

Swing Low, Swing Little

Edmonton's citizens, and its other newspaper, are beginning to take an interest in the education of children. University educators and students have been telling them for years to get interested.

Two rather incomplete and meaningless quizzes by three University professors have created an uproar that a royal commission report on education, two years in the preparation and the size of a Webster dictionary, was unable to do. Why? Because most people can understand something with little meaning, and most will not read a dictionary; many do not even consult it.

Senator Cameron published his report last year. Since that time it has been accused of being inadequate, and beside reports from Manitoba and British Columbia it does look a little pale. It does, however embody solutions to the problems indicated in the tests of Eccles, McNeil and Wonders. For example in regard to Social Studies:

"... without losing any of the desirable qualities of the present program, greater emphasis should be placed on the acquisition of precise factual knowledge."

Cameron's report also recognized the need for more and better teachers, and suggested what should be done to obtain them.

A perennial solution to our educational plight, also recommended by the Cameron Commission, has been advocated by nearly every educationalist, and nearly all of them are too chicken to try it — streaming.

Streaming could solve most problems, at least on paper, and it would be an interesting

experiment to try, and hardly as dangerous as progressivism, except to the experimenters.

Streaming is now practiced on an unobtrusive scale in Edmonton's schools, but it will never be really tested until two sacred cows which should have been done away with long ago, have been butchered.

The first: "... the masses have an equal right to an education along with the privileged," as practiced by the masses and reads "... the masses have right to an equal education at the expense of the exceptional."

The second: "... no one can be a judge of a child's capabilities." So we put all the children under the same roof, and the roof is raised if anyone tries to stream some of them out. Streaming has been worked in Britain, and with considerable success. The British realize what we do not, that an educator is a better judge of a child's capabilities than, as many Canadian parents think, they are or their children are.

Instead of making an effort to initiate a needed change, we continue to swing on the pendulum that is now completing its cycle from traditional to progressive, and back to traditional. Now that people are aware of difficulties and screaming, the road is open for the government and the educators of this province to produce a good educational system.

The good educational system seems to be between the traditional and progressive extremes so that the pendulum circles around the mid point of its arc. Every good physicist will tell you that with small swings about the mid point, perfection can very nearly be approximated.

Residence Plan

Today, with all the controversy over new and bigger residences, it is easy to lose sight of some of the ultimate purposes of residence life.

Besides clean and convenient living quarters, a residence also provides an opportunity for students to meet and become acquainted.

Here at the University of Alberta, those living in men's residences are particularly fortunate. Among the 300 living therein, over 30 are from foreign nations, many from India. Few Canadians have an opportunity to live

with and get to know people of such different backgrounds and cultures.

Regrettably these opportunities are not being capitalized upon. One has only to enter residence previous to or after any meal to see groups of these foreign students congregating together, alone. Nearby, groups of local students congregate together, alone.

Wherever the fault may be, it is a shame that those in residence are not taking full advantage of the opportunity which they are unlikely to have again.

Professor Plan

At the last council meeting there was a long, loud discussion and one which every council member, for the first time in history, had an opinion on. "Should council stick its oar into the problem of inadequate and incapable professors?"

Most members felt that incompetence on the part of the professor was a class problem, and should be dealt with by each particular class and each particular prof, and that council, but not necessarily students should keep their nose out of academics.

Further suggestions were that at the end of each year (we would think after marks are in) the professors and students in each department and/or faculty sit down and air out their beefs against each other. The faculty of medicine for example hold bull sessions of this nature. It is a way in which the profs may become better profs and the students, better adults.

Never-the-less, the problem of the inadequate prof was brought up in council, and it appears there is some reason to believe that there are a few academicians around who, brilliant in mind, cannot transmit their sparkle to their students. They are professors who belong in a lab and not in a classroom. They are researchers and not educators.

Last year's Gateway aired this same complaint and suggested that the professors be required to take some form of teacher training so they at least have an idea of how to go about their job.



QUEEN AFTER MATH

Debaters Bedunked

To The Editor:

Today (Friday, Feb. 3), I was present at a Hugill debate on the topic "Resolved that Engineers do not Deserve to Have a Queen". The debate was attended by a large number of engineers, who, by their conduct, proved the affirmative beyond a doubt.

In opening the debate, the chairman pointed out explicitly—and twice, because most of the engineers came late—that heckling from the floor is not a part of Hugill debates; that debaters are not allowed to take notice of, or reply to such heckling, so that it corresponds to throwing bottles at a hockey team; and that topics for a debate are assigned arbitrarily, without regard for the debaters personal feelings on the subject.

The engineers heckled loudly throughout the debate, at times drowning out the speakers. At the

Wrong Box

To The Editor:

The past Queen Week has again demonstrated the superiority of engineering over arts and science. Engineering practice demands "developing and maintaining high standards in the engineering profession, and enhancing the usefulness of the profession to the public." (ESS handbook 1960-1961).

This entails using intelligence and strength in the proper proportions to fit the circumstances. This same principle applies to the engineers' conduct during Queen Week; viz: using force when necessary to protect the queens from grubby arts (men?), and punishing the offenders for their misdemeanors. The Engineers effectively showed their mental superiority by letting the mob of three hundred "brave" artsmen (complete with gas masks to protect themselves from their own



THEY GUESSED IT

end, they seized the affirmative team and subjected them to the full tank-and dye treatment.

It may be noted that the man-handled debaters called the engineers "sadistic beasts", a harsh term, but an appropriate one. There may be justification for dunking queen kidnappers, but to do it to a debator for defending the topic assigned to him is an act of childish malice and plain stupidity. Engineers, it seems, have only one method of retaliation even when it proves the charges made against them.

I would also like to point out that the second year engineers, in claiming that Carmen Spencer was snatched before the official opening of Queen Week, are liars. She was kidnapped from the LDS Institute just after a church meeting there. I was present at the meeting; it ended at 12:30 p.m.

Once I thought the engineers were an unjustly slandered group. I no longer think so.

Kitchener Young
Science 4

offensive halitosis and B.O.) gloriously spirit away the dummy ballot box designed for DUMMY artsmen. Superior thinking again triumphs against brute force!

Fie on the artsmen for bravely exhibiting their disrespect for authority by throwing snowballs at Provost A. A. Ryan.

FOR SHAME!

Respectfully,
R. M. Bennett, Eng. II

End Rivalry—Push

To The Editor:

It is with regret that I note that the friendly (?) rivalry between our Engineers and Artsmen assumed the proportions of a riot today. This was neither necessary nor desirable. Are we to waste our energies on futile inter-faculty rivalry while other Canadian Universities bring honor upon themselves? Are we to become notorious while others achieve fame?

Continued On Page 6

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 Vichok, 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, Kyrill Holden, David Winfield. Photos by Photo Directorate.

Advertising Manager - - - - - Jack Derbyshire Business Manager - - - - - Walter Dinwoodie

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