

Apathy turns to wrath and beaucoup de lettres



You had no right!

I'd like to express my disgust at the ill-considered, ill-timed and malexecuted methods employed by students' council to deprive 18,000 people of a service we understood council was contracting to provide to the student body when they collected our students' union fees. I am referring to council's Monday night decision to cease publication of the Evergreen and Gold.

There may well be other services, such as day care centres, which are vitally needed on campus, Mr. Leadbeater. It may well be that the yearbook is meaningless to the majority of students.

But whatever the merits or lack of them of the Evergreen and Gold, they have no bearing on the undemocratic manner your council adopted to abolish the book. Many Canadian universities stopped publishing yearbooks last year—but they all held referendums first, to make sure the students were willing to release their students' councils from the contractual obligation of providing a promised service. Our council did not consult the student body. I cannot recall any member of council or the executive who ran for election on a platform of abolishing the Evergreen and Gold, so no one on council can say he was electorally mandated to do so.

The move was ill-considered for many reasons. Council did not inform the yearbook editor that they would debate the merits of the yearbook, consequently deciding an issue without hearing the views of the most closely concerned person. They chopped Evergreen and Gold from their budget months after the budget had been drawn up, months after the yearbook staff had swung into plans for publication, weeks after many graduating students had paid two dollars to Goetz Studios for a yearbook photograph. They chopped it in a rather belated effort to establish "priorities" in spending—something a well-directed council would have done before all else, before planning any program or service.

One begins to wonder if council has been spending money without considering the implications of their expenses; if councillors suddenly realized they would be un-

able to carry out all they had wished, or had promised, to accomplish this year; if they wildly looked around for funds; if they decided to kill the yearbook for other than qualitative reasons. Why else would council wait so long, cause the yearbook staff, its printers and this year's graduates so much inconvenience, and generally make themselves look silly? If they killed the yearbook because it was irrelevant, then they are five months late in doing it and therefore irresponsible. If they killed it to hastily rebalance a budget, then they are again irresponsible, in breach of contract, and in breach of the ethics of democracy.

Another unsavoury element of the proceedings is the precedent council has set in the area of students' union publications. If we do not question council's decision to cease publication of the Evergreen and Gold without a previous referendum, students' councils may someday do the same for The Gateway, the Telephone Directory, or the Student Handbook. Previous councils have come close to doing the same thing to Inside, the union's literary magazine.

By the way, what's happening to Inside this year?

Surely our communications mechanisms are all that form a common link in the huge, atomized "community" of U of A. I don't think any council, even though representatively elected, has the right to deal as arbitrarily with such a vital area as has the present council. "The students' union" is a broader thing than "students' council" in this instance; and it is the students' union which publishes its own communications.

The issue is much broader than whether we want a yearbook. The issue is whether we can tolerate such a significantly undemocratic, unethical method of handling the communications system of our university. I would urge everyone to protest to their faculty reps, and directly to David Leadbeater, the irresponsible action of council.

That was a real dumb way to get hold of \$44,000, David.

Elaine Verbicky
arts 4

Base your actions on principles of reality

I am supposed to write a rational, intelligent article on why I support the deletion of the Evergreen and Gold. Why I was last year's editor (Surprise! I imagine most of you didn't know that yet you do really want a yearbook don't you? And you are interested—quick now—who is this year's editor?). I'm now voting to have it discontinued. You may say I've had my cake and eaten it too, or perhaps, though how strange and unreal it would seem, I have been re-educated, and realize the new priorities which have been established. Not day care centres, but SUB expansion, education forums, housing are more important. Maybe not important to just selfish little-old-me, because right now I happen to think that I know why day care centres are necessary social institutions—and if it's just services you are concerned with

the number using the day care will give it top priority.

But back to yearbook—as that seems to be the word of the day—which all of us now, after 40 odd years of having it around (aside from a few war years when things were really tough) have incorporated into our vocabulary and decide we shall vocalize, verbalize, shout, write, petition, sing about.

Why? Think before you answer and don't give me any of the trite, wishy-washy reasons that have been tossed forth—

Because—I argued every one of them last year when I wanted to keep the yearbook.

But—I argued selectively—because I wanted only graduate pictures in the yearbook and that is what the famous referendum was about—

And if you recall, it was a very well worded political referendum—because the students' union could not afford to put undergraduate pictures in the yearbook.

I still wanted a yearbook with graduate pictures only, because I was the editor, and I wanted to change Evergreen and Gold, and make it different and better—I wanted it for me—my empire.

The survey at the end of the year "supported" this—if you call 3,350 out of 14,000 support. Of the 3,350 questionnaires, 92 per cent favored a yearbook, only 78 per cent in the present form.

Do you know the form the yearbook is taking this year? Have you talked to the editor about it? Have you seen Saskatchewan's last

Both sides now

Why did The Gateway (Oct. 23) print letters only of disagreement concerning student council's decisions towards the "Evergreen and Gold"? Granted, dissent is an objective of a newspaper, but it is not the only objective. In order to serve a "democratic" and unbiased role, it must regard all sides of an issue. I am certain that someone has an opinion to express in favor of council's actions. Again I ask why eight letters of disagreement were selected and not a single line was devoted in favor of the decision.

