

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

associate editor..... Brian Olafson  
managing editor..... Ron Yakimchuk  
news editor..... Alex Ingram

sports editor..... Bill Kankewitt  
casserole..... Elaine Verbicky  
photo editor..... Chuck Lyall

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—With everyone but the SUB phantom back (he is still in B.C. chasing Ogopogo), the place is really bustling. Here for our first press night, and to hear the ever loving' Eskis in action, were Terri Moore, Dennis Sylvester Fitzgerald, Gail Evasiuk, Brian Campbell (fresh from Berkeley), Bob Povaschuk, Bob (cowtown) Bragg, Jim Muller, Chuck Lyall, Glenn Cheriton, Leona Gom, Great White Father, George Russell (on loan from the Gauntlet in Calgary), Judy Samoil, John Thompson, and yours truly, ready for the Gateway freshie project, Harvey Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for 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. Offices 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

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1968

## Editorial

### The memorandum . . .

President Johns' unique memorandum on student conduct is truly a piece of literature. Not only does it give a vague outline of what is not happening at this university, but it also seems to suggest that in the event of any action by any group or by any individual which is termed improper, "prompt and decisive action" will be taken.

Whoever is going to enforce the cursus honorum will have a lot of room in which to work. Improper conduct can be anything from picking your nose in the washroom to slurping soup in the cafeteria. In this case, someone could apprehend you, haul you off to the enforcers who are, the memorandum suggests, committees such as the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement and you will be suitably punished.

DIE hardly rate the term "decisive action." DIE has been noted as a playground for law students and its harsh sentences could go far as forbidding a law-breaker as visit to the Students' Union Building for one week. They could even levy a monetary fine. Sometimes these are paid.

We believe the edict has far greater significance. We believe believe someone is afraid a minority group are going to take over the university and run it the way the present administrators do not approve.

"Decisive action" would mean calling the cops—not the campus patrol, but the real professionals.

Unfortunately, President Johns makes no bones about whom he sus-

pects if such action occurs. He specifically mentions a group called SDU (Students for a Democratic University) which have been active in making things a bit uncomfortable for some people who have much to say about what happens at this university.

The SDU were the primary force in organizing the march on legislature last March, have openly and publicly confronted the executive of the students union, have added an air of excitement to the campus. Finally, this university has some active dissent.

The edict suggests groups such as the SDU have no place here. They disrupt the functioning of the university which is the centre of learning, etc.

It suggests the university is a place for discussion as well as the search for truth and knowledge and blah, blah, blah.

When one group cannot voice their opinion without someone thinking they are going to start a full scale revolution, we are living in the wrong world.

And when adults who have completed high school cannot come to the university without facing a list of 'does' and don'ts' and be threatened with expulsion if they don't conform, then something is desperately wrong with the entire system—for the majority and the minority.

This is especially true of an edict which is not representative of the situation but also has inadequate means to enforce what it suggests may be happening.

### To frosh . . .

You are getting the first look at what appears to be a wonderful place. The buildings are nice and spacious and clean, everybody pays attention to you because you wear all kinds of badges, and there is lots of social activity such as dances, lunches, etc.

In a while, you will be shocked out of this dream-like existence. You will find that everything is not so great. The memorandum on student conduct is a good example. Mid-term exams are another. Christmas exams are yet another, though these last two are not nearly so fatal as the memorandum.

You will be disappointed to dis-

cover that you get bad lecturers, teachers, and instructors here just as you did in high school. You will find that some profs take attendance which means you are not yet mature enough to decide if you should go to class or not.

You will find that you are not treated as an adult though some profs have the insight to suggest you can think for yourself.

In this factory, there is only one way—work. Tolerate what must be tolerated. But work. And we'll see you for the whole year, not half of it.

Many won't be back after Christmas because the failure rate here for frosh is alarmingly high.



He says it's the dean's idea!

## CUS-ed at the congress

By RICH VIVONE

I see by the newspapers that the Canadian Union Students is not getting fair play in this city. By fair play, I mean at least two points of view should be expressed and both given equal space and on the same page. If one side of a story reaches the front, at least a part of the rebuttal should get there also.

Last Thursday, after returning from the CUS congress at Guelph, I was not really surprised to learn that the congress got very little play of any kind here. Apparently, news media considered it not too significant.

The next day however, I read in a front page story where Marilyn Pilkington, president of the students' union of this university, was highly disturbed about events at the congress. She attended it along with David Leadbeater, vice-president; Rolly Loing, law rep on council, and myself.

The story said Miss Pilkington was "threatened" etc. and was forced to leave before the congress concluded.

There is another side to that story. This is how it goes.

From the first day, it was obvious we were not looked upon with favor by most delegates of the 40 universities represented. The general impression I got was "what are you people doing here? You dropped out in 1966 and have no business here."

To my knowledge and to Loing and Leadbeater also, no one bothered Marilyn Pilkington in the first days of the congress. But on Friday, Aug. 30, she decided she wanted to talk at a plenary session. A report of the atmosphere at that plenary is printed on page six.

She asked permission to speak but the Simon Fraser, Toronto, and Regina delegates hooted her. Despite this, the congress gave her permission.

Throughout her 14-minute speech, she was interrupted 17 times. These were in the form of points of information, points of

order, and healthy heckling. Most of it came from the delegates mentioned above.

The essence of her speech was that CUS had no right to make decisions for students on matters which do not directly concern students. This was the stand Alberta took when they withdrew in 1966.

After the plenary which finished about midnight, most delegates went to sleep in the residence at the University of Guelph where all delegates were housed.

Late the next afternoon, I was having supper with John Zozirny, president of Alberta Association of Students. Marilyn Pilkington came over to me and asked if I heard what happened last night. When I pleaded ignorance, she gave me this account.

About 3 or 4 a.m., she was awakened by a loud pounding on her door. Apparently, there were some delegates banging on her door and shouting "obscenities". They kept it up for a short time and then went elsewhere. She said she recognized some of the voices.

The next night, the same occurred. All this time, these people were also running up and down the halls singing "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh" and "Solidarity forever, for the union makes us strong". They even took their entertainment to the courtyard outside. Most delegates let them have their fun because, though loud, they weren't hurting anyone.

When Miss Pilkington was disturbed one other morning, I advised her that because Leadbeater and I were leaving the congress Tuesday, I thought she ought to leave also. My reason for suggesting this to her were that Tuesday was the last day of the congress and the celebrations are usually quite vigorous after a seven-day affair.

I suggested "anything could happen" on a night like that and in view of what had occurred earlier, there was little doubt she would not be ignored by delegates.

After that conversation, I left the congress and she left the same afternoon.

## Dedication . . .

The Gateway begins this year in a sad atmosphere. Last summer, a former editor, Bill Miller died. He was well-known with all the present staff members and was to be the advertising manager for this term.

Bill was Gateway editor in the 1967-68 term and was a student here for four years.

To Bill Miller, we dedicate the first issue of the new term.