

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing

editor Ronald Yakimchuk

news editor Miriam McClellan

assistant news

editor Glenn Cheriton

casserole

editor Elaine Verbicky

sports editor Bill Kankewitt

photo editor Chuck Lyall

STAFF THIS ISSUE—It was a dry night here tonight, but poor Harvey really got his backbone jolted when he discovered a second engineer on staff. And it is a SHE. What is a perfectly normal girl like MISS Terry Pettitt doing in engineering? The rest of the staff, Laurie Kostek, Dave Fedorkiw, Joe Czajkowski, Judy Griffiths, and Katrina Sinclair, are perfectly shocked. And as for your's truly Harvey G. (for gawd its a mixed up world) Thomgirt, if there are people like Terry in engineering, maybe I should just slither over there.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1968

A committee to study the government and education

By ALLEN GARR
Canadian University Press

Ross Thatcher, premier of Saskatchewan, has threatened to close down any university in his province if students get rambunctious.

Students marched on the British Columbia legislature two years ago to see then minister of education Lester Peterson and complain about inequities in allotment of loans and bursaries. Peterson refused to speak to them except to say: "You should all be back in your classrooms or libraries, where you belong."

The government in Quebec has, so far, sidestepped its promise to build a second French university in Montreal and the minister of education, Jean-Guy Cardinal, said he would back any action CEGEP administrators would like to use, short of bringing in the cops, to drive the 45,000 protesting students back to class.

The list of incidents of government control, threatened control and interference in the educational system in Canada is endless.

The buck passes continually between the federal government and the provinces.

Student and faculty demands received in Ottawa are bounced out to the province and back to Ottawa. Governmental heavy handedness and irresponsibility at the federal level is perhaps best realized in Trudeau's classic statement: "Education is a provincial responsibility, you know."

But government intervention in academic affairs has been frequent in Canada since World War Two when government subsidy of postsecondary institutions became their major source of income. And the government is determined not to pay for a pie it can't keep its fingers in.

The most popular form of government control lies in its appointment of governors or regents to university boards.

What the government would like to believe is a marriage between themselves and higher education.

CRUG (the Commission on the Relations between Universities and Governments) was conceived to clarify the relationship between the two bodies.

CRUG is a co-operative venture of the Canadian Union of Students (CUS), l'Union Générale des Etudiants de Québec (UGEQ), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). Representatives of each of these groups—one from the student organizations and two from the professional organizations—make up the steering committee that acquired \$150,000 from the Ford Foundation in November, 1967, to finance the study. They also chose the co-commissioners, Dr. Donald C. Rowat and professor René

Hurtubise, and then set them the following mandate:

1. To consider the distinctive role of universities in the changing Canadian society, particularly with respect to their responsibilities for the development of this role at the various levels of society: community, provincial, regional, national and international.
2. To determine the need, nature, and extent of: (a) university autonomy and (b) government and public control of universities.
3. To recommend the appropriate instruments by which relations between universities and governments can be established that do justice to their responsibilities.

In discussing the mandate, Rowat says: "Almost anything to do with higher education falls into our terms of reference, so we have to set up priorities."

While Rowat is "impressed with the similarities of problems in education from province to province" it is doubtful simple description of them will do more than scratch the surface. CEGEP de Hull in Quebec is not Simon Fraser University in British Columbia.

Rowat admits he doesn't think he can study all problems in depth and seems to be more an academic chart maker than a social reformer.

The overwhelming mandate, however, is not the only thing which may render CRUG totally ineffective. CRUG co-commissioners have only until June 1969 to report and have had few briefs presented to them since they were appointed in May.

Letters requesting briefs went out this summer and set a deadline of Dec. 1, 1968. This was to allow Rowat and Hurtubise time to review the briefs before their planned three month tour of open hearings from January to March of next year. The deadline has now been extended to the end of December, in the face of summer slowdowns and general lack of information about CRUG.

Like a royal commission, CRUG hearings will be open to the public; unlike a royal commission, however, the CRUG report was not called for by any government agency and may, after being published, disappear.

While CRUG has a fair chunk of cash from Ford to operate on, Rowat said that most of this will go to pay the two commissioners and their staff of four, and the open hearing expenses. Rowat pointed out that the grant is relatively small when compared to the 7 million dollars already budgeted for the B & B commission and the 600 thousand dollars so far spent by the Royal Commission on the Status of Women.

We seldom measure successful projects in dollars and cents; it is only when they seemed doomed to failure that we wonder why.



Editorial

CUS — is the end near?

The Canadian Union of Students, after a frightful scare caused by wholesale withdrawals at their annual bull session this summer, came out of the meeting in pretty fair shape.

Threats to withdraw by such well-populated places as the universities of Manitoba, British Columbia, Victoria and Saskatchewan at Saskatoon failed to materialize. A number of lesser schools also remained solid with the union.

It was, after a sickening scare, a fine conclusion to a bad week for the likes of Peter Warrian, Martin Loney et al who lead CUS. Warrian is president and Loney, former Simon Fraser student president and acknowledged student power advocate, is president-elect and will take over as president next September.

And out of the CUS congress came resolution after resolution—dealing with numerous facets of society and university life. But the printer's ink was soaked mostly over the resolutions dealing with The Task—to organize the student masses into an anti-capitalists, anti-American, anti-fascist, anti-authoritarian, anti-imperialist, anti-administration movement.

This publicity has hurt them.

Loney laid it on the line when confronted with the media-CUS problem.

"One of the reasons (for the many prospective CUS referendums), is the treatment CUS has been getting from the media, particularly in eastern Canada. The impression the media has tried to give of CUS is that we are totally non-representative organization, which is irresponsibly urging students to more or less burn down their campuses. The press has tried very strongly to associate CUS with violence without ever substantiating their charges."

He said those universities withdrawing from CUS are victims of "genuine confusion" and "reflect a

lack of intellectual courage". He said the move to withdraw "is a call for a return to apathy".

Loney, an emotional and skillful speaker, said CUS "should be far stronger than it has ever been" by 1969.

It is difficult to follow this logic.

The media seems to have taken CUS by the scruff of the neck, bounced it to the floor and then retired to await the ten count. Right about now, we would say the count is at about, oh, six or so.

Already rejecting CUS in referendums held in the past two months are the Universities of Lethbridge, Windsor and Waterloo Lutheran. Even the CUS magazine can't publish because no one will advertise in it.

Now the former haven of student radicalism, Simon Fraser, will hold a referendum. The universities of Waterloo and Western Ontario will get into the act also. At last count, there were about 10 schools ready to put the word to the students.

CUS has about 29 members at the moment and if even half of the estimated 10 institutions put the boots to CUS, the battle will be over and Canadian student radicalism will get its first licking—on a national basis.

All quiet

No one in political science is talking. Dr. Christian Bay says one day he is all through and two days later he's back at the head chair and everyone appears happy.

But the faculty won't talk. The grad students won't talk. The undergrads don't know what to talk about. The apparent source of the problem is the department council. Grad students allegedly want parity with faculty. Sources say the didn't get it. So they withdrew—allegedly.