



nb

on page five this issue

letter on cus, attendance at council and the alberta association of students (which doesn't exist). we also have an editorial from the mcgill daily. more letters can be used.

## letters

### nait strikes back

In The Gateway Sept. 21 was an article entitled, "Alberta Students Banding Together." This article stated four post-secondary institutions, including NAIT, had banded to form the Alberta Association of Students. NAIT is not a member of such an organization, nor is NAIT aware of any such organization existing, nor is NAIT seriously considering to assist in the formation of such an organization.

On June 25, NAIT was represented at a meeting to discuss the possibilities of forming an AAS where it was decided:

1. To continue investigation into the possibility of forming an AAS.
2. Inform post-secondary institutions in the province about the progress being made.
3. Invite the criticisms and suggestions of post-secondary students.

A committee was to be set up to further investigate the possibilities of forming the AAS. This committee to include all post-secondary institutions in the province was never formed; or at least NAIT was never invited or informed of one.

Obviously, The Gateway, has been misinformed as to NAIT's position regarding the AAS. Perhaps a re-examination of the June 25 meeting minutes, plus an examination of the U of A students' union minutes dated July 11, 1966 and August 8, 1966 will clarify our positions as well as the proceedings which were carried on in Calgary.

J. Patrick Clarke  
NAITSA president

### issues not discussed

Much of the discussion in The Gateway, pro and con, regarding withdrawal from CUS is beside the point.

Arguments about the timing of the action, referral to the U of A student body at large, services lost as a result of withdrawal, etc., tend to obscure the important question of whether a national student organization like CUS should take stands on national and international issues or stick, to use Mr. Shepanovich's words, to "matters of direct student concern." Such a separation is highly artificial.

Increased aid to students in the form of scholarships, reduction or elimination of tuition fees and provision of decent, inexpensive student housing are political issues. To fight for these and to expect to make significant gains in this field whilst ignoring the total picture of governmental allocations is most naive and unrealistic.

How a government spends its income reflects its pattern of values. How can any student movement expect to effect a greater emphasis by government on higher education without taking account of policies and values which are reflected in utterly wasteful expenditures for ornaments and politically motivated investigations and commissions on ministerial scandals? Does any serious student movement really think it can make important gains for students by the narrow range of concerns which Mr. Shepanovich regards as proper?

Beyond that, students live in the

real world of political and ideological conflict, and they need to begin to cope with that inevitable fact while they are students. Study, analysis, and taking of positions on these issues through their organizations, should be part of their education.

Hopefully they may do better on this score than several preceding generations of alumni throughout the world who bear a large measure of responsibility for the sorry state of affairs prevailing today.

Charles C. Brant  
Chairman  
Dept. of Anthropology

### pro-cus committee

I would like to express the appreciation of the po-CUS committee for accurate presentation of our position in The Gateway Sept. 28.

Perhaps, it is wise to emphasize certain points. Our withdrawal from CUS has provoked reaction because many students on campus feel it is not an isolated incident, but is reflective of a dangerous attitude within our student government. Our opposition is not primarily to withdrawal from CUS. We are opposed to the manner in which we withdrew.

We can not argue against the constitutional or technical validity of council's action. But we seek to remind all students that freedom anywhere depends on more than the technical safeguards written into the constitution. Freedom depends on a traditional respect for the spirit, rather than the letter, of the law. Freedom depends on a tradition of openness in all matters relating to the public.

When government, at any level, becomes so convinced of its righteousness that it feels free to act without informing the public, the next step is for government to bypass the laws which protect us. (Perhaps I could point out that student government is representative, but not responsible, and the creators of American representative government in the Declaration of Independence stated free government must rest upon "the consent of the governed.")

I have so often heard students protest "high-handed" and "paternalistic" governments which we fear act without consulting or regarding citizens.

Last year many of us were concerned about a tenure case at U of A. If I remember correctly, the objections were generally two-fold. The first that secrecy, either deliberate or inadvertent, endangered the freedom of those involved. The second objection was the administration, since it felt its position was right, took short-cuts through the traditional procedure for handling cases such as this.

When I consider these student concerns of the past, I cannot help but wonder how students will react to council's manner of leaving CUS.

David King  
Chairman, pro-CUS committee

### attendance chart wrong

The "Council Attendance" chart published in the Sept. 30 The Gateway is misleading. This chart carefully shows that Miss Blakely, president of women's athletics has attended only one of the first eight council meetings. It would appear that Miss Blakely is neglecting her duty as president of women's athletics. She isn't! The "University Act, Excerpt Constitution By-Laws UAB Constitution" says:

The Students' Council shall be composed of the following members:

- (b) Voting Members  
(vii) The President of Men's Athletics or in his absence the president of the Women's Athletic Association.

