



letters

free education

To The Editor:

I am in total disagreement with Dr. Wyman, vice-president of U of A "Free education a detriment". Actually there is no proof that such is the case. On the other hand real and actual contrary proof exists on other campuses in other places, e.g. Russia, California, Newfoundland.

Free tuition may be a detriment, as is the instant of the "Canadian Native". However this does not take into consideration past long range geographical and climate factors. In comparison the Indian or Eskimo child has not done so well as the white child in school. There is no proof that free education has done this to the native, nor can one say that in this case the native did not gain by being exposed to education.

If one considers the devastatingly different student backgrounds on the campus: family, society, monetary, attitudinal, school, community, religious—even with free tuition equality of opportunity is still a myth. By sheer hard work and application the student may overcome some of his background detriments. But with tuition to pay, this becomes doubly hard to do. Removing tuition leaves the way open to tackle problems of adjustment and application to studies on the campus.

We as a nation are moving towards a welfare state. Setting up our students today and making more plausible their graduation is really money in the bank for the future. If they graduate, they will contribute an average of \$2,000 per year as income tax towards the support of the welfare state. Undoubtedly today's student will be the major contributor tomorrow. As history amply indicates, a nation that becomes a welfare state becomes financially unstable. We cannot do as the Romans did; expand our boundaries by conquest and demand tribute for our welfare state. But we can expand future earning powers and future tax paying powers by eliminating tuition today, and thereby stabilizing our future economy and society.

The consensus of a few well-meaning but badly misinformed students indicates that "free tuition" is a bad thing. In the past it also was considered to be so in the matter of tuition free secondary education.

Today "tuition free" secondary education is a fact we live with everyday. Statistics indicate that since the advent of tuition free secondary education our Gross National Income has more than doubled in its yearly increase. This is certainly not a bad thing. What would happen to our gross national product if post-secondary education were tuition free? It is rather certain that an increase would result, most likely unprecedented by any former increase. With a last year's increase of 9 per cent GNP can Canada go wrong to provide tuition free education at the post secondary level?

The Hon. Paul Martin, personally stated that the state is moving towards "tuition free post secondary education". Perhaps it would be best to support the issue and not fight it. We as students stand to gain and the country's gain later will be tremendously greater than the cost of "mere tuition".

nb

Today, Page Five is crammed with letters from our growing list of campus correspondents, and there is another of those popular Bassek cartoons.

Writers today praise free education, clarify a stand, complain about yearbook photos, say thanks, attack a cartoon and criticize a news story.

If your letter has not been published as yet, do not fret or give up. We will try to run them all, as long as they are signed and come to the point in approximately 300 words or fewer. Your Viewpoints are also welcome.



"Something about us not getting a message . . . makes you wonder why they came here . . . they can't even speak properly . . ."

badly-drawn frog

To The Editor:

I wish to protest most vehemently Mr. Drever's editorial cartoon of October 29.

That cartoon is wholly indicative of the reasons why Quebec and her students may choose to leave Canada and "the good ship CUS." It illustrates with great clarity (sic) the prejudice and refusal to understand the aspirations of French-Canada that motivated Laval University to refuse a Western Canada Week.

Granted, sir, CUS is a sinking ship. "Student Unionism" in English Canada is an exercise in futility. Real students everywhere should applaud the courage and dedication of the student activists in Quebec who have chosen to do something with their student syndicates.

The planning of dances and rodeos is not the function of a student; it is properly the function of a paid business manager. If student unions are to do anything they must realize that the word "union" implies pressure group action in the interests of students and not the entertainment of students.

That English-speaking McGill and Sir George Williams universities have chosen to join UGEQ must be one of the most encouraging signs in the national dialogue.

Rather than running cartoons that

ridicule students who take their role in society seriously, The Gateway should ridicule the pitiful organization students in Western Canada who think they can serve student ends by putting up activity signs and sending ineffectual briefs to unsympathetic governments.

UGEQ is a symbol of the concern and activism for which students throughout the world are being lauded at this time.

With one badly drawn frog, Mr. Drever may well have gone a long way toward destroying the good done by the work of hundreds of people in preparing last year's French Canada Week.

May Mr. Drever's prejudice be recognized for the shameful thing that it is.

May your bad taste, Mr. Editor, in printing this unfunny bigotry, be roundly and soundly damned by all who are real students, by all who are real human beings.

