



Student awards administrator replies

To The Editor:

Your editorial of October 17, 1961, entitled "Fraud by Students" has been noted. I would ask you to publish this letter in reply and to give it some prominence in view of the prominence of the editorial.

It is regrettable that the editorial writer did not take the opportunity to obtain information which could have prevented him from writing a statement full of untruths and misrepresentations.

I would like to make the following points in order that the student body may be properly informed:

1. You state that the standard student budget which we use is outdated and has not changed in ten years. The truth is that it has been increased every year for the past six years (as far back as records can be found) and that it is now 40 per cent higher than in 1955-56.
2. You state that any expenditure beyond fees, books and room and board are considered "frivolous." The truth is that nearly 30 per cent of the total budget is for items other than the three mentioned.
3. You imply that an excess budget would jeopardize a grant. This is not so. We would simply reduce the figure to a standard budget and then give a combination of grant and loan in accordance with the student's academic record.
4. You imply that the standard budget is not adequate. The fact is that a great many students live on considerably less than the standard budget and do this willingly and without inconvenience. The fact is also that our standard budget is considerably higher than that used at Saskatchewan and slightly higher than at UBC.
5. You state that ownership of an automobile seriously hampers the possibility of assistance. This is quite true. On the other hand, there is no rigid rule on this. If the use of an automobile can be justified, this is accepted. We are, however, often inclined to give loan rather than grant in such cases. But where a student living close to the university buys an automobile out of summer earnings and then comes to us for assistance he will be turned down and properly so.
6. You make reference to the excessive lapse of time between the date of application and the receipt of money. First year students, who are in most need of the money, do get their cheques within a few weeks after registration. Other undergraduates with real need or emergency problems can be looked after on request. Any undergraduate may have payment of fees deferred pending the result of his application.

Any student who does not bring enough money from his own earnings or other resources to pay ordinary living expenses for two and one half to three months is not doing his share. This program is not designed to give full subsistence but to be a supplement to what the student and his parents can do.

Students who are clearly ineligible, or who are asking for considerably more than the maximum provided, are advised as soon as possible after receipt of the application that they may be aware of their own problem. There are comparatively few applications turned down after com-

plete processing and then usually because the application is not in order or the committee does not agree that financial need exists. It would be a rare case where a student has to drop out at this stage for financial reasons. Students with special financial problems should have enough foresight to discuss these with the proper officials before the term begins and most do. If they do not, it is their own responsibility.

7. I cannot help but say that I am both surprised and disappointed that The Gateway—supposedly a responsible press—should put itself in the position of openly encouraging fraud. This is not only reprehensible in itself but is an insult to the great body of students who are inherently honest and wish to remain so for their own self-respect. We are aware that there are those students who are willing to perjure themselves and sacrifice their own honor and self-respect for the sake of a few dollars which they don't deserve. This is unfortunate but we will always have some such people at all levels of society.

A more mature attitude on your part would have been to discourage any attempt at fraud in applications. The money available is not limitless and when some, who do not need it, get it, it may easily mean that others cannot get what they really need. This is public money and is not available for any "right." Aside from the 600 Province of Alberta Scholarships of \$100 each, it is available only on the basis of need. There is no need or justification for fraud and those who use it or recommend it stand morally condemned.

8. The program of the people of this Province is a very liberal one. The average amount of scholarship and grant per student assisted is slightly higher than the average for Canada (this does not take in account loans for which figures are not available). The percentage of students assisted in proportion to the total student body is the second highest in Canada.

The Province of Alberta is putting approximately \$1,000,000.00 a year into direct outright student aid (in addition to over \$500,000.00 per year in loans). Without this hundreds of students presently here would not be students at all.

In conclusion, I can only say that your very-ill-advised editorial has done a considerable dis-service and injustice to the student body at large, especially to those who ask only for what they really need, as well as to the university administration and the government of the province. If it could be shown that the allegations contained in your editorial had any solid basis in fact, it would put in jeopardy the expansion or continuation of the whole program itself.

