

The Dalhousie Gazette
 CANADA'S OLDEST COLLEGE NEWSPAPER
 Published by the Dalhousie Students' Union
 Halifax, Nova Scotia, 429-1144. Printed by
 The Dartmouth Free Press, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
 Authorized as Second Class Mail by the Post Office Dept.
 Ottawa, and for payment of postage in Cash.

Editorials printed in the Dalhousie Gazette express the individual opinions
 of staff writers, or the Editors. This must be noted in all reprints.

Volume 99, No. 16 Halifax, Nova Scotia, February 9, 1967

TIM FOLEY
 Editor-in-Chief

DAVID DAY Associate Editor
 LINDA GILLINGWATER Managing Editor
 ROBIN ENDRES News Editor
 GAY MacINTOSH Assistant News Editor
 ELIZABETH SHANNON Student Council Editor
 DENNIS PERLIN Sports Editor
 SHEILA BROWNE Women's Sport Editor
 BARBARA KIMBER Features Editor
 FRANK WILSON Business Manager
 JOHN McKILLOP Advertising Manager
 MAUREEN PHINNEY Office Manager
 CAROLE CHISHOLM, ARLENE MERCHANT Secretaries
 ANGUS GARDNER Photography
 DAVID DAY Typography



Rejected by Council

Why free tuition?

Student's Council this week voted down a proposal by President John Young to send a brief to the Provincial Legislature proposing free tuition for first year students in Nova Scotia.

Here is the text of that brief.

Editors of this week's Gazette will be sent to all members of the Provincial Legislature and high ranking officials in the Provincial Education Department.

The entire proposal for the Provincial government reads as follows:

In order to enable Nova Scotia to progress and develop, both economically and socially, it is necessary to ensure that all Nova Scotians be able to attain the education that they desire and have the ability to utilize.

As a step to ensure a wider accessibility to post secondary education in general, and to university education in particular, the Dalhousie Student Union would ask the Government of Nova Scotia to consider the following requests:

Tuition fees of Nova Scotian residents graduating from grade twelve with three freshman credits and entering a Nova Scotian University be paid by the Government of Nova Scotia.

By paying the first year tuition fees of University students the government will be encouraging all qualified students to gain a university education if they so desire, regardless of their financial position. At present only 9% of the rural population of Canada ever achieves an education beyond high school. As well, only 28% of university students come from the 52% of Canadian families who earn less than \$5,000 a year. In contrast to this, one quarter of the university students come from the 6% of Canadian homes which have family incomes of over \$10,000. The promise of payment of tuition fees for first year students will encourage rural and poor families to send their able children to university and hopefully this will break the cycle of poverty in which these families are bound.

Because facilities are limited at Nova Scotian Universities the increased demand for positions which will be caused by the offer of tuition payments for first year students will have two noticeable effects on universities in the Province:

First, standards will rise because the financial position of Nova Scotian Universities forces them to limit enrollment; of necessity then only those of a high academic calibre will be able to enter universities, regardless of their financial position.

Secondly, it will mean that because more Nova Scotians will be applying to university that the ratio of non Nova Scotians to Nova Scotians attending University will be lowered to a more equitable level and thus not only will more Nova Scotians be attending in absolute terms but also percentage terms. As well, this will mean that approximately \$400 per student which is contributed to the operating costs to Dalhousie University by the Provincial Government will be used to educate Nova Scotians and those from other constituencies. At present the Province of Nova Scotia contributes 2,210 million dollars towards the operating cost of Dalhousie University. This as one can easily realize is a substantial amount of money, public money which is going to aid in the education of Nova Scotians and Canadians. However, because many Nova Scotians are unable to reach university for financial and other

Let them go to trade school!

This week nine members of student council showed themselves to be the narrowest of reactionaries. Their actions and comments at the Monday council meeting reflect attitudes that were on the wane 50 years ago.

Acting on emotion and misguided principles these people voted against the abolition of first year tuition fees.

For some the argument was that education is a privilege, and we only appreciate what we pay for. Others took the position that any scheme that would do away with first year tuition fees for residents of this province would flood Dalhousie with Nova Scotians and do away with the university's cosmopolitan nature. These are obviously two very different arguments and must be dealt with separately.

That university education today is a privilege of the rich, is a fact. But this is not to say things are as they should be.

A Dominion Bureau of Statistics survey released last year shows that money not intelligence is the deciding factor whether a person will receive a university education in Canada.

