

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press

Winner N. A. M. MacKenzie Trophy 1963-64
Winner Ottawa Journal Trophy 1963-64

Editor-in-Chief - - - Branny Schepanovich

Managing Editor Bill Winship Associate Editor Dieter Buse
News Editor John Jay Barr Fine Arts Editor Bev Gietz
Sports Editor Barry Rust Cutlines Editor Jon Whyte
Copy Editor Susan Gathercole Proofreading L. R. Clendenning
Photo Editors Con Stenton, Heinz Moller, Kendel Rust

EDITORIAL—Alan Meech, Robin Hunter, David Willis, Paul Jensen, Mike Horrocks, Jim Foster, CUP editor, Adriana Albi. Party editors, Jerry Blake, Pat Quinn. Display editor, Beverly Bayer.

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Bill Salter, Wendy Caywood, Marion Raycheba, Okcana Chomlak, Ellen Jastrebski, Irving Goldfarb, Allan Bragg, Bobbin Deadly-Smythe, Dan Van der Sellaar, Clark Kent, Lawrence Samuel, Mike Horrocks, I. M. Flatte, Linda Strand, Don Sellar, Dave McLaughlin, Patricia Hughes et al, Violet Ralson, Petroinka, The Fish, Alabong, Bill Wincship, Vasyl Vasylevich Satnikov, Allan Shute, Veneta Augustynovich, Janis O'Kostash, Gerry Ohlsen, A. Kinsey and Kormlenie, Dave Estrin, Lord Bertrand Hunter, Pat Oona O'Rourke O'Rafferty O'Malley O'Mooney, Gary Klernan, Lois Lane, Almee Dechene, Chuck Copeman, Maid Marion, wife to Robin the Hood, Bev Bayer, Spayed Cooley, Jim McLaren, Basil Dean, "Stop-the-Press" Schepanovich, Dick McDowall, Adam Campbell, Russ Purdy, Fabius, Ralph Bat, Zachary T. Peabortus Winterbottom, Bentley Le Baron, Davy Jenkins, John Taylor, Joe Clark, and Reggie.

The Gateway is published twice weekly by the Students' Union of the University of Alberta. Opinions expressed by columnists are not necessarily those of the editors. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final Copy Deadline: for Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday; advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Circulation 7,000. Office phone—433-1155.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1964

Political Integrity

On a number of occasions this year there have been important and controversial issues arising in the student community. To name a few related ones, there was the still-existing residence rates dispute, a planned march on the legislature which fizzled, suppression of a critical pamphlet during Varsity Guest Weekend, and temporary confiscation of a special edition of The Gateway.

Some of the results after student agitation had been exerted in these areas were indeed favorable; others were totally disappointing.

The most disturbing fact is that in some instances of high pressure student leaders have failed to honor their obligations to those who have elected them as their leaders.

The main reason for the breach of duty, it appears, is that the leaders concerned have been in fear of jeopardizing their own personal relations with the administration or of undermining university and government support in an unrelated area.

Let us consider only the first situation—where the leader is anxious about his personal disposition—for this is where political integrity is at stake.

Basically, when a person is seeking to represent a group of persons, he pledges—either expressly or by implication—to stand up unequivocally for the rights of his electors.

Once elected, the leader who has

integrity must subordinate all personal considerations to the duty he has to fight strongly for the rights and betterment of his constituents. The duty is not only political, but moral.

The leader who breaches his duty in favor of personal considerations is not fit to act as a leader. His breach is indicative of a lack of integrity.

This past year, unfortunately, there have been cases where student leaders have failed to fulfill their obligations. If various issues had never arisen, there would have been no breach of duty, no uncovering of lack of integrity.

But the crises have come, and it is fortunate they have in that the test has been made. It is unfortunate in that some have failed the test.

Yet shouldn't a student consider his academic career and other personal factors? The answer, of course, is yes—but the consideration must be made and the conflict between personal and public obligations resolved before one assumes a task of leadership.

