

province, he is exerting cabinet pressure upon one of his hired men, to fire a citizen—that is a very different thing. Moreover, legislature privileges, and I'm sure Mr. Dean understands that, legislative privilege calls upon the cabinet minister to exert a good deal more sagacity in response than it does to the citizen whatever his place in the society when he criticizes the government, which is an immensely powerful force, and therefore recognizes its disadvantage. It is a disadvantage in a democratic country.

I think the distinction here should be between a cabinet minister when he is making a speech on the floor of the Legislature and when he is making a campaign or promotional speech. In the first case he is speaking as a member of the government. In the second place, he is speaking for himself or at least not necessarily representing the voice of the people in the same way.

I think we might get back to the pragmatic point which I think was raised by Professor Baird up in the gallery. When in fact has this kind of coercion ever been effective? Has a member of the faculty of this university ever in fact been removed because somebody in the cabinet wanted him fired? We really ought to face realities, in this thing.

Thachuk: Is not part of the problem which has to be delineated, is the consideration of when the public statements are made, whether inside or outside the Legislature. I think I would agree with Mr. Dean that this is sort of a reciprocal relationship between the public and ourselves in terms of criticizing each other. But when it comes to a point where a faculty member or a school teacher is for some statement or some conduct notified that he may be disciplined by the appropriate authority, then at that point the danger of a public statement before the inquiry is made and before the proper board or a group pass judgment upon him, if then the ministers than make a judgment. There is the danger. This is precisely the issue in the Hertzog case. The statements were made between the date that Mr. Hertzog was informed of the inquiry and the date that the inquiry actually took place. There is the possibility of coercion—not on an open platform like this afternoon. (applause)

Mr. Williamson: Earlier when Professor Baird asked for concrete examples of coercion I did not fail to answer because there were no examples, but because I was too embarrassed to describe some of them. (groans)

However, I will now describe one particular such example which I had wanted to avoid. Two such examples. One such example was—perhaps someone can give me the exact date of this—when the students were planning a demonstration against the rise in residence rates. The demonstration as I understand was called off because someone, the president of the university, called the president of the students' union and the president of the students' union understood that that call was itself produced by an earlier call from the premier of the province to the president of the university. After those telephone calls had taken place the demonstration was called off.

A second example in my own case was, of course, the fact, as is probably well known that I was subject to three-quarters of an hour of intimidations, by the president of this university after Commonsense originally appeared. I was told I should stop doing it and if that is not intimidation, nothing is—especially when it come from the president of the university. (applause)

I would ask Professor Baird in the audience to be a little bit more subtle. Perhaps Professor Grant Davy left this province for other reasons than direct coercion. Are we not talking about a climate of opinion—a climate of intellectual opinion. (applause)

Dr. Baird: If I may refer to Professor Williamson's topic of telephone calls and talking to people, may I say these things may be designed to be persuasive, not coercive. (groan) They may well be used by people with no interest in coercion as a means to persuade people to accept responsibility and self-discipline. (applause)

Questioner: I wonder if it is possible a university professor to speak to anyone outside the university without being associated, not just in the public mind but directly by means of the mass media with the university itself?

Questioner: Gentlemen, it seems to me we have evaded the issue, and the issue seems to me to be this, and I'm going to

make pretty much a flat statement after which I will invite the comments of the panelists. This is a democracy, and the people who represent us in the Legislature, since they were elected by the people who seem to think that they represent what they think, have a right to express the opinions of society, and since the university is an institution in society the university should perhaps not try to harness the comments. We don't want to muffle the comments of the people in the Legislature as they are the representatives of the people and have been elected, should perhaps take note of what society is doing if they are going to serve a useful purpose for the people in the province.

