

# Gateway

Volume LXV, Number 14.  
October 17, 1974.

Published bi-weekly by the University of Alberta Students' Union, in the Gateway offices, Room 282, Students' Union Building.

## SENIOR EDITORS

Editor-in-chief: Bernie Fritze  
News Editor: Greg Neiman  
Arts Editor: Harold Kuckertz  
Sports Editor: Paul Cadogan  
Photography Editor: Morrie Eaman

## STAFF



## CIRCULATION

Circulation 18,000. The Gateway publishes on Tuesday and Thursday during the Fall and Winter Session. It is distributed to the students and to the academic and non-academic staff on campus.

Subscription rates: 54 issues, \$7.00  
Circulation Manager: Jim Hagerty

## PRODUCTION

Ad make-up, layout, and typesetting done by Student Media, University of Alberta, Room 232-4, Students' Union Building.

Production Manager: Loreen Lennon  
Typesetter: Margriet Tilroe-West

## ADVERTISING

No mats accepted. National and local advertising \$28 per page line.

Classified ad rate \$1.00 per issue. All classified ads must be prepaid.

Advertising Manager: Lorne Holladay  
432-4241

## FOOTNOTES

Publicizes campus events or those of interest to students, without charge. Footnotes forms available at the Gateway office and should be submitted before 2 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays.

Footnotes Editor: Cathy Zlatnik

## LETTERS

Submit all letters, typed and double spaced to the Editor, who reserves the right to edit the copy. Regular copy deadlines apply.

Editorial comments are the opinion of the writer, not necessarily that of The Gateway.

## GRAPHICS

Submit all graphics and cartoons, by copy deadlines to:

Graphics Editor: Gary Kirk

## COPY DEADLINES

Monday noon for the Tuesday edition, Wednesday noon for the Thursday edition.

## TELEPHONES

Editor's office  
432-5178  
All departments  
432-5168  
432-5750  
Student Media  
432-3423

The Gateway is a member of the Intercollegiate Press and The Earth News Service.



# NUS. CONDITIONAL OKAY

As a delegate representing *The Gateway* and the University of Alberta Students' Union at the National Union of Students conference, I make the following recommendations at the students of U of A, and to the Students' Council.

As non-members of NUS who have a strong interest in a national union of post-secondary institutions across Canada, it is with regret that I recommend we NOT join NUS at this time.

The Saskatoon conference was seen as the turning point by the Central Committee of NUS that would determine the immediate future of the union.

More specifically, it was felt that unless the proposed member-institution fees were increased from \$.30 per student to \$1.00 per student, NUS would not have a sufficient financial base to continue its operation.

The fee increase was approved by the voting members, and comes into effect September 1974. Ironically, this creates another problem that also could result in the demise of NUS; if the present member institutions fail in their referendums to ratify the increase, the NUS is no farther ahead than it was at \$.30 per student.

The fee increase is justified if and only if a number of changes are instituted by the NUS Central Committee.

These changes are imperative and must be initiated immediately if the U of A's membership is desired in NUS.

1. A financial audit of the NUS is non-existent. I feel that without an audit to show where all previous monies have been spent, and without the professional advice of a chartered accountant to help guide NUS through a period of limited finances, there is insufficient justification for raising the fees to member institutions.

Some members voiced fears that their respective Councils would not accept the fee increase. These fears might well be unfounded if the delegates could return to those Councils with an audit that would clarify the credibility of NUS.

And further, does NUS feel it can promote new members to join without first providing proper documentation as to its financial solvency?

2. As the Saskatoon conference progressed, it became apparent that personal differences between provincial caucus reps, Central Committee members, and NUS staff workers were hindering the direction in which the conference was moving.

A lack of strong leadership, coupled with unclear responsibilities of the Central Committee in relation to its staff indicated a serious lack of professionalism that is vital to the continued existence of NUS.

