

Wake Up B of G?

To The Editor:

I am led to believe that the reason for the slow progress of the final approval of the new Students' Union Building is mainly due to the University Board of Governors and to a very ineffective Student Council. If there is going to be something done let's do it.

Students are continually protesting a diversity of grievances. After three years of planning are we going to build a New Students' Union Building? Is it time to wake up these senile old men of the Board of Governors over their lack of action on students' wishes and their planned new building?

If we as students require some action by the Board of Governors must we always wait three years for our planning to be realized? If we want a new Students' Union Building let's make our demands known. The Board of Governors have played with this project long enough and I'm sure that every student joins with me in urging all associated bodies involved in the new Students' Union Building to get off their . . . and begin to dig, especially the Board of Governors who's final approval is required.

Lastly, I would ask what is the crusading Gateway doing in pushing for the completion of this project? The Voice of the Students should surely be supporting a cry for decisions.

Apathy in General.

Friends Challenged

To The Editor:

In public speaking there are three things that a speaker can accomplish: he can present a set of facts or describe a situation and give a closely reasoned analysis thereof; he can present original, challenging ideas regarding the origin and solution of a problem; or he can inspire his audience. Prolonged experience with professors, conference speakers, and clergymen has convinced me that the third of these alternatives is by far the easiest to accomplish; it is certainly the one most often attempted. Only a rare speaker can accomplish either of the first two alternatives, and only an extraordinary speaker can accomplish all three.

Judging by the audience reaction to Dr. Wilder Penfield Oct. 5, he chose the easiest of the alternatives, although, I can't really pass a personal opinion here: I wasn't even inspired. Dr. Penfield presented very few facts on the problem of disunity in Canada, thus of course precluding any analysis of the situation. Neither did he seem to have very many imaginative ideas regarding the origin of the problem or its solution.

The general theory upon which the Friends of the University choose speakers for the annual Henry Marshall Tory Lectures could be stated approximately as follows: we have been given a great deal of money to spend (up to \$1,000 per speaker), so once a year, we may as well use it to

grace the sticks of northern Alberta with the most eminent scholar we can find, regardless of whether said scholar can also discourse intelligibly on given topic. The validity of this theory is borne out by the last four Tory speakers. The corollary of this theory that applies to the case of Dr. Penfield would be: any well-educated denizen of Canada's melting pot, Montreal Island--even if his education has been in the field of brain surgery--is qualified to speak to a large, select audience on the problem of French-English relations. If the Friends of the University wanted to bring in Dr. Penfield, they should have insisted that he speak on a topic which he has spent most of his life studying, i.e. some aspect of neurology. If the Friends of the University wanted somebody to speak on French-English relations, they should

have chosen an expert in that field.

May I in summary make two very general suggestions to the Friends of the University as to improving the quality of these lectures?

1. Choose speakers not so much on their personal fame or eminence in a given area, but on their ability to discourse intelligibly on their specialty.

2. Have speakers actually speak on the areas on which they really are experts.

Henry Rempel,
Arts 4.

All Glass SUB?

To The Editor:

I'm hoping the new Students' Union Building is not going to be another "New Education" Building or Cameron Library, but now that SUB Expansion planning is in its final stages I'm becoming increasingly apprehensive. Richards, Berretti and Jellinek very openly stand

for modernity and have indicated that our new SUB could and should clash with the rest of the campus. Perhaps they're still thinking of an all-windows structure such as was considered earlier this year.

Personally I don't see anything so nauseous about red brick, I like ivy-covered buildings on campus, and I think a warm 'n

cosy collegiate atmosphere is preferable to stark futurity.

As we're going to have to live with this building for some time to come, I think we all ought to start thinking about what we want in this regard. Does the majority want a futuristic building, a traditional one . . . or couldn't it matter less?

Cherylyn Smith.

Les McLeod Under the Gavel

You read in this column's first edition that I enjoy attending council meetings. But some are less enjoyable than others. Such was the last meeting.

Perhaps councillors were having a bad night, or perhaps it

was the absence of most of the body's parliamentarians — but whatever the reason, there is no excuse for spending an hour in deciding whether the Union should buy its Christmas cards from the bookstore or have them separately designed. Council even spent some time on the relative merits of having a snowy picture on the cards as opposed to the extremely summery photo adorning the bookstore version.

You'll remember that council passed a motion to reinstate the President of Men's and Women's athletics as full voting members.

This issue isn't a new one. They were displaced from their seats two years ago and relegated to the Director's Circle. The debate then was even more hot-and-heavy, due to the natural reluctance of the members concerned to give up their positions.