Gerald L. Ohlsen
arts 3

(If a single cartoon about a national fact can "go a long way toward destroying the good done" by this university's French Canada Week workers last year, as you suggest; then Canada is indeed in a precarious position. This newspaper has already said editorially (Oct. 6) that dialogue with French Canada depends upon Quebec students meeting the rest of Canada half way.—The Editor)

legitimate concern

To The Editor:

I would like to congratulate the people responsible for arranging that the U of A campus was included in the "hoop-up" for the recent International teach-in held in Toronto.

I think it showed legitimate interest and concern for furthering Canadian's knowledge on the subject of Vietnam and other related problems. It is obvious from the large number of university and high-school students who attended that there is a growing number of young people who share this concern.

It is all the more deplorable then, that in this election campaign, so little of this interest is being shown by our political parties and their candidates. In all the masses of literature now being distributed, almost nothing is being said about such questions as the was in Vietnam, Canada's role in international affairs, the question of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the UN and many other matters of world-wide importance.

Teach-ins, however important and interesting they are, will be so much wasted effort if at election time we do not know what international policies each of the parties and their candidates stand for when we are making our choice.

(Mrs.) A. M. Mardiros,
President,
Voice of Women,
Edmonton Branch

and scholarship payments. For, as I remarked to your reporter, fees are only part of a general objective—increased amounts of money, for loans, bursaries and scholarships are among the other parts.

Dave Cruden
grad studies

yearbook photos

To The Editor:

We would like to lodge a complaint about the handling of yearbook photos this year.

It was stated on notices posted around campus that faculty of education students would be photographed from Oct. 23 to Nov. 7. Being conscientious education students we appeared in SUB on Oct. 21 to make our appointments in what we thought would be plenty of time. We were informed that the aforementioned time slot was already filled. A meeting was to be held that evening between the photographer and the students' council to schedule further time for these photos.

On inquiring Monday, Oct. 25, we were told that the students' council refused to grant the photographers additional time; thus excluding a large number of student pictures from the yearbook.

How, may we ask, does the student's union propose to publish a yearbook without the pictures of many students? We pay our fees and deserve to see ourselves and our friends in the yearbook!

Sheila Whittaker, ed 3
Elaine Hatch, ed 2
Judy Cox, ed 2

english lecturer robin mathews says

'the teach-in was no disappointment'

I have some observations about the teach-in at Convocation Hall. Downtown acquaintances I have met judged it a flop, judged us generally as failures, squares who got "done in" by the forces of the Sacred Establishment represented mostly by Ernest Manning.

As far as learning is concerned, I believe that the teach-in, the whole thing, provided food for discussion, debate, and research of important and wide-ranging kinds. I am not particularly interested whether someone "won" or "lost" the teach-in. The day there is a teach-in on THE POLITICS of education, the university, financing, and the intellectual community, I personally guarantee Convocation Hall with catch on fire with the heat of political friction. But I also guarantee that it is a teach-in that Ernest Manning and the education minister WILL NOT ATTEND.

Students and faculty alike were berated by my downtown acquaintances for not thumping Basil Dean for his lousy press and Ernest Manning for his lousy government and incompetent cabinet. I reminded them over and over that the subject of the whole teach-in

was the quality of the university, not the quality of the press or government.

But the important observation I have to make concerns the attitude of the downtowners to the role of the teach-in.

Even though they do not love us inordinately, the downtowners came to a political debate they knew they could not witness anywhere else in the society—whether in the present legislature or the political platform. Without knowing it, they took for granted (a) the importance of the university as a place of significant political criticism (b) the place of the university as tough spokesman against government, even (c) the importance of the university as the last place where men will attack any idea or action by any man on the terms only of philosophical detachment, principle, the search for truth.

They were disappointed, the downtowners, when in a brief eight hours, the members of the University of Alberta couldn't do the job of the legislature, the opposition, the press, the law society, the judiciary, the fraternal organizations, the businessmen citizens, and all the other "respectable" forces in society who have given up the role, in any serious way, of providing

a critical, serious, no-holds-barred check upon injustice, misrule, corruption, mismanagement, and incompetence anywhere in the society but especially in government.

That puts a tremendous burden upon the university.

Without admitting it (and they won't) the downtowners have recognized one of the terrible facts of contemporary North American life. They have recognized that the guts is going out of society, and if there is a hope it is in the young people, in the universities, in the few remaining places in democratic society where men will face the representatives of power and not be frightened.

As a member of the university I would say the teach-in had very good things about it. It probably wasn't as good as it could or should have been. That means there's room for improvement.

As a reporter of outside views of the teach-in I suggest the downtowners have given reason for more teach-ins. And they have grudgingly given expression to the view that the university is important, a lot more important than they want to admit, to the health of the community in the many, many ways that cannot strictly be called "academic".