

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - - bill miller

managing editor—ralph melnychuk

casserole editor brian campbell

makeup editor joe will

co-sports editor don moren

co-sports editor lawrie hignell

associate editor—lorraine minich

production manager jim rennie

photo editor neil driscoll

cup editor darla campbell

executive assistant sheila ballard

EDITORIAL—Desk—Doug Bell, Frank Horvath, Gordon Auck; Cartoonists—Dale Drever, Allan Shute; Editorial Board—Bill Miller, Ralph Melnychuk, Lorraine Minich, Brian Campbell, Helene Chomiak

STAFF THIS ISSUE—I was awfully lonely up here this time. The following loyal souls beamed the fact Canada's Unemployed are still unemployable: Lynn Ogden, Ron Yakimchuk, Bernie Goedhart, Al Yackulic (and his super-spastic camera), Lynn Hugo (the managing editor's current tormentor), Chris Ouellette, Cheryl Woods, Canada's Unemployed, and yours truly, Horvey Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published semi-weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for Wednesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, short shorts—5 p.m. Friday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, short shorts—5 p.m. Tuesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising Manager: Peter Amerongen. Office Phone—433-1155. Circulation—9,300. Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1967

not a time for insults

Student's councillors' behavior toward members of the student body leaves much to be desired.

A case in point is the treatment given Patrick Connell at last Monday's council meeting. Connell requested permission to speak on the issue of re-opening science rep nominations. The chair ruled he could not, but council upheld a challenge to the chair, and Connell had his say.

The chair's snide comments were par for the course. But after Connell was finished, eng rep Mark Fraser had to twist the knife in Connell's back.

"I am surprised that Mr. Connell feels this issue is so important he had to come and speak to us. I remember earlier this year he told us he would never come back again," said Fraser, referring to Connell's threat to boycott student government after the CUS withdrawal.

Connell may not always speak with ultimate truth and right behind him, but his batting average is at least as good as most councillors, and he has contributed valuable

ideas to the student body—witness his later participation in the debate regarding student representation on the Board of Governors and the GFC, as well as his work on co-op housing and the freshman orientation seminar.

Fraser's rude remarks, which if addressed to almost anyone else would certainly have been ruled out of order, typify council's general attitude toward the student body.

The half-hour question periods before council meetings illustrate this sort of thing all the time. The original idea of this period was to give students a chance to ask questions and make comments.

It was certainly not the intention to give the executive an opportunity to practice bashing people to shreds.

Perhaps Connell and others who have been shot down in the past are used to such treatment, and no longer take offence. But there is a danger students unused to the cut-throat methods of student government could be hurt.

Council could certainly use a lesson in good manners.

a matter of motives

And speaking of question periods, Dick Low's re-organization scheme should not have come up in the question period, but should have either been on the agenda or deferred to a later meeting when it could have been placed on the agenda.

Low's rush to have the matter brought to public attention causes us to wonder if perhaps political considerations were involved.

Two years ago, a students' union presidential candidate, Andy Brook, then chairman of the SUB planning commission, brought out a pamphlet about the new SUB very shortly before elections. We deplore such practices. There is no harm in candidates exploiting their past work in their campaigns, but they should not regulate the timing of significant public announcements about their positions by purely political considerations.

It is also suspicious that The Gateway received a copy of the scheme Saturday, while councillors did not get it until Monday's meeting. Council's lack of knowledge of the

scheme indicates two significant things:

- there was a lack of communication between the executive and the union committee of which Low was chairman;

- to comment intelligently on something, especially something as complex as Low's re-organization scheme, councillors must have some time to examine the proposal before discussion.

Low's scheme has some obvious merit, especially in its intent to specify executive specialization and increase the number of students actively engaged in student government.

But it was obviously drawn up without reference to either the university structure or the present union structure. Many of the concepts could be very easily worked into the present scheme.

In other words, what Low has presented is not a workable proposal for student's union re-organization, but an amalgamation of valuable concepts which should be considered in the actual re-organization.



"sorry about that, but lets face it—in our economy based society, you compete or you don't get whatever you think we're selling"

lorraine minich

the humility of it all

One of our esteemed councillors suggested Monday night to his equally-esteemed colleagues that perhaps it is time students at U of A started being humble.

Humility! Now there's a new angle, a new approach to student government, in fact to the whole university scene.

Totally unfamiliar with the concept of humility, I checked with the dictionary.

Humility: the state of being modest, meek, unassuming, unpretentious, respectful, free from pride.

I cannot help but agree with the suggestion of the inspired councillor. Students at this university should indeed be humble. We should be some of the humblest people around. God knows, we have enough to be humble about.

We should be humble because of our beautiful campus. Where else can one see such a wider variety of architecture? Where else is there such an unbelievable blending of the old and the new? Where else such an incredible example of the ultimate in careful planning? Where else the graciousness of some of the finest elm trees in the city? It is difficult to be humble on this praiseworthy campus, but we must try.

We should be humble because of our homey-nice residences. It is unthinkable that students, who for a

paltry fee can have the comforts of a cozy room and the benefits of three unlike-anywhere-else meals a day, are not respectful and free from pride.

We should be humble because of our unlimited opportunities to learn. Where else can one be in contact with so many intelligent people at one time? Why, at any time of the day we can find a whole lot of classrooms overflowing with eager students just soaking in knowledge (no, I wouldn't dream of implying that the professors are drips). Just because we are so blessed is no cause for us to be arrogant.

We should be humble because of our efficient friends in the administration building. The knowledge that there are people over there who can always be called upon to decline comment should make use meek.

We should be humble because of our students' council. Any group that can use time the way council does certainly deserves our silent and humble admiration. Some of us have heard that councillors think they are the greatest. But how many times have we heard them actually come out and say, "We are the greatest"? Such restraint on their part is, I suggest, true humility. It is from these living examples of humility that we should take our lessons.

And so, honored and humble councillors, speak to us that we too may be humble.