

letters

Frustrated library

At a recent meeting with Geoff Williams, President of N.A.S.A., the library employees were led to believe that the non academic staff on campus are happy with the way negotiations have been carried out on their behalf. The library staff does not fall into this category of being happy and satisfied with the situation. We have therefore

written this letter to publicly express our views.

During the above meeting with Geoff Williams we made several suggestions as to ways of notifying staff prior to the ratification meeting of the specifics of the items to be ratified, including salary. The N.A.S.A. executive discussed and rejected our suggestions.

Since this meeting with Geoff Williams we have found that a resolution was passed at the May 7th, 1973 General Meeting as follows:

RATIFICATION
WHEREAS many members attending the annual

ratification meeting did not feel they were given enough time to consider the points they were to ratify;

BE IT RESOLVED that for future ratification meetings, the points to be ratified be published with the notification of meeting.

We have been frustrated by the secrecy of negotiations to this point but we feel that the above resolution would ease this feeling of discontent if it is carried out, providing it includes, the actual percentage and specific details of all items to be ratified. This would alleviate the pressure felt when one must make a rapid evaluation immediately prior to the vote.

We at the library are holding discussions among ourselves to arrive at an acceptable percentage before attending the ratification meeting. We hope this letter will induce others to do the same.

We also hope this letter will inspire fellow non-academic staff members to air their views publicly.

Shirley Norris
representing 129 Library Employees

King Midas speaks out

I wish to provide the following information to the students at the University of Alberta with regard to the activities of the Council of Minister of Education of Canada Advisory Committee on Student Support.

Starting in late 1973 and continuing on into 1974, the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada (CMEC) voiced concern with regard to adequate policy development in the area of student support by the federal government. The major problem was that, at the level of policy for student support, the federal Secretary of State was responsible; at the administrative level, the Department of Finance was responsible for the Canada Student Loans Program. In May of 1974 the Province of Ontario requested that a federal-provincial policy forum be developed for the purpose of discussing problems in student support. The Council of Ministers of Education appeared to be a reasonable vehicle for this discussion. As a result of urging from Ontario, the Council of Ministers of Education requested that the Secretary of State identify an official of his department who could address the issues raised by the Council of Ministers of Education.

As a result of the requests of the Council of Ministers of Education a meeting was arranged June 26, 1974 which I attended for the Province of Alberta. At this meeting a draft mandate was presented to the group of provincial officials requesting that they consider changes which would be brought about in the existing federal student support program (CSL) with regard to, especially, certain known problems such as assistance to part-time students. In addition, the group was requested to study the possibility of coordinating a variety of federal student support programs and to report on other conceptualizations of student assistance which might ultimately replace the existing programs. The mandate clearly directs the group's attention, however, towards remedial activity pertaining to the existing Canada Student Loan Program. The committee accepted the mandate. At this meeting the provinces were requested to submit statements with regard to problems which they envisioned in the area of student support.

In September of 1974 the group once again met in Toronto and discussed the question of problems in student support. At this meeting the group arranged their activities in line with the August 1975 deadline for their report to the Council of Ministers of Education.

On November 21st the group once again met and reviewed briefs which were presented by the staff of the Secretary of State and provinces with regard to specific conceptual problems in student support, such as its relationship to educational opportunity, the question of the allocation of educational costs, interprovincial mobility of students, etc.

In December, the students at UBC requested that the Minister of Education of British Columbia consider student representation on this working group. The Secretary General of the Council of Ministers of Education replied in December to the effect that Council policy precludes students from serving on committees of the Council of Ministers of Education.

On February 13th, 1975 the group once again met, this time in Ottawa. The Canadian Union of Students was pressing the issue of representation on the Committee. They were notified by the Co-chairman of the Committee that the Committee could not place them as active members on the Committee for that would transcend the expressed policy of the Council of Ministers of Education. The Province of Alberta made a motion that the students present be invited in to discuss, informally, the activities of the Committee. The motion was defeated. Further, the Province of Alberta made motion that on day be set aside at the next meeting of the Committee for public input and that academics, students, Awards Officers, and other interested members of the public bring forward at that meeting briefs and make representation to the Committee. This motion, too, was defeated. The recorded vote here would be highly amusing to students of political science.

The above offers a brief description of the activities of this Committee. The Committee is bound to report to the Council of Ministers of Education with regard to short-term corrective measures which can be made to liberalize the present Canada Student Loan Program. It should be stated that this Committee is not mandated to design a comprehensive student support system for Canada. Increasingly, I am of the view that this is near impossible. In my estimation, therefore, there is no sinister plot to bring about a general alteration of student support in Canada. The fact that this group is meeting in secret (in my estimation, the charges of the students in this regard are absolutely true) is more rightly a mistake rather than indicating some malicious motive on the part of the Committee or the Council of Ministers of Education itself.

Those students who wish to seriously pursue the question of Alberta's participation on this Committee, or, for that matter, any other question of student support, I encourage you to contact me at 427-5609.

P. A. Tietzen
Chairman
Students Finance Board

Bloody record

In the February 26 issue of *the Gateway*, Dennis Wilson tries to make a case for evolution on the basis that society is evolving. Organic evolution necessitates change that is directed in a progressive manner from the simple to the complex and from disorder to order. Is this the way that society is evolving?

According to *Newsweek* magazine, "The 20th Century has the bloodiest record of all the centuries of history. Since the year 1900, the nations of the world have been party to many thousands of treaties signed mostly by sane men with high hopes. Yet there have been a hundred million casualties in more than 500 wars and insurgencies at a total cost estimated as high as 10 trillion dollars."