I don't say they must act on what

**NATIONAL DAY SUPPORT VARIES**

**NSD Promotes Access To U**

**3,500 UBC Students March**

**Students Hold Demonstration**

**Panel Discussion**

**Students stage action program**

**Education teach-in, ribbon drive**

**Protests design about inequality**

**11,000 Take Part In National Day**

**Manitoba**

**Fee fighter recruiting drive opens**

**Education Congress**

**Plans Protests**

**Day of Awareness To Support Concept of Universal Accessibility**

**LENNOXVILLE hold a national term plan to achieve Decision to hold month at the 29th here.**

**UNIVERSITY OF MANTOHA STUDENTS' UNION**

**Friday, October 29th**

**Fee BATTLE**

**COURTHOUSE SKIRMISH**

**Education action voted \$3,802**

**By DOUG HALVERSON Ubysses Council reporter**

**... before, during and after the fact**

**STUDENTS ACT ON HIGH FEES**

**WEDNESDAY, OCTO**

**National Student Day, Oct. 27**

**about inequality**

**Protests design**

**11,000 Take Part In National Day**

**Manitoba**

**Fee fighter recruiting drive opens**

**Education Congress**

**Plans Protests**

**Day of Awareness To Support Concept of Universal Accessibility**

**LENNOXVILLE hold a national term plan to achieve Decision to hold month at the 29th here.**

**UNIVERSITY OF MANTOHA STUDENTS' UNION**

**Friday, October 29th**

**Fee BATTLE**

**COURTHOUSE SKIRMISH**

**Education action voted \$3,802**

**By DOUG HALVERSON Ubysses Council reporter**

**... before, during and after the fact**

**STUDENTS ACT ON HIGH FEES**

**WEDNESDAY, OCTO**

**National Student Day, Oct. 27**

**about inequality**

**Protests design**

**11,000 Take Part In National Day**

**Manitoba**

**Fee fighter recruiting drive opens**

**Education Congress**

**Plans Protests**

**Day of Awareness To Support Concept of Universal Accessibility**

**LENNOXVILLE hold a national term plan to achieve Decision to hold month at the 29th here.**

**UNIVERSITY OF MANTOHA STUDENTS' UNION**

**Friday, October 29th**

**Fee BATTLE**

**COURTHOUSE SKIRMISH**

**Education action voted \$3,802**

**By DOUG HALVERSON Ubysses Council reporter**

**... before, during and after the fact**

# Three students walk out of AUCC meeting as renegade delegation officially seated

VANCOUVER (CUP)—Three students stalked out of a joint meeting of students and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada over the seating of an unauthorized delegation.

Ed Lavalle, western regional president of the Canadian Union of Students, left the meeting when two students representing what they termed a "conservative viewpoint" insisted on being seated.

Randall Enomoto and Gary Taylor, representing the ad hoc march of concern committee whose petition sparked UBC's referendum forcing the student council to lead the national student day march, also left the meeting.

The meeting between student representatives and members of the board of directors of the AUCC was announced after 3,500 marchers reached the parking lot of the Bayshore Inn where the AUCC was holding its annual meeting Oct. 27-29.

(An AUCC official said the decision to receive a delegation of students from the march was arrived at after the referendum at UBC approved the march by 61 per cent.)

The marchers were met at the Bayshore by a small group, carrying flippantly-

worded signs advocating a increase in tuition fees, and showering pennies on the first ranks of the marchers.

UBC student council President Byron Hender then invited the group to send a representative to the meeting with AUCC officials, at the same time as he announced the meeting.

As the student delegation began to squabble about the seating of the unauthorized two students, UBC President John B. MacDonald asked the students to let all viewpoints be heard.

"The AUCC board doesn't have to listen to this" said Dr. J. A. Corry, president of Queen's university and chairman of the board.

"We can't settle this for you."

The two unauthorized students, both from the law school, insisted their viewpoint wasn't expressed by the official delegation. When they refused to leave, Lavalle, Enomoto, and Taylor walked out.

At the round-table discussion of the fee situation which followed the walkout, the student viewpoint was presented by UBC council vice-presidents Robert Cruise and Peter Braund, CUS Vice-president Richard

Good, the Ubysses editor, the commerce society head, and a representative from Simon Fraser university.

AUCC board members said that while they agreed fees ultimately should perhaps be reduced, the whole problem was a matter of priority.

Corry said university administrators have to worry about maintaining and improving the quality of instruction given at their institutions, as well as the state of access to their institutions.

He said at present the former is the first priority.

Cruise asked the board members for some sort of sign that they were in general agreement with the ultimate ideas of lower fees.

"Is it possible for students to get some sort of formal, rather than unclear, commitment," he asked.

MacDonald said he, for one, couldn't make such a statement.

"If you ask me to give you a guarantee that fees will not go up, in effect you are asking me to assign a higher priority to keeping fees steady than to improving and maintaining the quality of education."