

Anger and danger: day care and E & G

I was a science faculty rep plus a married students' rep on a council at junior college. I have seen students driving their children night and morning to a baby sitter; and on occasion, had to personally take students' children for them so they could make it to classes. I know of two women students, one a widow, the other separated, who had to leave their children with relatives in another city so they could attend university.

Who among us would have liked to have been separated from their

parents at age four or five?

I would like to have a yearbook; apparently we do not have enough money, I am willing to pay my share of the extra funds needed.

I do not want a yearbook at the expense of someone whose need is greater than mine.

I would not enjoy that yearbook at all.

I have seen too many people too angry over this issue. Anger and Danger go hand in hand. Perhaps we should all cool down.

Harold Moore
ag 2

Safe sound off

Dear Boys:

No doubt your girls and amours will thrill at the thought that their "protection" was bought and sold for two bits in a common lavatory (latrine?). How apt! How romantic! No wonder the more sensitive do feel like two bits, afterwards.

Our most self-righteous and bankrupt of all student councils might at least have had the gump-tion (if not the common business sense) to mount the dispenser beside the coke machine. O brave new world that has such people in't!
A. R. Johnson, ed 2

How tuition fees actually make greater university accessibility

Dan Jamieson's article in The Gateway last Thursday reiterated that the students' union is generally in favor of the gradual abolition of university tuition fees. Before the students' union adopts such a position officially and becomes a pressure group for the cause, I would hope that the question receives very careful study. There are some very good reasons why tuition fees should be retained, and I would like to review these.

A major argument put forth by both the students' union and the Alberta Association of Students is that abolition of fees would remove one of the obstacles standing in the way of universal accessibility. This argument may very well be a fallacy, in that elimination of tuition fees may have the opposite effect in the long-run: i.e., it may curtail the amount of student places and the amount of educational services which Alberta universities will be able to provide. Thus a large number of students may be denied access to university simply because the supply of services is diminished through abolition of fees.

Mr. Hunka makes the statement that the "tuition is so little anyway." Yet this "little tuition" provides some \$5 million, or approximately 12 per cent of the universities' operational budgets. Let's not be deceived by small percentages. Five million dollars buys a lot of student places. It can build a lot of buildings, it can hire a lot of professors; it can even supply more parking so that students don't have to suffer the tremendous inconvenience (?) of riding transit

buses. Because tuition fees are so low, I doubt that they are obstacles preventing anyone from attending university in this province. Yet the amount of revenue they raise is substantial and not insignificant as Mr. Hunka would imply. What's \$5,000,000 anyway?

If \$5 million is eliminated from university budgets, it will have to be replaced from public sources. It's just a fact of economic life that the public purse is limited in the resources it can command and using more of it to buy university services means that less is left for providing other equally deserving services in the public sector. Studies that have been conducted on educational cost trends in this country show unequivocally that educational spending is rising faster—substantially faster—than public revenues. Therefore, if we are to get more finances for education, both the public and the private sector are going to have to pitch in more. This means retaining and even increasing tuition fees, not eliminating them.

The other major argument that is sometimes used for abolition of fees is that university education is a social investment. Society pays but it gets back a good return on its costs in the form of increased productivity and in all sorts of non-pecuniary benefits (like good citizenry). But who's the primary beneficiary of this social investment? The university graduate—that's who! I am not denying the existence and importance of the social returns to education, but what I am saying is that the private returns of a university education to a graduate are so

great, that he should share with government in the costs of this education.

Many studies have been conducted on the private rate of return to personal investment in a university education. The results show that the return in the form of increased personal income is often more than two or three times the return that would result if the student had invested his money (including foregone income while at university) in some other venture on the capital market. One study showed that a university education resulted, on the average, in an increase of over \$100,000 in the lifetime earnings stream of the university graduate as compared to the earnings stream of the person who had only a high school education.

Do we want society to totally subsidize the university student when the monetary returns (let alone the psychic returns) are so great? To me this stance is clearly inappropriate. It is more logical to conclude that if the society and the student both benefit, they should both contribute to an investment in university education.

So let's not get into a fired-up hurry to abolish university tuition fees. They are not unjust, and they make for more accessibility, not for less.

Dennis Dibski
grad studies
ed admin

F ck Alberta's censorship

On the issue of the cartoon the university printing services refused to print, it was not the fault of our friendly local provost, Professor Ryan. He says that he has never and will never censor The Gateway. According to him, he was asked by the printing services what the legal position of the university would be if the cartoon were published and he informed them that criminal charges might be brought by the attorney general re: Pornography. Though on this point perhaps his logic was a bit faulty. After all, if they can publish something in B.C. why not here, Social Credit notwithstanding? So for heaven's sake don't attack Ross Grant or the university on this issue. It's just that nobody really wanted to go to court over the matter. Rather, we must seek to change our archaic and perverse laws regarding what one can say and what one can read and see.

