was not fit to represent them. While I can agree with the latter part of his statement, I feel that his, and others', attitudes towards responsibility are the real reasons for the weakness of our so-called "responsible" student government.

It is the difficult duty of every councillor to act in the best interests of his electorate without unduly prejudicing the rights of a majority of students. When I realized that my principled stand could frustrate the desires of a great majority of the campus and that our interests were incompatible and incapable of compromise, I voted in favor of the full \$3.00 fee increase for professional students. However, I resent the Gateway's implication that I derogated from my duty by refusing to silently "rubber-stamp" a decision which I felt to be inequitable. Kindly look elsewhere for your symptoms of irresponsibility.

Frank T. MacInnis
Law representative
students' council

Electorate wants analysis; not just platform summaries

Another SU election is coming upon us and thanks to council's move to protect the sacred institution by eliminating so-called non-serious candidates and radicals on campus making the invisible scene, we can look forward to another dull election. It will probably be one of the lowest turnouts in years with a more than likely reactionary swing to the right. So much for predictions.

The reason I am writing this letter is to find out what plans The Gateway has for covering the forthcoming election. Are we going to have an in-depth analysis of candidates' election platforms, interviews, or just a mere summary of their platform? I think that a lot can be done for the electorate in this area regardless of our lack of interest. I might suggest that one could look at the platforms over the last five years and really not find much differences in the promises put forth or promises kept.

In spite of our ignorance of what is happening up there in SU land, I hope The Gateway takes up its responsibility as an important information media, as opposed to opinions of writers.

Earl Silver
arts 3

VOTE UNDECIDED

VOTE HARVEY G. THOMGIRT

Picture Censored

Ted Kemp, you're just plain stupid!

Attribute	Rank
Volume of publication	1
School at which doctorate was taken	2
Having the right connections	3
Ability to get research support	4
Quality of publication	5
Textbook authorship	6
Luck or chance	7
School of first full-time appointment	8
Selfpromotion ("brass")	9
Teaching ability	10

This chart appeared in *American Political Science, A Profile of a Discipline*, by Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus (1964, The Atherton Press, New York). The chart was compiled from the responses of members of the American Political Science Association, when they were queried about the factor they considered important in "getting ahead" in their profession.

Ted Kemp — you're just plain stupid!

You ought to know that teaching ability contributed f—all to success as a university professor! The number of publications is most important — haven't you

seen the results of the attached survey? We don't even ask that the publications be good: quality of publications comes five ranks lower down.

And teaching? — it's right down at the bottom. Three ranks lower than luck or pure chance.

And you'd better realize that we students aren't going to do a damn thing about it, 'cause that's the way it is, baby. We can't change the system. If THEY say that teaching doesn't count, that's good enough for us.

Maybe we once thought that you were a good teacher, but if the head of your department says you're not a good philosopher, then he knows best, man, and we no longer want you around. Maybe we once thought you were worth having around, but if they say you're no good, then you're nothing, man—We made a mistake. They all know better than us.

So shut up, pack it in, and leave quietly! Let the rest of us get on with our shit-eating in peace.

Doug Mustard
grad studies

for PRESIDENT

HARVEY'S PLATFORM

- Proper students union priorities—service functions first as the established university
- End haggling and get on with SUB Expansion and student-run residences
- Better communication for the university
- Students first on parking priorities
- Better parking facilities
- A council responsive to the needs of students
- End to censorship of student media
- Student parity where it belongs

HARVEY G. THOMGIRT
your snake
in the grass
on the grass
and for the grass

Judy Samoil, you're poorly informed!

The Gateway has done it again. Once again they have published an editorial by someone who is obviously poorly informed. I refer to the article by Judy Samoil appearing on page four of the latest Gateway—specifically to her reference to students in the professional schools.

As a fourth year medical student, I am in my seventh year on a university campus—two years more than the five years that Miss Samoil speaks of as being almost standard (which, incidentally, is not borne out by statistics). In addition, I have had the full benefit of undergraduate status throughout the entire seven years—something that an individual taking two years beyond a B.A. is not treated to—and this, in spite of the fact that I earned my B.A. before ever entering medicine. Perhaps that sounds "like little kid talk," but I would invite Miss Samoil to wear the shoe for awhile and see if, perhaps she doesn't become a bit tired of it.

Also, her assertion that many of us spend as much time in SUB

as students from other faculties is erroneous. For most students in third and fourth year medicine, it is unlikely that they are even on campus once a week, let alone spend time in SUB. Senior medical students are assigned to the various hospitals in the city for one to two months at a time for their instruction. Thus, most of us spend only a couple of hours per week in lectures in the Clinical Sciences Building, and seldom have either the desire or the time to go over to the main part of campus. If students from other faculties spent as little time in SUB as medical students, there would be no need for expansion of the facilities, as the building would be deserted 99 per cent of the time.

As a student from one of the professional faculties, I suggest that not only should we be exempt from the fee for expansion of SUB, but that it is about time the gods that be considered granting us graduate student status, and the privileges thereof.

Rita Scott
med 4