

DID YOU KNOW THE VIET-CONG ARE LEAVING BUNCHES OF MARIJUANA IN THE JUNGLE FOR OUR TROOPS TO FIND.

YEA! THEY CALL IT BOTANICAL WARFARE.



More council priorities beefs from arts students

As members of the executive of the Arts Students' Association, we wish to express our complete disillusionment with the infantile performance of student council regarding the following:

- The student union takeover of food services in SUB. Must we remind council of their decision regarding education as the first priority of the student union? They have completely negated this priority by committing over half a million dollars for the takeover of money-losing food services. (Last year food services realized a \$15,000 loss.)

- Shooting down the principle of encouraging the formation of undergraduate organizations as feasible working units in the university milieu; specifically by re-

fusing a grant or loan of even one dollar to the Arts Students' Association, even though they spent over half a million dollars on taking over food services.

Without funds this year the ASA will be unable to achieve its priorities of education, student representation on all faculty bodies and working for the betterment of the arts students' function in the university and society.

Is the student council going to work for students or merely become an irrelevant food and service complex on campus? After all, it is the responsibility of society and the university to supply such basic needs. Let us ask them to do that for a change.

Andy Von Busse
(for) executive, ASA

Suffer the children...

By LINDA ST. ONGE
Mothers on Campus Committee

It is regrettable that the issue of a day care centre has become a point of controversy, especially since our original request was simply for an on-campus space that would pass provincial regulations and could thus be used to establish a licensed day care centre, financed initially through our own endeavor. Moreover, such a centre can and should be financially self-sufficient, since the parents on this campus certainly do not expect other students to pay for their education. However, since various issues have been raised, allow me to present a few facts, documented by a July 1969 survey of the 2,300 married women students registered during the 1968-69 session:

(1) A day care centre does not eradicate a woman student's responsibilities. The average mother on this campus works hard—over 60 hours a week not including class time. She has only seven hours a week for leisure time. In addition, 46 per cent hold jobs during the university year.

(2) Over 50 per cent have family incomes under \$8,000 per year, with an average of two

children per family.

(3) The vast majority of married women with children are adult students (none are under 20 years of age) who have already postponed their educations for various reasons, such as "putting hubby through."

(4) Speaking of the men, please consider all the male students on this campus who are married with children. They are also temporarily postponing their traditional family role of breadwinner in order to attain an education. Is this an "irrational desire," as Mrs. Peterson has suggested? Our proposed day care centre is for their children, too.

It is sad to note students' anger regarding proposed (temporary) allocation of student union funds to a day care centre on campus. There are many student union supported organizations at this university which are of benefit and/or interest to only a minority of students.

We sincerely hope that those who have expressed disapproval can be mature enough to recognize that a day care centre is not a frivolous luxury, but a necessity for their married friends.

Is it a case of the paranoid editor? or you can lead a horse to water...

Dear Mr. Scarth:

When introduced to you some weeks ago by mutual friends you impressed me as being a relatively intelligent and stable individual; not at all likely to exhibit acute paranoia. In this light, I was more than slightly taken aback by your response to the 'censorship' incident with the university printers. For such a trivial decision on their part, your reaction, in my opinion, was rather excessive.

Some of your staff have mentioned to me that The Gateway is, to paraphrase their comments, 'dying for, or perhaps for lack of, news'. Does this explain the return to triweekly publication and the apparent decrease in the ratio of news to advertisement? Your temporary refusal to compile editorials was based, I believe, on a suspected student apathy.

Are you, perhaps, seizing this opportunity to circumvent the problems facing your newspaper? If so you must surely fail. No amount of stimulation can cause

a dead horse to become upright, and upright they must be to offer support and conveyance. If you really believe that life may still exist, life in this student body, by all means press on. But I think you might find more success if you were to attack viable issues

over and above petty decisions of equally petty administrators.

Of course, if you feel you have other evidence of the fact that you are being censored, please let us have it. Reading the articles of The Gateway leads me to believe that you do not possess any credible claims. The world might look dark now, but really they're not out to get you.