In this country 52 per cent of families have incomes under \$5,000. Their children account for 25 per cent of the university population. At the same time another 25 per cent of the student body comes from the six per cent of Canadian families that earn \$10,000 or more.

One of the first mistakes the proponents of the 'privilege-theory' make is to equate 'free education' with the abolition of tuition fees. They are not the same thing.

It has been estimated that it costs about \$1,700 a year to attend university at the undergraduate level. The fact that this is a conservative estimate is indicated by the figure given as an average tuition cost, \$429.

Now keeping in mind that the proposal under consideration at the student council meeting involved only first year tuition let's imagine a possible case.

Bob G. is the son of an unskilled laborer in Halifax. He has two younger brothers and sister, all living at home. Bob's father experiences seasonal unemployment and cannot afford to provide funds for a university education.

Bob has entrance requirements but his average is not high enough to win a scholarship. Because he is just graduating from high school Bob can only expect to get a two month summer job. The DBS survey revealed that students already in university, on-the-average manage to save \$418 from their summer jobs. Bob can't expect to do this well.

Even if Bob can convince his parents to sign a student loan form for the maximum \$1,000, he is a long way short of the necessary \$1,700.

With free tuition and his summer savings Bob might make it to university.

The second myth that the reactionaries hide behind is -- "Free tuition would mean a

lowering of academic standards because everyone would want to go to university.

The fact is that the law of supply and demand would insure that academic standards would rise rather than decline. If the economic barrier is removed and there are more students applying for entrance the university will be forced to raise academic standards.

A third myth is -- "The money has to come from some where. If the government has to dole out tuition for all those lazy would-be academics they'll have to get the money from taxes. Why should everyone pay to support a few?"

The answer to this one is obvious. It is well known that a person's earning ability rises in direct proportion to educational level. A high school dropout may never pay income tax as an unskilled laborer; the government won't get the money back it has invested in his elementary education. (This is not counting what the dropout may cost the government in welfare.)

A university graduate - especially a professional person such as a doctor or lawyer - because of his increased earning ability he will pay back the government's investment in him for the rest of his working days through taxes.

The government, which is the government of all the people, will use the money to pay for the education of the next generation and providing all of the other public services.

The second argument that free tuition for Nova Scotians would ruin Dalhousie's cosmopolitan character is a joke.

Education in Canada is a provincial responsibility. The province pays the biggest portion of the shot and therefore it is expected that they should give priority to training their own people. At the present time the province is spending an average of \$1,120 on every Nova Scotian in university. Dalhousie alone receives \$2,200,000 towards its operating costs.

In many ways out-of-province students represent a handicap for Maritime universities. Some estimates place the number of non Maritimers in Maritime universities at 40 per cent. This disproportion hurts the province when it applies for its federal grant.

A large number of the out-of-province students come to the Maritimes because of the grade 11 entrance requirement (grade 12 for Ontario.) Dalhousie raised its standards last year to equal the requirements at other Canadian universities. This step alone is going to make Dal far less cosmopolitan.

However, as long as Dalhousie maintains its reputation as the best university in the Maritimes and has the best (only) med and law schools in the region it will attract outside people who want a first class education.

They are a better class of people.

Perspective

Here I stand... I can do no other

Be it known to you O King, that we will not serve your Gods, or worship the golden image which you have set up. Daniel 3:18

Here are three young men of university calibre challenging the autocrat Nebuchadnezzar that they would not conform to his authority. That they remained adamant to the point of being thrown into the fiery furnace, their protection, and their subsequent recovery that led to the conversion of the King, are known by all. What is not realized by only the cursory reader is that every Christian, faithful to Christ, is bound to stand as they did. The images are not the same. There is today no fiery furnace, but the ridicule of being called 'some kind'... 'obscurantist.' The images of today's campus are many, but I have chosen only two, and will show why a Christian cannot bow to them.

The first is the doctrine of Evolutionism. The claims of the evolutionist are based upon doubtful interpretation of scanty evidence, and sometimes upon no evidence at all. While granting that there has been too much personal acrimony on both sides in the past, which I do not wish again to stir up, it is still imperative to re-examine with scientific scepticism the whole question of evolution, and look further into the problems raised by its acceptance. Is Man just another animal in a constant state of change? Is the material eternal? Can Nature change itself by its own forces? Positive answers to these questions can only be concluded from a belief

in evolution by natural selection. I believe that this leads to a hopeless, fatalistic philosophy; that the nature of Man can only be changed by evolution into a higher being - a superman.

