

The Color Is Gold

Color night and The Gateway invariably end the year simultaneously, and the most unfortunate aspect is that there is a color night to end the year with.

Each year hundreds of students gather for a meal, and fawn before their peers, or their benefactors—and the feeling is a mixed one—for awards they have no business getting, and the councils and boards have no business giving out.

In the first place, the awards committee has no objective means of assigning the awards. It tries hard, but it is useless even trying.

The number of awards given, and their cost, are ridiculous for an institution even as large as this. Between activity and athletic awards, the Student's Union each year spends about \$1,500. It is spent on awards that in many cases are not deserved, but given because the awards are there to be given.

Awards are given as an adjunct to the work

done to earn the award. Yet the work is, or should be if done well, an award—and a recognized one—of more value than the tin and tinsel given out on color night. Students are cited for their contribution, but the contribution, if carried off successfully, is itself a greater award.

Outstanding persons should be cited, but even in a University of this size, there are usually only four or five students, in each of athletics and activities, who have done distinguished enough work to deserve a citation. To these eight or ten people, the awards should be given.

Picking these people would present no problem. They are obvious enough to even the most disinterested student. This would prevent lobbying for awards, eliminate the non-deserver, and best of all eliminate the seeker, for the task of obtaining such an award would be a task of dedication.

Who's Kidding Whom?

One thousand, four hundred people having a good time is usually sufficient testimony to the success of a campus function, and such was the case at Saturday night's "Bar None".

The success of that evening was spoiled by some dribbly-nosed, drunken, '64 arts and engineering students, and some gossiping faculty patrons and their open-mouthed spouses.

A good dance was presented by the aggies, who for the intermission attempted a quartet of cowboy songs, one of which was left out, and the remaining three drowned out, due to the pernicious prattle of some of this University's junior and senior citizens.

The image of the patrons, who did not have the decency to "patronize" the function they

were patronizing, was reflected in the actions of a dozen reeling 18-year-olds.

At least an excuse was available to the "kids". They were young, drunk, and inexperienced, and could only construe their behavior as acceptable in the light of that displayed by their sober, experienced, well-mannered, elder models.

Last week's commentary on the Polemis case has evoked so much favorable comment that The Gateway is considering running reports of leading cases weekly throughout next term. You've heard of the D.L.R. and the T.L.R.; make ready for the G.L.R.

Scholars Shine

One of the planks in the platform of the unsuccessful candidate for the Students' Union presidency was a call for awards which would recognize scholastic achievement.

Whether or not the plank was a vote-getter is immaterial; it was a thought worthy of merit. As was noted in a Gateway editorial earlier this term, a student can win an award for doing almost anything on this campus—except studying. And to study is his ostensible reason for being here.

A system of pins and rings would perhaps be

adequate to salute our top students. Anything more would be considered too ostentatious. Our campus has a long way to go before brilliant students could be recognized by large "A" crests or Gold Key-like jackets; and top athletes discernible only by their brawny physiques.

We trust that our new student president and his executive will demonstrate their fair-mindedness and sense of duty by at least giving consideration to an idea espoused by a defeated candidate.

Save Your Confederate Dollars . . .

At least in the faculty of arts and science, students have forgotten the injustices of bringing big name entertainment to campus without first consulting their wishes. Interest in the new representative and what he or she could offer them as their member on Students' Council reached a vibrant crescendo Tuesday when 54 students came to hear the platforms. It was estimated one third of these people were

loyal supporters from other faculties. And just last week rumbles were heard that ASUS might rise again.

The engineers, in the spirit of something, have taken it upon themselves to reorganize the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society. We always were suspicious that the only thing engineers were good for was organizing ASUS.

FROM THE Editor's Spike

The most haunting year end question an editor must answer is "how well have we done?" It is a question of utmost complexity, gnawing consternation, and defies solution on any basis.

Some editors have answered it on the basis of enemies made, some on the response in the letter columns, and some on the basis of personal commendation.

We have made enemies, had good response in our letter columns and been personally commended. But is the metal of our enemies' constitution a base one, have the letter writers said what we should have said and said it more eloquently than we could have, and were the personal commendations only niceties, with no basis whatsoever?

On only one basis can an editor determine "how we have done" and even then be filled with doubts. The basis—whether the paper accomplished what he set out to do. What "he set out to do", though, is something an editor can only know for sure at year's end.