By the way, if you fail to print my letter, may I claim censorship on your part?

Bryce Schurr
grad studies

Editor's note—By the way, the last comment was beneath you. Certainly, The Gateway is breathing hard as it usually is for lack of staff. But to return to a triweekly after succeeding as Canada's second university daily for a one-month TRIAL and then to pay for the extra pages with increased advertising is hardly dying. The issue is not the cartoon—it is student control of The Gateway. If a "petty" administrator holds the vice-president's post, that is an issue. Taking a stand is not paranoia.



At best, the issue was tragi-comedy

I have been moved by the almost tragically funny (almost funny tragedy?) of the "cartoon issue" to write a letter. Unfortunately, your editorial "Hidden Witch Hunters..." expresses very closely what I had to say.

I feel, with Dr. Tyndall, that the cartoon is not in good taste; unlike Dr. Tyndall, I would not choose to enforce this taste upon others. Perhaps you should indeed seek another publisher: the University Printing Services seems a poor choice for a university publication.

Philip Fites
grad studies

Gateway has right: it respects dissent

I regret that I have been unable to attend your meetings concerning last Friday's censorship issue. This letter is in support of the freedom of The Gateway to print whatever it considers fit.

No one in such a position as Mr. Grant, no matter what he directs, has the right to censor a public organ of communication strictly upon his own taste. If there is any censorship to be done, the public will do it as individuals. If the public as a group then feels that something is to be done concerning a newspaper's content, they can then protest any policy they consider to be retrograde to their interest. In the case of The Gateway, this protest would most likely be seen on the 'letters' page of the very next issue, as The Gateway has never shrunk from printing views in opposition with its own.

James Lee
grad studies (drama)

Cartoon did womanhood a degrading injustice

If I had had the power to stop the Vietnam cartoon from appearing in The Gateway, I would have done so. The idea that a woman involved in intercourse is being done 'dirty' is racist and degrading. A cartoon showing America shitting on a face labelled Vietnam would be more appropriate.

J. G. Timourian

S...k it to 'em readers, at least it's exciting

Authorities not "God"—Readers should have say

Messrs. Grant and Tyndall:

If a man with power says to a group of people that they are perfectly free to vote in elections, but if they do they shouldn't expect to get a job or rent a house in that town again, would you consider his behavior a fair and acceptable use of his power?

Apparently you would. You have done the same thing to The Gateway. You have used your authority to force them not to print an "objectionable" cartoon. Oh, yes, they are free to print it, if they go somewhere else than the University Printing Services.

But the University Printing Services, for economic reasons, is the very existence of The Gateway, and you know it! So you are in effect saying to The Gateway "do what we want or lose your life."

A university is to serve the students. The power that is invested in you is supposed to serve the

students and it is expected that you exercise it with some amount of responsibility. Dr. Tyndall says that everyone he consulted with found the cartoon objectionable. But how many of the students which the university is supposed to serve did he consult?

Who are you to judge what is objectionable and what isn't? I don't consider myself able to make subjective and moral decisions for others and I certainly don't consider you to be a better judge of such matters than I am.

If I were in your position I would realize that I am not God and cannot judge what is objectionable for other men, and therefore, I would allow anything to be printed and let the readers judge for themselves.

I want to see that cartoon in The Gateway.

Susan Pollock
arts 1

Oh, far be it from us to say Dr. Tyndall is in poor taste

I wish to register a vigorous objection to your publishing of the letter to you from D. G. Tyndall. I found that particular letter in poor taste. In my opinion it should not have been acceptable for inclusion in any publication which is to be printed by the university's Department of Printing Services. In my view, to use the services of the university to print material of that type would be to demean the university.

However, if by a remote chance, it was the printing services which insisted on its publication, you should have—I assure you that

this is not a semantic quibble, it is an important matter of principle) become a non-censor and refused to print something like that with the other letters.

I can only say that it has been the unanimous view of those with whom I have consulted that the letter in question is in poor taste. You are apparently of a different opinion, but it is we that have to read it, and we feel that opinions different than ours should not be seen.

C. B. Samuell
sci 1