Once a person has decided to act as a leader, it is correctly assumed that his primary objective in matters concerning his constituents will be to represent them completely and positively, and personal repercussions must take second place.

If not, a person fails as a leader and must withdraw as such.

Two Main Issues Reviewed

Our publishing year has come to an end, and it is time to assess what we have done editorially.

One of our objectives has been to make students think more deeply on all matters which concern them directly or indirectly. In this respect, we can make no complete assessment of what the results have been, the reason being that total thought is a vast area, and costly research would be necessary to assess results in every field.

On the other hand, there have been — to our mind — two very important concrete issues involving practically every student.

The first of these has been Students' Union Building Expansion. During the entire year, we have been critical of the high total cost and lavish nature of the project in its present form. We have been specifically critical of such ideas as a SUB

interdenominational chapel — possibly to be built with student funds.

The second, and perhaps the most important, concrete issue this year has been the original, unjustified increase in residence rates for the new residences. We were especially anxious about the fact that the increase would mean a substantial boost in the average student's cost of living.

With regard to SUB Expansion, we were happy that a number of candidates and most of the electorate appeared to favor a more down-to-earth policy. There are many signs now that the new council has more critical views on expansion, and this is fortunate.

A good deal of student activity on various fronts has resulted in a small gain on the issue of residence rates. But we must not be content, for though some ground has been won in the fight for justice the battle is not yet over.



"ROGUES' GALLERY 1964"

After Midnight

Another Gateway regime has completed its course, and the time has come for me to say good-bye as editor. A new man is waiting to take the office.

As I begin to sever the ties that I have made with Gateway over four years, and as our final edition goes to press, the feeling comes to me that my time with The Gateway has been fast and eventful. And the reason for this, I believe, is that The Gateway is a very dynamic human institution—where many decisions must be made, deadlines met regularly.

Looking back, I can well remember many conflicts and disputes involving myself and the paper, but on the whole the memories that come to mind are those that give me pride and deep satisfaction when thinking of The Gateway and the people that made it. And although my year as editor has been the climactic one, the other years are as memorable.

I will remember the excellent staffers who worked with me, the various characters I met at CUP conferences, the people who hated me, the ones that supported me when the time came to stand up and be counted.

There were the clashes over SUB Expansion and residence rates. The confiscation of our special edition. The vain attempts to remove me as editor. And the staff that would have resigned in support of me.

This past year was definitely the most exciting. As I said in a report, this is without doubt the most controversial year for The Gateway since Joe Clark was at the controls. I'll always remember the editorial which was written and published in anticipation of a demonstration that never happened. Such are some of the gambles.

There was the first press-night, when Bill Winship and I were up all night preparing the paper for the presses. And there were all the other late press nights — and the eight o'clock classes the morning after.

The people I met were most interesting. There were the whiners, the ones who will always whine and will never be satisfied with what another does. And there were those who suffered unjustly through our errors, and understood.

I will remember and always appreciate the dedicated staffers who came through with the effort that won trophies, and they had the spirit that made it all fun. And the group at the print shop, who always cooperated.

And I will always be thankful to the fellows in my wing in Athabasca Hall who hammered on my door to make sure I got to my eight o'clock class after press-night.

There was the time when Provost Ryan came into the Athabasca dining room at lunchtime, unannounced, and tore into The Gateway. And I'll remember my rebuttal—also unannounced, also at lunchtime.

There were the editors I worked with who came before me—Bentley Le Baron, Dave Jenkins, John Taylor. All good men, all with different ideas on how to run a paper.

And the critics. Omayal Karmy. Don Wells. Henry Beissel. And others.

But another regime is taking shape. This year I enjoyed—nay, lived—The Gateway as an "insider." I hope that you enjoyed it as an "outsider"—as a reader.

And now I must say good-bye.

Branny Schepanovich

Looking Back through The Gateway

January 22, 1960,

In the spring of this year Assiniboia, originally built in 1912, will be torn down to make way for a new Education building. . . . The end of Assiniboia will see the beginning of six new men's residences likely to cost more than \$7,500,000.