WAA doesn't even have a vote if UAB is represented at students' council meeting. Now, checking your attendance chart, you will find that every meeting Miss Blakely was absent, Art Hooks was present.

I suggest that the next time a council attendance chart is printed in The Gateway mention of a co-vote for WAA and UAB be made.

Donna Deschner  
ed 3



## a year of entrenchment

Following is an editorial reprinted from the McGill Daily.

Plenty of jaws must have dropped and plenty of eyeballs must have bugged out when the McGill delegation to the CUS national congress launched themselves into this their 30th annual group therapy meeting. It was only one year ago, at this same event that our delegation was a driving force behind the enactment of a series of resolutions that had the potential of making CUS an active organization with a purpose. This year's delegation has not yet

made its official report, and by the time they do the CUS Congress will be only a memory. In any case, the information available now makes for some interesting reading.

The Martlets got things rolling by announcing that they would not vote on any resolutions related to international affairs. Evidently the delegation took its usual line that students don't know anything about issues of international scope, care less about them and of course have no right to be committed on them.

As it turned out, when the chips were down and the boys saw red, as in the motion to "work towards the establishment of bilateral programs with the All-China Students Federation", they backed down and voted a resounding no.

The same retreat from isolation came on the suggestion that CUS "undertake a study of the possibility" of an exchange with Cuban students (a member of our delegation had just returned from a trip to Cuba, so presumably they had some information on that one). They voted against the "possibility".

Asking for peace in Viet Nam is quickly falling into the motherhood and boyscout category, and here the group felt safe in making affirmative gestures.

On the education side of things CUS followed up on last year's precedent-setting resolution on universal accessibility to post-secondary education. CUS followed up, but not McGill. Showing an unexpected interest in separatism on a provincial level, the boys decided education was a local issue, and they wanted no part of the gradual abolition of tuition fees or the conversion of loans to bursaries. A whole concept of higher education that McGill has been instrumental in bringing to CUS last year was dropped, at least by us.

Perhaps the true ideals of the delegation shone through most clearly on the question of CUS membership itself. Wracked by the pressures and realities of twentieth century Canada (?), and the impudent bravado of CUS in becoming articulate, at least on some issues, the boys choose for themselves individualism.

Evidently by voting not to give CUS the dollars it so richly does not deserve, each and every student can help destroy national apathy, and revitalize CUS, if it still exists.

On an infinitely more sophisticated level voluntary membership is supposed to lead to the polarization of two rabidly committed political organizations. Just as a starter, which side is CUS going to represent?

So that's the story, and we're really out of it.

The other day at the McGill Conference on Student Affairs they called this a year of entrenchment, and they were right.

## freshettes

from the xaverian

Your plight, and it is exactly that, lies in establishing the best possible relation with the male population, and yet total submission and lack of the individual's freedom must not be sacrificed. What lies ahead for You?? Probably Joe College himself, perhaps the heartbreak under the dark eyes of the star quarterback, the usual raking-over-the-coals session by the student discipline, utter frustration over term papers. But stop! Down with pessimism! The path leading "in" follows these stepping stones.

Don't refuse a dance, it may be your last.

Do study sometimes.

Do say Hi.

Don't look too good in the library —guys think girls go there to hustle not to study.

Do remember to drop your coat on the floor when he doesn't remember to help you with it.

And whatever you do—Don't.

## co-ed visits revolutionary

"Extremely bold" and "revolutionary" indeed is the idea that there is to be visiting between the lounges allowed in the Lister Hall complex. Think of it! Boys and girls actually in the same room together, and not even brother and sister. Why, this experiment is going to make educational history.

As the editorial in The Gateway has pointed out, though, we must be all extremely careful, lest who knows what might happen (snicker, snicker). Strict control must be the watchword. In fact, come to think of it, maybe a second look needs to be taken at this university's policy

allowing boys and girls unchaperoned in the same cafeteria.

But all in all three cheers to Dean Sparling and Derek Bone for having the cautious good sense not to look to University of Toronto and York University for their ideas about co-educational housing. There, in "Toronto-the-Wicked," men and women students are actually allowed into each others' rooms, and at night. If inter-lounge visiting is revolutionary, that just sounds positively apocalyptic, doesn't it kiddies?

Peter Boothroyd,  
grad student