In reply to these questions the Christian claims that Man is unique, created differently from all other creation in the image, or likeness, of God. However, he fell losing that image. His present nature is changed by being re-made a son of God, not by evolution, but by adoption by God through faith in his son Jesus Christ.

By MICHAEL BURSLEM

The Christian further claims that God created out of nothing, that the material has both a beginning and an end. This understanding is an obstacle to the thinking mind, because the mind is not designed to comprehend 'nothing'. It can only work on the material. As our cat has not sufficient cortical power to prove the Binomial Theorem, Man cannot contemplate the non-material. Can Man say that the non-material has no existence any more than the cat can claim the Binomial Theorem has none? This leads to the second image which the Christian will not worship. This is Naturalism.

Naturalism is the theory that all matter, inorganic and organic, obey Laws of Nature that are binding and unchangeable. This is the first Article of Belief to the naturalistic scientist, for there is no evidence

that the laws themselves in time have remained constant. The Christian scientist, however, maintains that they have changed, as when Christ fed the 5000 with the two small loaves and five fishes, or as when he rose from the dead. These changes occur according to the higher laws of the supernatural, or supernatural. The problem in talking about the supernatural is that Man has only a natural language. Its application to the supernatural leads to many misunderstandings. When a Christian refers to Heaven and Hell as places, it is assumed that he means above the clouds or the bottom of a bottomless pit. That he believes in a personal Devil does not mean that Satan is a little fellow with horns and a trident. These are misrepresentations. But the Christian will defend to his death that Heaven and Hell are places and that Satan is a personal Devil. How can the Christian be so sure? Because he believes that the only window affording a glimpse of the supernatural is through the Bible, which bears the authority of God.

Having told you what the Christian will never bow to, let me now tell you to whom he will bow. He worships the one God, his Father, who has placed in his heart these words-

"Whereas I was once blind, now I see," and

"I know that my redeemer lives, and at the last day, in my flesh, I shall see God."

The Pentagon's fog of words

It has been said that truth is the first casualty in war, and justice the second. A third victim should be added to the list - the English language.

The cold war, the hot conflict in Viet Nam and the press department of the Pentagon have combined to produce an extraordinary jargon which year by year has been seeping into and debasing ordinary language.

A familiar example is the word "escalation". When the United States lands another division in Viet Nam, or bombs Hanoi, it is not intensifying the war; it is "escalating" it.

Conversely, any move to halt the raids on North Viet Nam, or otherwise slow down the fighting is known as "de-escalation".

Then we have various kinds of "responses" to enemy action, particularly the "flexible" or "graduated" response which apparently means that if the other side confines itself to "conventional" weapons the U.S. won't bring out the atomic bombs.

It is, however, bad form to talk about atomic weapons. They are always "the deterrent".

There is much talk, in this connection, of a "credible deterrent", one believed capable of frightening the enemy. (An incredible deterrent, presumably, would be a missile which can't get off the ground, or a warhead which refuses to explode.)

This peculiar language has the basic characteristics of all jargon - the use of odd and complicated expressions where familiar words would do just as well.

In part, this no doubt reflects the desire of officials to make their pronouncements sound learned and important.

But we suspect there is also the notion that ugly ideas and proposals can be made more acceptable if they are veiled in queer and unfamiliar language.

It is more comfortable, after all, to talk about "10 megadeaths" than about the actual killing of 10 million people.

Voice of the Student

Hees visit inspires "Ode to Bees"

To The Editor:

As might be expected, the recent visit of Mr. Hees to Halifax (and, of all things, to our very own campus!) has aroused much resentment in a large proportion of our student body. It is sincerely hoped that by his visit Mr. Hees has not furthered his long-cherished hopes of becoming the next leader of the Opposition and, indeed, the future Premier of this Canada of ours.

If Mr. Hees wishes to present himself as the ideal public image of the modern "Perfect Politician", which he obviously wants to do in his own typical sickening and narcissistic manner; he appears to overlook the fact that only a short time ago his behaviour in the company of a certain female German partner has not been adequately explained to the complete satisfaction of all upon whose votes he would depend in any future election.

In view of the strong undertow of adverse feelings attending Mr. Hees' visit I would request that you print all or part of this letter and/or, hopefully, the following "Ode" which is written in 'commemoration' of this shameful event. Please note that the spelling of the word "Bees" is not a typographical error.

"ODE TO BEES"
 (To the tune of "That Was a Cute Little Rhyme", etc., etc., etc.)
 There was a young woman from Munich
 Whose bosom was large for her tunic.
 It was Savigny, NOT Hees
 Who caused Dief to wheeze,
 Though both had their fun while it lasted!!