Sincerely yours
R. B. Wishart
Administrator of Student Awards

Oh you brutus

Sir:—It is reassuring to know that at least one student at the University of Alberta recognizes the irresponsible behavior of the Kappa Sigma fraternity in the needless death of their mascot, Brutus II, as a result of the cross-country race October 14, 1961 (Edmonton Journal Tuesday, October 24, 1961). The Animal Defence League of Canada wishes to add its voice in the protest against such a thoughtless and immature attitude on the part of the fraternity towards a creature in its care. It is lamentable that the brotherhood of

this fraternity does not extend beyond its human members.

Barbara Chapin,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Animal Defence League
of Canada,
Edmonton Branch,
P.O. Box 3584.

The numbers game

To The Editor:

The Gateway often takes pains to sneer at The Edmonton Journal, and with good reason. But its own darkness of mind regarding "biased marking" could hardly be equalled by Edmonton's "light of life."

That students and a student newspaper could crave statistical treatment in a world already sick with uniformity, conformity, and anonymity is a phenomenon difficult to accept.

To add to this plea for a deliberate disregard of the individual under the pretext of impartiality the further implication that students who speak out (and up) are "apple-polishing" is disgraceful, a new low in yellow college journalism and a reflection upon the gutless fear of those who do not speak.

That at the University of Alberta, of all places, where the passivity and timidity of the students has reached unbelievable proportions, the college newspaper would seek to discourage those few who have the will, wit, and wisdom to rise from the anonymous bog in which the majority are willing to croak away their lives is indefensible. The editorial view expressed in the October 27th issue cannot be the view of some of the more astute and perceptive people I know to be on The Gateway staff.

Can you not see the hands of the big brother into which you are delivering yourselves. What makes you think, what naive I should say, how can you believe such a system does not do the exact opposite you expect?

Furthermore, to turn the product of your year's work into a vacuous abyss of non-entity for the sake of a personally destructive and a far from foolproof anonymity is a disappointing development in the student's vision of his search for knowledge and wisdom at university. Look at your culture, organization man; haven't you enough of the Willies? Low, man, low.

Of course, you must know that the assumption that "written examinations are valid criterion of academic achievement" is nonsense. A sensible student knows them to be expedient, like most unworthy things. Objectivity presses buttons, men. Into your caves, you will be numerical memory if you're lucky, soon cap memory if you're lucky, soon comfort to the forces of darkness by joining them.

Sincerely yours,
E. J. Rose,
Assistant Professor
Department of English

House painter wanted

To The Editor:

I commend the Gateway for the timely and perceptive article "Salesmanship and Art" in a recent featurette.

The production en masse of these pseudo-Renoirs and pseudo-Utrillos, etc, is big business in Canada and the United States. One producer is quoted in a weekly magazine as saying:

"Out of 300 or 400 (artists) I sometimes find only one for us. I always asked them how fast they paint and they usually think they paint fast. Ha!! They think five or six pictures a day is fast. Most of my good artists can do 20 pictures a day."

If these paintings were out and out forgeries, it is possible that something could be done about the situation, but they are in fact merely

imitations of popular styles and motifs, which the casual and uninformed buyer finds vaguely familiar.

Peculiarly those most often the victims of these hucksters are professional people with a university background. It is perhaps our obligation as a university community to do a great deal more than we do now to help our graduates develop their own tastes in the arts. If we do not accept this obligation we may seriously handicap the growth of art in Canada, while allowing the entrepreneurs to intimidate us and grow rich in the process.

Yours sincerely,
J. A. Forbes
Faculty of Education

Big give

To The Editor:

As a prosperous, apathetic, self-centered student I would like to protest the editorial on the front page of The Gateway of October 27 in particular and the whole WUS drive in general.

In its entire campaign the WUS committee has shown a complete disregard for the integrity of Alberta students as individuals and for the dignity of Chilean students as people. Charity at the best of times tends to be degrading both to donors and receivers, but when it is made into a slogan money drive it becomes disgusting. The publicity was symptomatic of this basic sickness. For example, the Revolution on Tuesday noon. First of all, this demonstrated our indifference to South American politics. Chile is not Cuba (pardon my lack of a sense of humor at this point).

Secondly, it showed our refusal to take seriously the political aspirations of our Latin American neighbors. I have a friend in Chile who I know would be quite offended at the way we have been talking about Chile if he ever found out. (Did we not learn this lesson from "Bucks for Bombay" last year?)

