



nb

this page five has letters on parking, mr. zemrau, the plight of st. albert students, two articles on cus, and an old editorial on girdles.

letters

junior basketball

If correctly reported in *The Gateway*, Oct. 14, E. D. Zemrau, UAB Business Manager, is guilty of inexactitudes with respect to the operation of last year's junior varsity basketball team.

He states basketball was played in exhibition games and in the senior men's league on a partial basis last year. No part of this statement is true. The "Bearcats" played in a junior college league last year and were in no way involved in the senior men's league.

Although the calibre of competition was not the best, team spirit was excellent at all times.

I am speaking as a player of this team.

The coaching was excellent—perhaps the best in Alberta—and as a result the team accomplished a lot, not only in individual satisfaction of competing team members, but also in game satisfaction.

Two years ago, the Bearcats won the Alberta Senior 'B' provincial championship, but it is a moot point whether Mr. Zemrau considers this an accomplishment.

In two exhibition games with the Golden Bears in this two-year period, the Bearcats managed to split the games, losing the second by a slim three-point margin. The Bearcat team of the past two years did nothing to hurt the reputation of the University of Alberta both competitively and academically. Its performance both on and off the court was anything but disreputable. In view of this, Mr. Zemrau's remarks should be reconsidered.

Mel Read
grad studies

parking

Do you own a car? Can you find a place to park it near the campus? Have you received a summons from the Campus Patrol? They hand them out as if they were penny stickers.

The Campus Patrol is highly ineffectual, except where handing out tickets is concerned. There is no parking space available in the 'A' lot—it fills up at 8 a.m.

One is forced to park elsewhere and the Campus Patrol puts a ticket on your windshield, even though one is parked in an area which is unmarked as restricted, in fact unmarked completely. Unreasonable.

The parking problem is crucial. When will the Board of Governors do something about it? Isn't it well past time? How about the students' union prompting some action?

As for myself, I have received three tickets in the past week. One is deserved, admittedly, although out of desperation. The other two are not for the above reasons. I won't pay them, if only on a matter of principle.

Carol Kosior
grad studies

Editor's note: You think you have problems—I've had \$8 worth in the last three weeks.

a solution

We, living in St. Albert, have an isolation problem. Transportation to and from university is practical by car only. There may be times that our normal means of transportation may be temporarily tied up leaving us stranded unless a substitute ride may be found.

I would like to know how many St. Albert students would be interested in making available their transportation, on an emergency basis, to other students.

What I am suggesting is not a car pool but a list of "spare" rides to and from campus. What I have in mind is each of us putting our name on a list with probable departure times from both St. Albert and the University, then if for some reason a person is left rideless he can contact someone on the list and get a ride.

If you are interested in the above idea or other ideas along the same line, perhaps you can give me a call at 599-8789.

Allen McQueen
comm 2

the thin pink line

Following is reprinted from the *University of Ottawa Fulcrum*.

The program of free education gradually adopted by the Canadian Union of Students over the past few years should be seriously questioned.

What has it done for students? Last year, the congress adopted the policy of universal accessibility. CUS then organized a series of demonstrations on what they designated National Students Day. The country lived with one day of sound and fury, which, following Shakespeare's script, signified nothing.

Having accomplished so much in the past year, CUS this year further demanded student stipends, almost as if their previous demands had been met and they were pressing on to the next objective. CUS, concentrating its forces on free tuition, accomplished nothing; how much more will it likely accomplish if it is fighting on several fronts? One at a time is still good fishing.

The actions of CUS do not reflect that students are but part of a large Canadian society. CUS is concerned with the poor student, but not with the poor, with free education, but not, for instance, free medical care, with education, but not the government economics which may restrict educational progress.

Until the horizon of its concern has expanded, CUS will not receive support from other sections of the nation in a position to help CUS achieve its goals.

It may be rubbing salt in the wound, but judging from premier Johnson's announcement of free tuition in Quebec universities by 1968, the *Union Generale des Etudiants du Quebec*, though it walks more softly, carries a stick that CUS might well envy.

a look at

the executive position

John C. Long, a fourth-year education student takes a look at the executive's position on CUS withdrawal as published in *The Gateway* of Oct. 7.

The students' union executive position on CUS withdrawal given on page 8 of the Oct. 7 *Gateway*, is not convincing. The executive point of view is based on two main assumptions from which confusing arguments and misleading statements have been derived:

1. that the decision to withdraw from CUS was based on a basic concept of student government, and

2. that CUS is concerned with issues "peripheral" to student concern.

These statements and subsequent arguments can be challenged.

The first statement of the article says that decision to withdraw from CUS was "a decision arising from a basic concept of the rights of student government."

I only ask: what is that concept? If it is so essential a concept why is it not clearly expressed?

I suggest that it is a basic concept of student government which only the executive knows! That the students' council decision to withdraw from CUS "arises from a basic principle of the right of the individual to represent himself" I also find hard to understand.