The reasons for their eviction were several. The idea first came about as a result of one of the ever-present council re-organization drives. It was thought the creation of a Director's Circle, to sit with council with limited speaking and no voting privileges, would make for a smaller, therefore more efficient, council.

Members of the Director's Circle were to be all important Students' Union organizations. It was to function as an advisory board and communications organ for Council. Well, it was established but it never did work.

In support of the removal, it was claimed that athletic reps, while elected by students at large, did not really represent students in the same way councillors supposedly did, e.g.: they didn't represent a group of students to whom they could refer and report. They represented instead the special interest of some students-athletes.

The status-quoers had an answer for this: the athletic reps are different, they have a hand in spending the seven dollars of our union fee that automatically go to the University Athletic Board, and thus they should be in communication with and responsible to, Council.

Quickly came the answer: communication and responsibility are possible through a Director's Circle. And side issues entered too. It was proposed that if council deposed the athletic reps, why shouldn't the Wauneita rep, the CUS rep, and the Gateway rep also go? CUS and Gateway put up a good enough case for staying but Wauneita's council status was saved more by a timely motion to table than by any logical appeal.

This is the history behind council's decision, and there are new factors: Namely, more communication difficulties between council and UAB—aggravated as usual by UAB's allotment of 7 dollars per student.

So, the sports types will be back on council. Is it a wise move?

University Students

Earning More, But Learning Less

The following article is reprinted from the *Toronto Telegram*. It was written by Gary Gottlieb, a third-year university of Toronto student.

Each year when a new wave of freshly-scrubbed freshmen floods the college campus, I have no illusions as to why most of them have come. The reason is green and bears a picture of the Queen.

Ever since they first asked their parents for a dime to buy an ice cream cone, these students have been exhorted to stay in school by parents and educators, and always, always, were they presented with the same argument. Stay in school and you'll make more money.

Not that parents and public officials were always as frank and forthright as all that. In their usual obtuse and pontificating manner they beat around the bush with such sonorous statements as "Don't join the ranks of the unemployed," and "Continuing education essential." Granted, all this may be true, but never once did they stress education for its own sake, and never once did they ever attempt to implant the idea that learning in itself can be satisfying and worthwhile.

It should not then be particularly shocking to find that most of my fellow students are attending university for the sole purpose of obtaining a pot of gold at the end, and in so doing are gaining nothing of any real worth from the academic environment to which they are exposed. They may come out as good doctors, good lawyers, and good engineers. But they do not come out good men. They are merely skilled technicians.

MAIN MOTIVATION

They may contribute to the maintenance of society, but these types of professionals contribute little, if anything, to its growth. If perchance they do, it is for the financial remuneration, rather than the satisfaction within, the satisfaction that comes from having done something worthwhile for one's fellow man.

Money has become the main motivation for students entering college, and each year more and more mediocre students clamor at the doors and squeeze their way in. That money is their primary interest in attending university is evidenced by the paucity of students who choose to become teachers, nurses, social workers, and researchers. And the

ever increasing demand for sociologists and psychologists continues to go unfilled, as does the need for pupils in the other social sciences, and in the humanities as well.

That university education is being given a hard sell is frightfully obvious, but it is not simply a matter of education being oversold. Higher education is being undermined, robbed of its very essence, because the wrong things are continually being stressed. The real values of a university education are being stomped underfoot in the mad scramble to obtain a degree.

SAFEST, SUREST

A university education cannot open up closed minds, but it can fill up empty ones. A university education cannot do away with wilful ignorance, but it can remove shallowness of thought and enlarge one's horizons. A university education cannot make wise men of fools, but it can edify and improve those with the required capabilities and abilities who are prepared to make the necessary intellectual investment.

But these true values of a college education have been all but disregarded by the majority of my fellow students. The attitude that prevails is that a college education is the surest and safest way to reach material prosperity in the road ahead. This attitude is readily perceivable in the characteristic traits of today's college graduates.

University graduates, for the most part, inflate themselves with self-importance, and wallow in their own conceit. The humility that comes with a true education is unknown to them. Interested only in themselves, the problems of others matter little. The age of humanitarianism has in their eyes disappeared, and those handful of graduate students who serve a few years in underdeveloped countries are looked upon as dreamy idealists and foolish do-gooders.

Surely it is time we realized that the financial reward of a higher education has been stressed long enough. How long must we persist before we see our folly?

Education is not something to be oversold or undersold. It is something that is above the stock and trade of the busy marketplace.

Until we recognize this, and begin to value a college education not in dollars, but in sense, we cannot begin to face, let alone solve, the problems besetting the world today.

Notice

All planning for the new Students' Union Building will be completed on Oct. 20th. Anyone wishing to make submissions that might change the basic design must do so before this date.

J. A. Brook, Chairman.
S.U.P.C.