If society is in fact evolving in a progressive manner, the world should continually be becoming a better place to live in, even as evolutionists of the 19th Century predicted it would. 20th Century experience, however, would point to society's devolution rather than evolution.

As I see the direction that society is going, it is much more satisfying for me to maintain my faith in a personal Creator than it is for me to put my faith in any evolutionary process to bring about constructive change.

Roger Armbruster
Education 4

Mouthy "boys"

It would seem the "boys" from Red Deer College have had too much to drink again. Instead of flapping their yaps in *the Gateway* (Feb. 4) they should put their bottles where their mouths are!

The Ninth Henday Chugging Team challenges Red Deer College Beer Drinking Team to prove their mouths can be as full of beer as hot air.

Contact us and we'll set it up in the near future.

Rick MacDonald
Chugging Coach
9th Henday

Bottoms down

Please convey our deep-seated and bottom felt appreciation to the noble men with brushes who sanded and varnished the benches in the Phys. Ed. Building during Reading Week. Our thanks comes with great tenderness and softness (those splinters and slivers were so unkind.) Once again from our very bottoms, thank you.

From all the bums
on campus, signed
Gladus TenderRump

Rank amateurs

In the Reading Week edition of *the Gateway*, Lawrence Wargrave was attacked by several people on account of his *Hot L Baltimore* review. One letter in particular, by Craig Proulx, made me wonder about the amount of insecurity there apparently is in the Drama Department.

Mr. Proulx states that he has been amazed at the poor quality of theatrical reviews found in *the Gateway*. Well, Mr. Proulx, I have been amazed at the poor quality of theatre I have seen at the U. of A., and I think a bit of cynical criticism directed towards the department is the most deserving write-up *the Gateway* could print.

Mr. Proulx condemns Wargrave for his apparent lack of theatrical knowledge. Of course, no one could know as much about drama as drama majors themselves, as Mr. Proulx so proudly informs us he is. He attacks Wargrave for criticizing the New York Drama Critics' Circle. Mr. Proulx, is the N.Y.D.C.C. above criticism? I am not an intellectual, yet the rationale for this criticism which "escapes" Mr. Proulx is quite obvious to me as a layman. Wargrave simply disagrees with the group's opinions.

Mr. Proulx stumbles on to state that Wargrave has no business criticizing the Drama Dept., which is the single most ridiculous statement in his letter. Indignation! Omigosh, the Drama Department has been criticized! Insulted! Mr. Proulx, anyone, anywhere, has the right and the business to criticize the Department, and right or wrong, Wargrave is entitled to his opinion. Mr. Proulx would be well advised to realize that when he escapes the womblike confines of the Fine Arts Building, there is a big world waiting for him, and there will always be critics who will insult and criticize. If Mr. Proulx wishes to become a professional, he should first learn to take criticism like a professional, instead of carrying on his immature, reactionary, and totally irresponsible responses.

It is interesting to note that Wargrave is accused of having no knowledge of theatre, yet, Lawrence Wargrave is a drama major himself. He is one of the finest actors I have ever seen, and although I saw him in a highschool play five years ago, his talent then far exceeds most of the actors I have seen here in Fine Arts.

I sincerely hope that Craig Proulx is not indicative of the opinions, attitudes, and mental processes of most drama students, for if he is, their amateurish inability to take criticism and build from it will seriously main any hopes they might have of making it outside the U of A.

Gordon Turtle
Arts 2

Gateway

Volume LXV; Number 44
March 6, 1975

Published bi-weekly by the University of Alberta Students' Union, in the Gateway offices, Room 282, Students' Union Building.

Editor-in-chief: Bernie Fritze

SENIOR EDITORS

News Editor: Greg Neiman
Arts Editor: Harold Kuckertz
Sports Editor: Cameron Cole
Photography Editor: Brent Hallett
CUP Editor: Cathy Zlatnik

STAFF

Kim St. Clair
Scott Partridge
Nancy Brown
Rick Fritze
Greg Karwacki
Ray Popikaitis
Marc Leland
Norm Selleck
Mary MacDonald
Leo Block
Mike Morrow
Stu Duncan
Kathy Broderick
Bob Blair
Judy Hamaliuk
C. Geddes
F. N. Croy
Diane Kermay
Buster Keaton
Nanker Phledge

CIRCULATION

Circulation 18,000. The Gateway publishes on Tuesday and Thursday during the Fall and Winter Session. It is distributed to the students and to the academic and non-academic staff on campus.
Subscription rates: 54 issues, \$7.00
Circulation Manager: Jim Hagerty

PRODUCTION

Ad make-up, layout, and typesetting done by Student Media, University of Alberta, Room 238, Students' Union Building.
Production Mgr: Loreen Lennon
Typesetter: Margriet Tirole-West

ADVERTISING

No mats accepted. National and local advertising \$.28 per agate line.
Classified ad rate \$1.00 per issue. All classified ads must be prepaid.
Advertising Manager: Tom Wright
432-4241

FOOTNOTES

Publicizes campus events or those of interest to students without charge. Footnotes forms available at the Gateway office and should be submitted before 2 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays.
Footnotes Editor: Cathy Zlatnik

LETTERS

Submit all letters, typed and double spaced to the Editor, who reserves the right to edit the copy. Regular copy deadlines apply. Editorial comments are the opinion of the writer, not necessarily that of *The Gateway*.

GRAPHICS

Submit all graphics and cartoons, by copy deadlines to:
Graphics Editor: Gary Kirk

COPY DEADLINES

Monday noon for the Tuesday edition. Wednesday noon for the Thursday edition.

TELEPHONES

Editor's office
432-5178
All departments
432-5168
432-5750
Student Media
432-3423

The Gateway is a member of the Intercollegiate Press and The Earth News Service.