# Council a joke

If Students' Council has trouble figuring out why very few students take them seriously, if Tema, Dean, et. al are disturbed over their inability to fill vacancies on various boards and committees, if certain councillors are upset that students in their faculties see them as a joke, then I suggest that all these people read over the minutes of Tuesday's Council meeting. At that meeting, the political immaturity of several councillors worked to defeat not only an important motion, but the pretense of democracy as

At the Council meeting of November 13, a motion was made for Council to "oppose the use of public funds by City Council for the purpose of building or operating the Convention Centre, and that the executive make this position known to the City Council and the media." After some debate, this motion was tabled and sent to the External Affairs Board, which is chaired by vp external Tema Frank. The EAB was to make a recommendation on the motion to Council at a meeting held on Tuesday night. That motion never came back to Council.

Instead, the EAB returned an entirely different motion. It read: "move that Students' Council accept the EAB recommendation to remain neutral on the issue of the Convention Centre, and to encourage students to attend the Students' Union forum to be held Monday, November 26, and to vote in the November 28

Apart from the laughable second part of this motion, which suggests that Council would run an effective campaign to encourage students to participate, the whole concept of fundamentally denying Council the right to vote on a motion put forth, (i.e. — the original motion) is an abrogation of the democratic process. The motion was not scrapped by Council, but merely referred to a board for recommendation. The board destroyed the motion and sent back a recommendation on a totally different motion.

This is no doubt the work of an External Affairs Board that sees its role as controlling the aims and desires of Council. The arrogance on the part of the Board, and the four members of the executive that supported it, demands a full explanation by Frank. Her Nixonian methods in defending the EAB's stance are a joke, and the other executive members who exercised little responsibility in their decision-making should be censured in public.

The tactic was obviously aimed at avoiding identification of Council with one side or another. Executive members and other councillors dragged out the old argument that Council should not involve itself in outside political affairs. That argument has been proven false several times, notwithstanding the fact that it is a huge red herring.

What is the refugee adoption plan? It's outside involvement. What is throwing money away on a hockey team? It's outside involvement. But, these two activities are safe, non-controversial participation. No reputations are in danger, no debate really forthcoming. When it comes to something that requires a little commitment on the part of councillors, it's time to run and hide under the statement that "it's not our business", knowing that shelter will be available from Frank and Olmstead.

If students didn't involve themselves in political issues women probably still would not be allowed to vote, Joe McCarthy would still be hunting communists, Nixon would still be bombing Cambodia. Student involvement in issues big and small is as crucial and legitimate as is trade union involvement, interest group involvement, politicians' involvement, and all the other sectors of society that see fit to offer comment.

But no. Our Council, composed largely of inexperienced debators and representing virtually no one, feels that students should remain detached from the issues of the day. While they spend money to gain some recognition in the community, they hypocritically decide to isolate students from society, to make us look like we don't know and we don't care. And then they wonder why students are seen as a unique and off-beat group in society.

Tema Frank, Dean Olmstead, Sharon Bell and Willie Gruber, our fearless leaders, continue to embarrass themselves with their displays of political maneuvering. It's a good thing they go to university, because here they don't have to possess or defend political views. They can remain consistently neutral. (It's interesting to note that president Olmstead spoke against the loss of the tabled motion at the end of the meeting, but did not oppose the infringement of democracy during the course of the meeting.)

The fact remains that Council has avoided making a statement. They will continue to neglect being responsible to their constituents, and are still not accountable for their actions.

Oh well, they have protected students' blissful nonparticipatory attitudes towards outside issues. Good work. The Chamber of Commerce loves you!

**Gordon Turtle** Lucinda Chodan Keith Krause Portia Priegert Alison Thomson

KarlWilberg Bruce Cookson



VOL. LXX NO. 21 THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1979 SIXTEEN PAGES

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Janet Laddish, Peter Benn, Sarah King, Nina Miller. Janice Michaud, Maxine Murphy, Austin Hitchins, where are you, Hollis Brown?, W. Reid Glenn, Mike Walker, Brad "I got the red-ass" Keith, Bruce himself, Diane Young, David Marples, N.F. Good, Dora Johnson, Pam Spencer, Garnet DuGray, Nad Netz, Rick Townshend, Karlos Hunter,

## Technocracy objects

This is a response to "Don Quixote" Marples column of 6

You have certainly earned a place in my scrap book of calumnious and ignorant diatribes. You not only distort and misrepresent your subject — Technocracy — you also degrade and demean yourself as a graduate student, as well as the Gateway and the University. Sheltering behind the licence allowed student writers you wield your poison pen with irresponsible abandon.

My association Technocracy and Howard Scott (who died on 1 January, 1970) dates from 1936. I believe I have quite a comprehensive understanding of the subject and the man. Your sources, whatever they may be, are grotesque distortions and apparently vindictively motivated. The body of thought that is Technocracy is thus buried in a mass of personal attacks and lost to view amid the overburden of malignant and emotional garbage.

# criminals

Glenn Martin's belief that calling the U.S. government war criminals is leftist propaganda is not necessarily true. (See his letter in Tuesday's paper.)