Thirdly, the Tuesday meeting was typical of the sheep herding tactics which are used by Students' Council whenever it wants to hold pep rallies. Few students will attend a meeting they know nothing about simply because an enthusiastic voice over a loud speaker orders them to do so.

The brochure did present some facts but even it was tainted with a rather sick slogan: "Give big—it's tax deductible." Good grief.

The Gateway has presented some information regarding the disaster in Concepcion University. However, more should have been said.

Perhaps the key sentence to the whole problem is this, "Alberta students want something they can see, touch or eat in return for their money." This seems to be the philosophy the WUS committee was using this year.

I would like to suggest that this is a denial of any humanity, sensitivity and altruistic sentiments which the student may (and probably does) have. WUS is based on the idea of an international cooperative brotherhood of university students. That idea was lost in the financial campaign.

I appreciate the concern, the good intentions and the hard work of the WUS members. I would only suggest that they rethink their basic motivations and methods before they insult the student world with another BB or CC campaign.

Cathy McCurdy
Arts 3

Kupsch acts up

To The Editor:

Re: Review of "A Touch of the Poet." What qualification does your critic, Richard Kupsch, have for writing theatrical reviews?

Apparently Mr. Kupsch is neither familiar with the play nor the playwright's other works, nor, as far as that goes, with the playwright himself.

The fact that O'Neill was born and raised in America seems to have been missed entirely by the reviews also. It certainly can not be said

that O'Neill was restricted to an intricate with irony as Mr. Kupsch seems to imply. Also it appears as if the reviewer has missed a major point of the play, that of Sara's self-realization which was well portrayed.

The scathing attack on Miss Murphy is entirely unwarranted as her performance was equal to any of the other actors and certainly at a level of which Mr. Kupsch seems not to have any perception. If he would read the play he reviews before he criticizes its performances in the entirely different media of the theatre, his criticisms may become of some value. Until then try to publish a better quality of theatrical reviews so that they may service both as guides to the actors and as education to your readers.

Your critically,
L. Schotte, Arts 3

Franklin denounced

To The Editor:

Re: Letter by Al Franklin.

We of the agriculture club wish to redeem ourselves from the blackening degradation wrought upon us by one so called "Al Franklin," who by his falsity had the audacity to include himself as one of our exalted faculty.

We neither accept nor condone his feelings on this matter. Mr. Franklin, not being rushed this year, has no doubt used this incident to bring to bear his own particular antagonism toward fraternities and to ruthlessly slander the high nutritional value of bottled ferment. Mr. Franklin obviously does not realize the high protein content and high calorie value of Alberta barley.

We suggest Franklin disdain (sic) from further petty public denunciations (sic) in the name of agriculture and in the future use his own dishonorable faculty, (whatever that may be), to flaunt his superfluous (sic) drivel.

Bonafide (sic) Members,
Ag. Club.

Editor's Note: Sic, sic, sic.

Plucked plumbers

To The Editor,

Dear Fink:

It has come to the attention of the Engineering Student's Society executive that campus opinion has once more turned its essentially evil mind and voice in full blast upon the engineers.

We are referring specifically to the alleged "assault" upon one C. Dirty Dudley Evans whose finkishness is second only to your own.

Unfortunately our earnest attempts to rectify his sad state of affairs have been to no avail. We are led to believe that Mr. Evans refuses to listen to reason and insists on bringing legal action against members of the ESS.

He thinks he has good grounds for such an action.

This is nonsense!

Therefore, we have no alternative but to publicly deny these charges he has levied against us so unreasonably and at the same time to bring an action of counter claim for libel and slander.

Accordingly, acting in the true, ethical engineering tradition, and at all times solicitous of the underdog, we are establishing a booth in the Rotunda of the Students' Union Building, the purpose of which is to obtain funds for both parties to the pending legal actions.

We mean BUSINESS.

We hope Evans does too.

The truth will win out; the right will triumph . . . at the discretion of the court of course.

In Good Faith, we are,

Yours sincerely,
E.S.S. Executive, per
Maurice A. Lomothe,
President

Editor's Note: A most subtle method of obtaining funds for parties.

(More Letters on Page 7)