* * * * *

I have been speaking in terms of "we", for like the captain of a ship, the editor can determine the destination, but depends on his crew to attain it. Condemnation and praise must of necessity rain on the editor's head for it is he who must take the responsibility. But scorn and praise must also be showered on the staff, and this from the editor, or from the staff knowing their editor has been praised or scorned.

For these reasons, I talk of the paper produced in terms of "we" and the evaluation made in terms of "I".

* * * * *

Enlightenment, of others and of self, is one of the newspaper's greatest challenges. At a University, the challenge of enlightenment is even more acute. Enlightenment on certain issues was an intent at the beginning of the year; in some instances it was successful, in others only tried, and in others discarded.

Provocation of groups and individuals was not planned—it rarely is—but arose from their actions, or lack of same. Provocation was, again, met with some response.

Condemnation and commendation were given throughout the year; some was accepted, some ignored, and some rebutted.

A fact remains in all these cases. We did meet a challenge. That very meeting is one mark of success, and working within the confines of a newspaper, not a scandal sheet, we can say we were successful.

* * * * *

Much of the year's accomplishments were not evidenced in the newspaper; some of the staff were not aware of them. They were changes in the internal structure of The Gateway. Editors were given more responsibility for their departments, and the staff more room to try ideas of their own. Some did, others were not aware that they could, and others did not bother.

Now is the beginning of a tremendous technical transition that will come over The Gateway within the next five years.

It will become bigger—more papers per week, and pages per paper. It will come out faster—the three day delay between press night and circulation will be chopped. It will become more professional and its staff will have to be more thoroughly trained to handle their jobs, and editors will become just overseers, not copy readers and delivery boys when no one else is around.

* * * * *

One thing I hope will not change—the individuals that make the paper.

Most Gateway staff are individualistic, hence The Gateway's cliquy appearance to the outsider. The staff recognize in each other the individual, and in this sense only, the people working on the paper are typed.

Any person is free to make himself available to the paper, but those who use their spine only as a means of differentiation between their head and their ass never last, not because they are not accepted, but because they can find nothing to accept.

* * * * *

To the staff who were challenged and challenged in return, to those who are seeing and taking part in the changes, to those who have maintained their self-respect and sanity in its most aesthetic sense, to those, for the manner in which they have committed themselves, must go the greatest of praise. For if anything was successful about The Gateway this year it was the "Gaffers".

Thirty

THE GATEWAY

Member of Canadian University Press

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF - - - - - John Taylor
 MANAGING EDITOR - - - - - David E. Jenkins ASSOCIATE EDITOR - - - - - Roberta Sheps
 NEWS—Jim Richardson, editor. Bev Woznow, Brian Watson, Kathy Showalter, Don Robertson, Heather McCoomb, Lyn Irwin, Reg Jordan, Branny Schepanovich, Dave Collier, Bill Samis, Iain MacDonald, Elaine Stringham, Bentley LeBaron.
 FEATURES—Wolfe Kirchmeir, editor. Violet Vlcek, Carolyn Brodeur, Peter Kirchmeir.
 SPORTS—Gerry Marshall, editor. Owen Ricker, Assistant Sports editor, Dieter Buse, Eleanor van Oene, John Burns, John Neilson.
 PRODUCTION—John Whittaker, Dick Bide, Kae Powers, Percy Smith, George Yakulic, Lorna Cammaert, Betty Cragg.
 OFFICE STAFF—Judy Odynsky, Barry Mailloux Eugene Brody, Judith Brown.
 EDITORIAL—Adolph Buse, Chris Evans, Don Giffen, Joe Clark, Richard Kupsch, Sheldon Chumir, Doug Chalmers, Assistant editors, Bill Samis, Bentley LeBaron, Lyn Irwin. Government editor, John Francis. Cartoons, Kyril Holden, David Winfield. Photos by Photo Directorate.
 Advertising Manager - - - - - Jack Derbyshire Business Manager - - - - - Walter Dinwoodle

FINAL COPY DEADLINE

For Friday Edition—8 p.m. Tuesday For Tuesday Edition—8 p.m. Sunday

Opinions expressed by columnists in this paper are not necessarily those of The Gateway or members of its staff. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein.

Office Telephone—GE 3-1155