International organizations, other nations, and the U.N. vehemently denounced the My Lai massacre, the secret bombing of neutral Cambodia in 1969 and 1970, and several other American activities during the Viet Nam War as war

As well, Nixon's circumvention of constitutional American procedure for declaring and expanding war was illegal. As president, he single-handedly moved the war into Cambodia without congressional approval. This was seen as a criminal activity, and part of the whole Watergate affair.

While the Viet Nam situation was not a black and white issue, criticism of American activities should not always be construed as leftist propaganda. There is also rightist propaganada, and that is what Glenn Martin has apparently accepted as the truth.

Martin Lamble Agriculture 2

Strange that you should take the trouble to compile a column of lies and half-truths when you could have researched the subject right here on campus at the Technocracy office in HUB or in the University Library

What can be your motivation? Do you favor burning books and suppressing freedom of expression other than your own? Do you attack from the 'right' or the 'left'? Are you communist or fascist? It is hard to tell. You do not say. By your techniques you could be either.

In any case, attacks such as

yours, or a defence such as mine, are unlikely to have any significant effect on the course of events which will determine whether there is a Technocracy in America's future. We regard it as a natural consequence of increasing energy conversion in a highly industrialized society of continental magnitude, such as we have here in North America.

In the meantime students will continue, no doubt, to make their own judgements on Technocracy as an appropriate technique for future social operations on this continent.

Walt Fryers Technocrat

## Tuition fees just

With regard to your editorial of November 14 "Freedom to Choose," I feel that certain statements are in order.

Having been a full-time student here during most of the last seven years, I have paid a substantial sum of tuition fees. During that time I have also heard an incredible amount of nonsense relating to the tuition fee issue. It is quite fashionable to make loud pronouncements of the great injustice of raising The fact that tuition fees. Gordon Turtle (editor) parrots this same old line is not surprising, given his consistent leftist bias that predominates so much of his writings.

It's time that all these tired old anti-government tirades were critically examined. At the risk of initiating a flurry of letters and being branded a Tory hack, let me say that I am in favor of tuition fee increases so that students continue to contribute a reasonable and responsible share towards their education. It is very fair, indeed quite generous for students to be required to pay only 10% of their education. This

cost factor is essential to weed out the frivolous students who have no desire to apply themselves to their studies.

Tuition fees are increasing to offset the inflationary erosion of the Canadian dollar. Thus, if tuition fees are not increased, they actually decrease. Has Mr. Turtle considered that? When viewed in that light the provincial government has never really raised tuition fees; it merely maintains them at a constant level. One can hardly blame the Progressive Conservative Party for a basic fact of life in Canadian society: that of the continual erosion of the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar due to constant inflationary pressure.

Today I am paying off my education debts through fulltime employment and I expect to do so for some time. Instead of complaining, I wish to go on record as saying that I am very grateful to a generous government that paid up to 90\% of my

> Peter D. Schalin Education IV

## Slow library explained

Library users are entitled to an explanation of the tardy performance of terminals used in charging out books at circulation

Until last summer the Library's circulation system operated with the same terminals installed when the Library automated a dozen years ago. The supplier stopped manufacturing the terminals and our units gradually deteriorated.

There was a problem of finding replacement units compatible with library specifications.

New terminals were installed and tested over the past summer. They performed satisfactorily during the testing period, but at that season the service load was light. The shortcomings of the terminals only became apparent when the winter session was in full swing and the service demands on them heavy. Basically the problem is that terminals have to queue to access the micro-computer rather than having simultaneous ingress. In addition certain gremlins put in an appearance causing erratic behavior in record keeping. The Library's Systems staff are fully involved in correcting the problems, but it takes time.

To return to the slow circulation service, the present automated system may be described as underpowered. Steps are being taken to upgrade . it. Specifically, the microcomputer controlling the terminals is being made more powerful.

Completion of the up-grading is expected by mid-December. Once the microcomputer has the extra power, the terminals hopefully will charge out books with greater dispatch.

The Library regrets the inconvenience and loss of time to which its users have been put this session. Your indulgence is requested for a little longer.

Bruce Peel Librarian to the University

### Sneaky stairwell users

It has come to my attention that a small number of students have managed to locate the stairwells in the Students' Union building, and are using them to get from one floor to another. This sneaky maneuver allows them to bypass the long lineup that forms at the entrance to the building's elevator system. It is my personal opinion that these students should be deterred from doing this, and should be forced to stand in line with the rest of us. In my anxiety I would like to offer a few solutions to the problem.

1. Paint the stairwell entrances a more camouflaging color, and hide them behind barriers, partitions, and no exit signs.

2. Instead of just locking the stairwell doors from the inside, they should be locked from both sides so that people can not enter or exit the stairwell.

3. Replace the tiles on the main floor of the building with large concrete hexagons and hope that in the confusion no one notices that the building has stairs.

Replace the existing cramped elevators with one small elevator that doesn't move. This should deter students from using the building altogether.

Murray Sund . Engineering 4

#### Gtwy mks thngs hrd

wth rfrnc t th lttrhd n th Nvmbr 20 ss f Gtwy, 'm dply dstrssd, s grdt lngstcs stdnt, n yr ngtv pstn rgrdng vwls. t s qt vdnt tht lgnns nd vwls, fr wtht thm, mch mr tm s rqrd n rdr t ndrdstnd th ntndd mssg.
Shn Shmmss

Grd Stds, Lngstcs

Rght n!