



People of Reason: Common Sense is not Common

Dear People of Reason,

After all is said and done, the G.F.C. has rejected the request of some 12,000 students of a University population of about 18,000. This does not mean, of course, that only 2/3 of the students wanted a "reading week" as of this term. Some just didn't bother to sign and others were just indifferent. Granted though, there were opposers.

So get 12,000 students on campus motivated sufficiently, enough to join for a common cause, is an achievement which holds well for the future. Who or what is G.F.C. to tell the masses that "Your decision is 'wrong' and not in your best interest"? It seems to me that the G.F.C. is as mixed-up as is Dr. S.H. Simmonds (Civil Engineering).

He guaranteed his ability to get 11,000 people in Edmonton who would sign a petition to abolish the University; and he would use this as his basis for discarding the student's request. Maybe he can even get 500,000, the population of the city, to sign such a petition, and if this is the case, he in all his wisdom will disregard such an entreaty by his rationale. Common sense is not so common after all. I hope I never have the misfortune

of having to take a course from such a "talented reasoner." The University Government should use this testification of intelligence dogmatic attitude to ask for his resignation.

What is most significant, however, is whether the students will make their requests a demand, and all stay away from school for the period Feb. 28 to March 3. It's OK if men like Dr. Simmonds continue to teach through this period even in the absence of students.

Mon-Art Pon of Arts II suggests that it is not justified for the 12,000 plus, to want to impose their feelings on the other students. Does this mean that on any issue Mon-Art feels there must be a unanimous vote before action can be taken? His final thought is not really worth consideration.

I dare say that the Administration of Universities as McGill, U. of T., Sir George, (maybe I shouldn't mention this one), even U.B.C. would not have dared to, so openly defy the popular section of their respective student bodies.

This is open confrontation. The students have been challenged. Are we going to give

in or shall we stand?

Maybe the Administration knows its student body, that's why it can take such a chance.

H. Singh
Eng. III

"Totality" for Women

Dear Editor:

Your comments about the booths at Women's Week and the chocolates and the quilts, etc. make me think that perhaps you have "missed the whole point".

Your idea of woman seems to be of a radical with a clenched fist and an unwanted pregnancy. Let me tell you that not all women are like that - in fact we do not think that very many are. Granted, women should have equal opportunities and pay with men, but we do not think that they are oppressed or abused. A woman needs more than a high paying job and ambition to make her happy - hence the idea of a "Total" woman is not that far out. It has been said that man needs to be respected and that woman needs to be loved. We do not think that the guerilla tactics of women's lib proponents are earning them any love.

You say that Women's Week was not representative, perhaps because the radicals were not allowed to control the whole week the way some radicals control the Gateway. In case you hadn't noticed men and women are different in many ways - Long live the difference! It is not a matter of equality of sexes but a diversity of purposes. One can not completely function without the other any more than one could completely replace the other. There is more to life than just sex, or money, or social status. A woman should develop the ability to function in all phases of life.

Linda Lowry
Ruth Smith
Sue Barker
Marge Bowden
Vivian Gilbert
Sharon Hornsby

Student Health Must Stay

Dear Sir:

The student health service must stay. Indeed, it should be further developed. Perhaps most important, it is a meaningful and humanizing influence in an over-administrative and impersonal University corporation. Arguments that the service be discontinued because a provincial health service has become available are nonsense. Substitute facilities would be more expensive to the community and less effective for the needs of University students. If economies are needed there are a number of obvious places to consider - the student health service is certainly not one of them.

There is nothing new in the view which I have expressed, and it has been recognized elsewhere

where National Health Services are available. I was on the staff of the Medical Faculty for many years at University College London, England, where a complete National Health Service was available. Nonetheless, the Student Health Service at the College was constantly being developed and adapted to meet student needs. It had a full-time staff of 3 physicians (a specialist in Internal Medicine, one in Obstetrics and Gynaecology, and one in Psychiatry) plus ancillary staff for a student body numbering four thousand. I never heard of any suggestion that it be discontinued, and when I left, it was being expanded.