Come on, Mr. Scarth and The Gateway team, pull up your pants before somebody notices.

Garry Chmara
ed 1

Editor's note—Fasten your belt buckle Mr. Chmara, there weren't any.

E&G functions

Mr. Leadbeater and council conjure up memories of Big Brother with their high-handed axing of E&G and their subsequent attempts to pacify us with the implication that the day care centres are in our better interests. Give us credit, Dave, for the ability to understand the impact of a yearbook and allow us to decide our own better interests.

An in-depth yearbook could successfully fulfill campus needs:

- to record, evaluate, and perhaps pass judgment on the year's problems and activities so that we may be informed and haunted by our actions.

- to serve as an annual report to the student shareholders of the dehumanized, bureaucratic students' union. And it is in our best interests that these needs be filled.

By introducing the projected \$44,000 "deficit" students' council appears to be building a dubious basis upon which to beg their moral obligations. During budgeting and subsequent fee assessment, a levy (\$3.15) was allocated to yearbook production. It would seem that by accepting fees on the basis of this intended budget students' council is morally obligated to provide a yearbook.

And, after all, it is in our better interests.

Neil Driscoll
B.Sc. '69
Al Yackulic
G.S.

A question of priorities

Some members of council don't seem to have very logical reasons for dropping the Evergreen and Gold. Secretary Wendy Brown says "the prime problem is that students are just not interested, only 12 to 15 people are putting out a yearbook for 18,000. I suppose this means that The Gateway should be axed too as only around eight to ten people are putting out a newspaper for 18,000."

David Leadbeater's feelings are that there are more pertinent areas for yearbook money to be spent, such as educative programs and day care centres.

Of course we need to hire an educating worker whose job it is to organize and plan forums, panels and debates.

The enthusiasm for this sort of thing is unlimited. The fantastic number of 40 students attended the panel discussion on labor, Tuesday. We need more of this.

We also want a woman social worker to educate women and make birth control and abortion information necessary. It doesn't matter that abortion is illegal. All that matters is that there is a long line-up waiting for abortions. Vive abortion, down with beauty contests.

Why doesn't the council get off their cloud and face reality? The majority of students want services.

If Mr. Leadbeater feels frustrated, how does he imagine the student body feels? They don't want to be indoctrinated with some person's (persons') propaganda, e. g., Mr. Leadbeater in Wednesday's issue of The Gateway: "intelligent reaction from the student body on this matter (the tenure system) would necessitate a thorough educative program."

Ha! What next?
Brainwashing?

Gordon Braun
eng 1

yearbook? (it was tubed). I suggest before you glorify your image of what the yearbook will be, that you talk to the editor and ask for his editorial policy.

Did you really look at last year's yearbook? How was it different from 1968-67-66? Did you know that five faculties print their own yearbooks—three on their own paper?

Now in that sacred document SC69.133, I made the suggestion the council consider the future of the yearbook. I also spent two pages of a three and a half page document stating that the personnel board needed assistance (not financial but human) if the students' union was to continue providing some of its "services." (i.e. Senior Grad, Awards, Course Guide, GFC representation), services which students demand because they have paid student union fees.

Do you realize—yes this is going to require rational, cool headed, unemotional mathematical consideration so if you cannot, stop reading and continue ranting and raving—

- That of the \$260,000 (plus \$10,000 interest) administration—the actual running of that "service" station called SUB, including debt retirement — net expense: \$142,810.

- Publications—by far the next most important item if we are to look at this by priorities: net expense \$88,550 (including The Gateway).

- Which really isn't bad, until you realize it's last—and contains all the other "services" that are so vital to students—approximate net expense \$30,645.

Is this how you want your money spent?

What about . . .

- SUB expansion—because we could hardly classify it as administration, and it's not really a publication. It would be priority number four.

- What about housing — this lovely little complex for 112 Street to house students cheaply (\$40-60 per month) in a nice apartment with handy little stores underneath—stores in which we all pay cash and which in turn pay rent (rent: cash) to the students' union—we might even break even????

- Parking—you obviously don't care at all, because this hasn't even been raised.

- Students' assistance—did you get your loan this year—or didn't you work this summer?

And finally what about your education—and I don't mean your degree—what else are you learning at university—bridge, judo, the 96 positions, etc.—

You aren't developing a social consciousness though, and perhaps you don't really give a damn—because you are selfish, greedy, and just want, want, want, for me, me, me!

Well, I too wanted, wanted, wanted, for me, me, me, and I got a nice little award too—a nice yearbook and a Gold Key—(sprayed dull to lessen the glare).

But now I want more, but I don't want for me, I want for you—I want you to think, I want you to read, I want you to shut up until you have, because until you have you don't know anything—You only know something went wrong—but why? Talk to your reps.

Be responsible—base your actions on the reality principle instead of the pleasure principle, and follow through the verbalization with planned commitment.

Wendy Brown
sec. students' union