This statement when considered in relation to a subsequent executive statement that "it is not the right and responsibility of student government to make partisan policy statements on behalf of students whom they have been elected to represent only on student affairs" forces one to ask this question: Is not the students' council decision to withdraw from CUS itself a violation of such a principle?

It appears to me that the executive is critical of the very same kind of action which they took themselves.

The executive contention that CUS is not within the category of student affairs or that it is "peripheral to student concern" is only an expression of opinion and should be recognized as such.

Further, if CUS is not within the realm of student affairs (and the executive contends it is not), then the students' council decision to withdraw from CUS is equally improper since council is then making decisions beyond the province of its own concern.

I find executive reasoning here confusing and contradictory.

Subsequent executive arguments are also contradictory. How can the council executive say that "student leaders of compulsory student societies should not extend their limited representative privileges to state personal partisan opinions on issues and purport these to be the views of the students" and then proceed to withdraw from CUS on behalf of all the students of the university on the Edmonton campus?

They can't and be consistent in their reasoning.

Another question: what criteria are being used by the students' council executive to determine which issues do or do not come within the scope of student affairs?

Since such a question is an important one, should not all students have some opportunity to examine the criteria? To provide such an opportunity would certainly be consistent with student democracy.

In response to the paragraph headed "Action at U of A", I find the executive claim that the recommendation to withdraw "did not take the councillors by surprise" a misleading report of reaction to CUS withdrawal.

As any regular *Gateway* reader knows, CUS withdrawal did surprise (and disappoint) students who are familiar with CUS problems and who have worked on CUS local projects. Besides this is not the issue.

The section of the executive defence entitled "The Alternate Program" further indicates some weaknesses in the executive position.

It appears to me that the alternate program is going to do what CUS has been doing in the past. But is national CUS cooperation and support guaranteed?

We cannot be sure in the present context of U of A withdrawal. One

also wonders how the new external affairs committee (which the executive suggests will replace CUS) is going to determine that way, if any, external affairs are of student concern.

The executive belief that policy decisions which result from a study of issues should be decided by the individual student through voluntary organization is not realistic and contradicts the point of view expressed by the executive (paragraphs 4 and 6 of the Oct. 7 article) that student governments should be political.

The executive would have to agree that it is difficult to be effectively political without commitment (and we cannot afford to be otherwise on issues which affect us as students and as citizens).

That the action taken by the students' union was in the best interests of students at the University of Alberta Edmonton has got to be demonstrated so far as convincing proof exists. The executive contends that "ultimately the decision to reject CUS or remain outside the organization rests with the students body."

Yes I agree. The students of this University can thus legitimately contest the students' council decision to withdraw from CUS.

the elastic curtain

Following is an editorial reprinted from *The Gateway*, Feb. 23, 1965. We feel its points are still valid.

Nothing so offends the masculine sensibility as the "elastic curtain", that solid bastion which surrounds the derrieres of the campus delectables.

Down with girdles, we say. Down with Playtex, Saran, and all the wrap-around repressors which bind and fetter our females more firmly than those condemned shoes worn by the women of China in days of yore.

Is there anything more ridiculous, we ask, than the sight of a trim, well-formed, energetic, young body crammed, jammed and slammed into an elastic cocoon? It used to be, "there is a destiny that shapes our ends." Now we cannot be sure.

If campus females were prone to sag and drag, weather and wear and tear, then we might be sympathetic; but we know that these ailments of the ancients are not afflicted upon the young of body, at least to the extent that every female must fortify and reconstruct herself each morning after her libations.

Those campus queens who must always be seen sharp and set for the kill, hair backcombed with the greatest of skill, do, perhaps, find it necessary to conceal every virtue that is theirs naturally. Artifice and camouflage are

the greatest weapons. They let no cheek go unturned.

But those of the feminine species who prefer to work with what is theirs by birth are doing themselves a disservice by putting their wares into supermarket status, wrapping each morsel in sanitary Saran wrap. It doesn't become attractive girls, merely sterile; and the sooner you discover that, the better it will be.

Men have suffered through the whims of women from the days of the cave. But never has Woman so set herself to suffering so much as in these days of the skin-tight chastity belt. When we say we are offended by the gentler sex's proclivity to set itself to endure a more inhumane torture than the Inquisition ever devised, we are offended not by the garment but by the type of tyranny it represents.

For it should be patently clear that the girdle is a fascist undergarment. It is never disigned, in spite of what the advertisers may say, to give freedom, but rather to restrict movement, both physiological and mental.

In an environment where the stress is on ideas and liberty, is it not absurd to agonizingly restrict the body?

Girls, we beg of you that you reconsider what you are doing to yourselves when you butress your behinds. Give yourselves the freedom you need to be free people in today's world. You will be more respected for it.