

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief Al Scarth

managing editor Dan Carroll sports editor Joe Czajkowski

news editor Judy Samoil

STAFF THIS ISSUE—And furthermore, there is still hope for us all. The hopeful were Marion Snethlage (from across the hall), Ann Beckman (who was detained in the editor's office while we dummied in page one) Barry Carter, Pat Kostyla (dragged off screaming by B. S. "Pool Cue" Bayer), Dorothy long-arm-of-the-constable, Jim (tries to) Carter (away), Nilson and Winteringham (two are Beth-er than one), Terry Pettit (still blowing around) Elsie Ross (not to be confused with Betsy), Yolanto Kononowicz (sex-y blond), Able Trinton, A.B. (from humble beginnings and a frothy Stein) Ron Dutton, Brian MacDonald, Steve Makris, Brian Campbell (emerged from the cave at his fire-breathing best) and a slight singed Harvey G. 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—6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Thursday prior; for Thursday edition—6 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Monday prior; for Friday edition—10 a.m., Thursday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior; Casserole—copy deadline 6 p.m. Monday, advertising—noon Friday prior. Advertising manager Percy Wickman, 432-4241. Office phones 432-4321, 432-4322 and 432-4329. Circulation—15,000; Circulation manager Brian MacDonald, 432-4321.

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

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1969

Editorials

Less work, more pay?

For most people, the less they work, the less they get paid.

But one select group of people in this community and society have come upon a much more profitable ethic: the less they work, the more they get paid.

Yes, the lawyers will say using their services even for a simple divorce case is just common-sense insurance.

What is the sense in taking a chance, they say. The case might get bogged down, complications might arise, you might have to spend more in court fees than on a lawyer if you have to go back several times, you might lose your cool in court and the case too.

The only thing they forget to tell you is that in insurance terms, their premium for a broken leg is higher than the charge for their double-indemnity life policy.

The lawyers charge about \$500 for most divorces. Yet they may spend as little as five hours on a simple case.

Where is their rationale for even that one in ten cases to justify a

wallet bulging as much as if they spent ten or 20 or 30 hours?

It is only justice that the charge for a divorce be computed on the time spent preparing the evidence.

Lawyers are professionals and should gain the just remittance for their skills but a markup on a product of 1,000 or 2,000 per cent should send any consumer after the merchant with a club and a vengeance to use it.

One Edmonton lawyer said it was easy for health and welfare minister John Munro to criticize from his \$45,000-a-year civil service seat.

Might we remind this particularly undernourished lawyer (he probably only makes \$20,000) of the responsibility differential between his and Mr. Munro's job.

And from the looks of things, while Mr. Munro may just be tasting sour grapes because he can't make it in private practice (according to our private Edmonton lawyer), at least he is worthy of a portfolio that works against the high cost of living. We only wish the lawyers would do something about the high cost of leaving.

Hose them, don't house them

We can only agree when Mr. Leadbeater says faculty should have last priority in housing in future campus development.

Some members of the GFC expressed concern yesterday that no consideration had been given to faculty housing.

Well, they just happen to make a few thousand dollars more per year than their students. We think that is consideration enough.

In fact, as it was so well pointed out last night by a student visiting

students' council, not only do the faculty have enough to afford cars; department heads and such other revered persons are given preference in parking near the university.

While this student rushes to campus early only to find himself walking from Windsor Park, department heads slip into their cozy reserved parking slots and stroll across the street to their respective faculties.

Is that the administration's idea of democratizing the university?

DEFINITION OF DESPAIR :



finding out they've changed the book list after you've bought your books...

CUS — or how I become Left at Lakehead

By WENDY BROWN
Secretary of the Students' Union

Before I went down, I would have voted **NO** to a referendum to rejoin CUS, because the idea had been defeated by the students at University of Alberta for the past three years.

I had no supported opinion of my own, I had never been exposed to CUS, I had never been told to think and reason, and look critically at the situation.

I was in nursing—a safe, secure, sterile area—where one, especially a student, is not expected to question, to think of change, let alone verbalize a proposal!

For three years I had been exposed to an ordered system—then **POW!** I was at Lakehead: expected to have an opinion, expected to know where I was—and I didn't know. I was threatened, for three days I walked around with a clenched fist in my stomach, not looking at anyone, fearful they might start to talk to me and expect me to reply. Reply with what?

Fortunately, I met some very kind, understanding individuals who explained what was going on, what was happening, and, surprise! — answered my simple (dumb?) questions without criticizing. The persons were real—were approachable, they knew what they wanted, they were bright, older, "educated" and involved.

I read anything I could get my hands on. I read but did not quite understand. I read again. Very slowly, a picture—fragmented—was beginning to form.

Terms, words I did not understand were tossed about knowingly—everything was "rhetoric," "moralistic shit" or "a dialectical process." Capitalistic imperialism was **BAD**. Mandel, Mao, Marx, Mush. Samuelson's economics, Smiley's Poli Sci (and yes David, he is writing the policy papers for the conservatives' convention).

I was lost, but fascinated.

The Congress progressed slowly. Repetition was evident.

Tangible ideas were absent. At times, it appeared that CUS was doomed. It could not survive without funds. It would die, disintegrate and all hope of change, of solidarity would be gone. But would that affect us here at University of Alberta. The student body had voted **NO**

three times.

A constant struggle prevailed between the CUS Secretariat and "the radicals" of the left caucus. CUS people appeared mild mannered beside these other individuals whose methods of change I could not support.

But what was proposed by the CUS Secretariat and other CUS members appeared good—sensible, although certainly different from the present situation. It would necessitate a greater commitment by students, a greater responsibility to their lives and development. Would students accept this added challenge/burden? It would require students to think, talk, question, reject, accept, modify on a broad sphere—not just at university, in the community, in government, but in their own minds.

The proposals for reform hit me hard—attacking a life, a system I had known, had accepted unquestionably for 22 years. Now I was told it was wrong. Not "out and out wrong," but unbalanced.

Competition between men is a socialization process. It is not inborn, survival is, but not exploitation of other humans for self gain.

Gradually the picture gained pieces. What was proposed was a reorganization of the entire socialization structure, economically, socially, culturally—not today, tomorrow, but gradually over many years. Our lost generation was finding itself through courage and caring.

I had merely skimmed the surface but I liked it. It stimulated me, aroused me, angered and confused me. But so does **SEX**.

The turmoil within me at the Congress has not subsided. I am now re-evaluating, away from the euphoria of the Congress.

Some papers presented were excellent, especially one by Dave Black—which I am still struggling through. All papers, resolutions, proposals can be gotten from Bob Hunka, but I have presented my feelings to you, in an attempt to show how many students on this campus may react.

If there was a referendum tomorrow, I know how I would vote, and I would be able to support my decision.