M. Schachter, M.D.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Physiology

The Gateway

member of the Canadian University Press

Staff This Issue

Under the glaring spotlights of the videotape boys from down the hall the following people gathered in the Gateway office to perform their debut on the stage: Jim (keep that camera away from me) Selby, Henri (le grand monsieur) Pallard, Bob (our council reporter) Blair, Colette Forest, Beth (the ham) Nilsen, our award-winning typists Ann Parker, Barbara Preece, Irene Kuhanyshyn, our cultural programmers Ross Harvey and David Bird, armchair quarterbacks Ron Ternoway and Stu Layfield, the visitors from down the hall Don (the ripper) Spence and Dave (Preminger) Ragosin, Elsie Ross, Karen (who did not want to be mentioned in staff this issue) Moeller, and now signing off yours truly, Harvey G. Thomgirt.

Departments Editor-in-chief-Bob Beal (432-5179), news-Elsie Ross (432-5168), Sports-Ron Ternoway (432-4329), advertising Percy Wickman (432-4241) production-Jim Selby 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.

Editorial

Here we go again

Students' Union elections are almost upon us and we're about to be smothered with all kinds of weird proposals from all sorts of weird people. The one thing all these people have in common is they all want our vote. And the one thing their proposals will all have in common is they are all designed to get our vote.

On page 7 of this Gateway, we have reprinted the platform the present executive ran on last year. Beside it we've printed our analysis of what they've accomplished in relation to what they said they'd accomplish. They haven't really accomplished very much, have they?

Many of the proposals of last year's "MacKenzie Slate" seem to have been designed simply to get votes rather than to propose realistic solutions to students' problems.

For instance, "the possibility of buying houses in Garneau and leasing them to groups of students on a non-profit basis" could hardly have been considered, by anyone who had investigated the situation, to be feasible. The university has already bought the houses and is leasing them to students, but on a profit basis. As well, the University's rental agent for Garneau, The Royal Trust Company, is also making a profit. Was the McKenzie executive so naive as to believe they could wrest control of the area from the university or did they include that point simply to get votes?

Similarly, the present Executive recommended the "establishment of a Summer Employment Service." But exactly what was proposed by McKenzie and friends had already been set up and had operated very effectively the previous summer. Didn't they know it was already in operation, or were they hoping most students wouldn't know?

The present Executive promised "better Gateway coverage of campus news". They didn't tell us, during the last election how they proposed to accomplish this. None of the present Executive had ever worked for The Gateway nor did they discuss the possibilities of this particular proposal with the people who did work for the paper. It is doubtful that any of the present Executive had even been in the paper's office before the election. After the election, they decided that, even though they know nothing about the operation of The Gateway, they could legislate their kind of news coverage to a volunteer student staff.

"In order to personalize the university," the McKenzie slate said, "the students' union should decentralize some of its functions to organizations which are more responsive to student needs." And yet, they proposed a re-organization of the Students' Union which would have centralized power in the Hands of the Executive and away from the Students' Council. Did the Executive really believe they were one of these "responsive organizations"?

As well, the Executive forced the SUB workers into an unfortunate position. The workers were afraid the present Executive would not deal with them "in good faith" so they formed a union to deal with our elected representatives. The Executive has hardly talked to any of the SUB staff (besides the managers) before or since the unionization struggle. This is "personalizing" the university?

They said their proposals were "responsive to student concerns". Certainly the Second Term Reading Week proposals (backed by a petition of 12,000 students) were responsive to student concerns. But was it responsive to try to bargain off some of the holidays we already enjoy in favour of this baby of this Executive?

The present Executive said there is "the need for a new direction in the students' union, for a students' union which is responsive, creative, and innovative in its approach to student concerns". We elected an Executive that was none of these.

Last year we elected an Executive which said worthwhile things but, after they were elected, showed little concern for putting their impractical proposals into practice.

This year, we are going to have to be far more careful in whom we elect. It is important to us to have an Executive who will attempt to make the university a better environment in which we live and work.

We will have to examine the proposals and approach of the candidates much more closely than we have in past. We must attempt to ensure that the people we elect are not lying to us by formulating proposals which look nice on paper but which are impractical and which the candidates have little intention of carrying out.