Anonymous Dal Student
 (English Canadian, in case reader is concerned with bi-culturalism!)

N.B. Again it is hoped that this letter will be printed in toto, but please make any necessary changes or deletions without subtracting from the intended meaning.

Thank You,
 Mon., Feb. 6, 1967

To The Editor:

The Gazette never seems to be available until three or four days after the publication date. All very well and good for write-ups of past events, but your feature on coming "Campus Events" is always out of date by the time it reaches the students. For example, the issue of Jan. 26, 1967 contains notices for Jan. 27-29, but was not available until Jan. 30. I suggest that you either publish notices well in advance, or, better still, discontinue the feature and leave it to the Dal-O-Gram, which, in my opinion, is operating reliably and efficiently.

A Disappointed Dal Student

To The Editor:

With the exception of the edition of Jan. 26, the Gazette has been distributed on the afternoon of publication since September. Occasionally, there is some difficulty in distribution to the Law School and to the Forrest campus.

The Jan. 26th edition was delayed three days due to unforeseen typographical difficulties.

Associate Editor

To The Editor,

Please will you consider this article for publication in the Dalhousie Gazette.

I enjoy reading the Gazette, but I do feel that the philosophy of most of the contributors is a little too hedonistic for a satisfactory, full, abundant life. I could have written that the Christian will never bow to hedonism, but I fear that is attacking too close to home, since most people whose ideas are attacked take it as a personal insult. So I have started out on the boundary, I trust that no one will conclude that I am attacking them personally, only their too ready acceptance of the theories of evolution and naturalism. I fully realize that such a stand will nevertheless be unpopular to the majority of students. That I cannot help. A university stands to uncover the truth; and when Jesus Christ affirmed before Pilate that he was the truth I believe he meant it.

So, with your approval, I ask that this article be published.

Michael Burslem,
 (Medicine II)

(See Perspective, for Mr. Burslem's comment-Editor)

CARNIVAL -

-Continued from Page 1-

were at the Black and Gold Review. The girls' hockey game was packed, and the folk concert sold out."

From 400 to 500 students showed up at the Mount Martock outing.

"We were completely pleased with the turnout at Martock. It would be the biggest thing at the Carnival in another two or three years."

However, a couple of sour notes were struck during the long weekend.

At the ball, centennial flags on loan from the centennial Committee for decorations were broken and ripped from the ceiling by enterprising students with ladders.

The posters of the Fathers of Confederation which were to be donated to Intro Dal met with the same fate.

On a different note, Foggy Laucus would like to apologize to people who couldn't get into the folk concert.

"This was due," said Laucus, "to the fact that when the doors opened between fifty to fifty-five people rushed in without tickets so that about twenty with tickets had to be turned away."

But on the whole, he considers the Carnival a success. "There's more student support this year than there has been in the last five. That's not saying much, but it's an improvement."

Cruel mistress has three trained kittens to be given away. (one male and two female.) phone 454-6268. Ask for Robin.

The Pentagon's fog of words

It has been said that truth is the first casualty in war, and justice the second. A third victim should be added to the list - the English language.

The cold war, the hot conflict in Viet Nam and the press department of the Pentagon have combined to produce an extraordinary jargon which year by year has been seeping into and debasing ordinary language.

A familiar example is the word "escalation". When the United States lands another division in Viet Nam, or bombs Hanoi, it is not intensifying the war; it is "escalating" it.

Conversely, any move to halt the raids on North Viet Nam, or otherwise slow down the fighting is known as "de-escalation".

Then we have various kinds of "responses" to enemy action, particularly the "flexible" or "graduated" response which apparently means that if the other side confines itself to "conventional" weapons the U.S. won't bring out the atomic bombs.

It is, however, bad form to talk about atomic weapons. They are always "the deterrent".

There is much talk, in this connection, of a "credible deterrent", one believed capable of frightening the enemy. (An incredible deterrent, presumably, would be a missile which can't get off the ground, or a warhead which refuses to explode.)

This peculiar language has the basic characteristics of all jargon - the use of odd and complicated expressions where familiar words would do just as well.

In part, this no doubt reflects the desire of officials to make their pronouncements sound learned and important.

But we suspect there is also the notion that ugly ideas and proposals can be made more acceptable if they are veiled in queer and unfamiliar language.

It is more comfortable, after all, to talk about "10 megadeaths" than about the actual killing of 10 million people.