Leadership and a higher degree of professionalism will do much to promote NUS on non-member campuses, and this in turn will give NUS a larger base in Canada, and more resources with which to finance their operation.

3. The proposed NUS policies deserve full endorsement because they will, if enacted, provide needed and tangible aid to all students in Canada.

Unfortunately, not enough direction regarding the implementation of the policies was discussed in Saskatoon.

NUS suffers as a credible lobby group simply because too much emphasis is put on semantic arguments, and not enough emphasis is put on the pragmatic approach to their campaigns. If NUS is unable to approach the government with a realistic attitude, the student aid lobby will fail before it begins.

Because there exists a need for a union of students on the national level, and because the NUS does not actively campaign on the U of A campus, and because there is a need to gain popular support on all campuses in Canada, I recommend that Students' Council investigate the

possibility of establishing an NUS office on campus. The cost of maintaining an office with telephone, typewriter, and stationary is minimal in light of the potential reward

that a strong union could provide our students. An NUS office would also provide our campus with a direct link to the provincial organization, thus allowing for the possibility of added student input from a non-member institution.

I also recommend that Council investigate the possibility of hosting the Conference on Women Students. Because of serious space limitations and inadequate facilities available to NUS, the U of A is in a position to provide its services in support of this cause.

In closing, I strongly recommend that the U of A Students' Union maintain its liaison with NUS, and attempt to increase student awareness with both NUS, and the policies it stands for.

I feel confident that any positive directions taken by NUS will result in a strong movement by U of A students to support NUS.

Bernie Fritze.

## letters

### Whom? or What?

Abortion: Of course I'm against it. From the evidence of what we know now about foetal development, abortion is obviously murder. I won't take time to go into it here: detailed discussion already exists in the literature of the various right-to-life groups.

But let's look at some pro-abortion arguments.

1) "No one is forcing people to have abortions if they don't want to. We respect people's freedom of choice. Why don't you? You have a right to your own personal beliefs, but so do we."

In the America of the first half of the 19th Century, no one was being forced to own slaves. Persons who felt that the ownership of slaves was wrong had the freedom not to do so if they wished. In fact, whole

states had outlawed slave ownership within their borders. But, they were still forced (by the American Constitution!) to return runaway slaves from other states, of course.

However, a small but vocal minority weren't satisfied with this. They seemed to want to impose their views about slavery on other people. This denial of the individual's freedom of choice so frightened the people living south of the "Mason-Dixon" line, that they eventually felt compelled to try to secede from their own country.

They failed. The small minority was right. Some say that objective science cannot decide moral issues. Opinion doesn't matter. Fact is what makes the universe tick.

2) "Anti-abortion activists keep talking about the rights of the foetus: the blastocyst, even, early enough in pregnancy. But, they never say anything about the rights of the mother."

Everybody has rights. I have a right to decent bus service. But, if I had threatened to bomb the homes of a few bus drivers during that bus strike we had



If a pregnant woman is deliberately injured, or accidentally injured during the commission of a felony, that is also murder one, if the injury causes a miscarriage.

Everybody has rights. Some rights take precedence over others. Those who favor abortion are choosing the wrong rights.

Not directly related to the abortion controversy, but closely connected to it, are the controversial living-foetus experiments being performed in several countries.

Since the doctors performing these experiments do not seem willing, for "moral" reasons, to make an all-out effort to save the foetus, but, instead, kill him or her long before the law can touch them for killing him or her, I do not hesitate to describe the current crop of experimenters in this field as murderers.

However, if every attempt was made to preserve the life of the foetus for as long as possible, there would cease to exist any moral stigma connected to these experiments, even if, for a time, they were doomed to failure.

last year - why, everyone would be talking about their rights to life! Nobody would worry about MY right to decent bus service at all! Especially not the arresting officers.

Abortion is justified in some cases. In cases of rape, abortion should be available. If it is determined that the woman was made pregnant as a result of the rape, the rapist get a murder one rap.