K. C. Smith
arts 1

Women can't get both knowledge and family

In her letter to The Gateway of Oct. 24, Ellen Singleton accuses Bill Farion of being "against equal opportunities for education by all people." However, it is my opinion that if a real enemy of equal treatment in life is to be found here, it is Ellen, and not Bill.

Suppose it is the case that Bill just wants an education. Suppose that Ellen wants an education too, but that she also wants a family. In order to have both, Ellen must receive assistance in the form of day-care centres partially paid for by Bill (out of his student union fees).

Now Ellen is being educated, has a family, and of course the use of the day-care centre. Bill, who just wanted an education, isn't even receiving the use of his own money. Equality? Hardly!

According to Ellen's reasoning, people who postpone gratification

should be at the mercy of those who don't, and the number of a person's wants determine that person's rights to the property of others.

In my little story above, Ellen and Bill both had equal opportunities to an education before Ellen decided that she wanted a family as well. However, Ellen thought she should be able to have a family and still not give up any of her opportunity for an education. In other words she thought she could have something for nothing.

Equality of opportunity presupposes equality before that opportunity. People who want to have their cake and eat it too surely cannot be treated equally with those who do not entertain this irrational desire.

Tom Peterson
arts 3

I wanna kill, kill, as Gateway takes trip

By AL SCARTH

Shrink: I wanna kill, KILL, KILL! I mean I wanna see blood and guts and babies' eyes dripping off my teeth.

And they were all singing it and one of them started jumping up and down and shouting kill, KILL, KILL! All in four-part harmony.

Well, the guy who was jumping up and down got embarrassed and disappeared into the bathroom cause all the waitresses and truck-drivers were looking on. And besides, when he started jumping up and down everybody else stopped singing. "I was so embarrassed."

The thing was, of course, you just don't expect it in a small-town restaurant somewhere in the blizzarding wilds of Saskatchewan.

It wasn't that you could blame the waitresses or the truck-drivers, or The Gateway staffers.

But you're ready to expect anything from the man who brought you "Fake fatality at four in the morning" and "The Vatican Rag in front of the Ontario cathedral at letting out time" and getting arrested for it.

"Genuflect, genuflect, genuflect."

Well, it was just that kind of a trip—the one when someone calls and asks in Regina, at four in the morning, if YOU remembered to bring your photo editor to the conference.

"My God! You mean we forgot Hebditch?"

But that ain't all. Never trust some quick-witted sonofabitch news editor on a conference away from home.

I mean, I mean, I had the front page all laid out. I had even figured out what to tell the rent-a-car people.

I mean, when the yearbook editor who was supposed to be in hospital "shaken up" walked in the door with a bottle of scotch; well, I mean, I grabbed him, he'd walked out of the hospital in a daze or something and he'd better sit down or he might do something, you know, get upset.

Well, when the sonofabitch quick-witted news editor exposed his hoax, I mean, you were so happy, you couldn't kill

him. And really, when you thought about it, you remembered the other news editor who showed up in the Red Deer RCMP detachment in a toga and laurel wreath after being arrested for carrying cold tea in a whicky bottle and said "I was so embarrassed" after the drunks rattled their bars screaming "Put him in here! Put him in here!"

It's that kind of a staff. They're not all crazy—most stayed in the warm hotel headquarters of the university newspaper conference during the weekend while four participated in a Regina Vietnam protest parade. Hebditch the photo-editor was in the parade too but he got lost.

It was one of those conscience type of things—that parade. You didn't really think your opposition to the war could best be expressed by carrying a fake torch behind some supercilious ass from Regina New Democratic Youth in an expensive ski jacket and gloves—but you carried it.

One conservative staffer was suddenly transporting a "Smash Capitalism" placard almost as tall as himself and hiding behind it he muttered: "What am I doing here, I must be crazy!"

Then the same staffer roared through his home town of 50 souls on the way home early Monday morning giggling demonically and honking the horn: "That's old so and so. I hope he wakes up."

When he finished his round of wake-up calls and arrived at home, one of the first questions his mother asked was "don't you ever wash your socks?"

So much for a blooming radical.

To end it all there were the roadblocks. "Do you belong to some kind of an . . . organization?" the constables at one asked. At another, the driver was asked "is this just your family ma'am?" Receiving a negative reply from the editor, they pointed their flashlights at him and demanded "Are you some kind of a . . . hitchhiker?"

For a staff exposed to infectious hepatitis, they sure met a lot of people.

I mean, you can get anything you want . . . on a Gateway staffers' trip, excepting boredom.

"HELLO, U. OF A PRINTING SERVICES?.. MR GRANT?
AH!... SAY, ARE YOU INTERESTED IN A
NEW JOB?"

