



letters

a grievance

Before any more shallow opinions are rendered by The Gateway, we would like to set aright a few of the comments made in your October 13 editorial dealing with the proposed Students' Union Academic Grievance Committee.

As it appears to be the only thing The Gateway latches onto, we will deal with the obvious. The original recommendation of the Academic Relations Committee was accepted unanimously by council on July 10. During the ensuing three months we carefully considered the formulation and implementation of an Academic Grievance Committee.

The Gateway objects to our planned manner of implementation. Even for The Gateway, it should appear obvious that the idea of formally contacting the administration crossed our minds, especially since such action was recommended by council. Well, such action did cross our minds. In fact, we considered the entire matter very carefully and seriously. The decision was eventually reached that we should do nothing of a formal nature with the administration until the by-law was accepted by Students' Council. (We did, however, make some informal contacts to a few non-administrative faculty members.)

So, when Mr. Leadbeater presented the by-law on behalf of the Academic Relations Committee, he was not an over-anxious crackpot, fettered by courtesy, disrespect, and undiplomatic ideas. Instead, he was revealing a procedure of implementation which was calculated by the ARC to produce the most effective and harmonious entry of this foreign body into the university organism.

At this stage, we will not go into the rationale for our decision—most of the reasons were given at the last council meeting. They are based on three premises. Firstly, that a Students' Union Academic Grievance Committee, no matter what it is called, will meet with considerable opposition in some quarters of the faculty—and, therefore, the support of the Students' Union should be assured before any possible confrontation with the faculty. Secondly, that the best plan of implementation would be the one that would produce the least friction, frustration, or chance of confrontation. Thirdly, that the best plan would not be one which surreptitiously foisted the SUGC on the university, but

one which informed all parties in the proper way and at the proper time. If anyone wishes to discuss this further, please feel free to contact either Jim Matkin at 422-6305 or David Leadbeater at 439-7283. This particularly applies to The Gateway, who could have severely hurt the implementation of the SUGC.

The Academic Relations Committee has been told what to do by council. We will proceed to discuss the matter formally with the administration. Although we disagree with that plan, we will do our utmost to achieve the best interests of everyone concerned. Diplomacy has always been and will continue to be our watchword.

Jim Matkin
Chairman,
David Leadbeater
Academic Relations
Committee

a pome

Each new education term, whether primary, secondary or post-secondary, seems to produce its share of protesters on how so very little will be learned in that term. This year will be no exception and to prove my point, I'll start the parade.

sounds round me
range from blue to black
and a tourique on the mind
can all but stop the flow of words
so all that remains
of a once blissfully begotten poem
is a sentence without a name
and a thought without a mind

R. A. Kavalilak
arts 2

yearbook blues

I want to clarify and correct statements that were made in The Gateway story and editorial on the subject of yearbook fees, and then criticize the attitude of some student administrators on this subject.

The editorial suggests that the union would be in a bad way if people start refusing to pay for some services rendered by the union. Agreed. There are few people who endorse the concept of unionism more strongly than I. But we must distinguish, as the editorial failed to do, between essential services

and non-essential services which the students' union performs.

Essential services are such things as union buildings, support of clubs (all clubs), Al Anderson's salary, etc. Without such essential services a union loses its relevance, and is no longer operative. Therefore a compulsory levy must be made on every union member in order to maintain these essential services.

Then we have non-essentials like the yearbook. Clearly a yearbook does not require \$6.00 from each student in order to exist. If 300 people were interested in producing and paying for this kind of memento, they could. We all did in high school. The students' union is not "threatened", to use Phil Ponting's paranoid cry, if the yearbook is made optional.

Treat Green and Gold as another club—put it into perspective. The situation now is undemocratic—a total of \$81,000 (\$6.00 each) is going towards a project which thousands of students have shown to be irrelevant. Last year a third of us on campus did not pick up a yearbook. Student administrators are well aware of the rejection of the yearbook by at least a third of the students. Thus they order from the publishers only enough books for about two-thirds of the students. Yet we are each forced to pay \$6.00. What happens to the approximately \$21,000 that our administrators tell us is to pay for yearbooks that are not even ordered?

That everyone is compelled to pay for yearbooks is totally undemocratic and contrary to the concept of unionism. The way to alleviate this situation is simply to make the yearbook optional.

Both King and Anderson agree that a yearbook is not an essential and therefore should not be a compulsory service but should be made optional. Characteristically, Anderson is hedging in initiating this reform because it would take some administrative effort and there has never been any major trouble from students.

Our treasurer Phil Ponting's myopia, and his condescending attitude I would find tragic if it were not so humorous. To say that people who do not want to pay for a yearbook will not achieve their purpose by not paying for their yearbook, is a serious case of illogic. Not to see the withholding of \$6.00 as an act of civil disobedience, as Ponting doesn't, is plain stupidity. And then we have Ponting pontifically saying,

"Ah, yes, there have been minor rumblings from the masses about yearbooks before, but with a few placating words from us, the executive (and possibly a pat on the head?) they have withdrawn from these echelons, content and satisfied."

His statement that "I don't think we have any major threat this year either," forcefully yanks him out of the category of the confident, willing-to-serve, open-minded student representative that we prole-students hear so much about at election time.

Teri Turner
arts 2

kick-line kapers

Having just seen the first kick-line of the year, and having experienced kick-lines in previous years, we have come to several conclusions:

1. Kick-lines seen on this campus are almost invariably of sub-standard quality. The choreography is generally non-existent, the lyrics leave much to be desired, the girls are frequently out of step and off-key, and the general appearance is messy.

2. Kick-lines are used to promote nearly everything on this campus, from presidential candidates, through political parties, to dances. Surely other methods of promotion could be found by some of the supposedly ingenious people inhabiting this university. Our verdict can only be lack of imagination on the part of the promoters and an apparent lack of resources.

3. The constant use of kick-lines on the part of promoters of at least fairly serious aims would appear to reflect their opinion of the mentality of the average student. We suggest that the nature of the promotion be appropriate to what is being promoted.

In view of all this, we have a suggestion for at least a partial solution. Perhaps a kick-line bureau could be established with the help of one of the dance clubs on campus. An organization feeling the need of a kick-line would approach this bureau, who, if they considered the request legitimate, would provide a kick-line of trained dancers and singers and possibly even a lyricist.

Robin G. Walker
sci 3,
Lynn Weinlos
arts 3,
Anita Satanove
ed 2

tory explanation

I would like to make a number of things quite clear to the students on this campus and especially to Mr. Fowle. First, Mr. Don McKenzie was chosen as the chairman of the Students' Union Building opening for his enthusiasm and ability. He and his committee worked hard to demonstrate the potential of our new building with a diversified and full program of activities. Being a Conservative is an asset at any time and it is extremely difficult to deny that Don's influence on the students who listened to Dr. Huston's readings and Ian and Sylvia's music were converted en masse to Conservatism. My sincere congratulations to Don McKenzie, Mildred Frost, Laura Scott, Bob Hunka and the rest of their committee for mak-

ing the building opening so successful.

The Students' Union Opening Committee invited Mr. L. B. Pearson of the Liberal Party to be the keynote speaker. He declined. They then re-invited Mr. Pearson to attend. He declined but suggested a substitute. Mr. J. Turner of the Liberal Party was invited to be the keynote speaker. He declined. Mr. Lougheed, leader of the Conservative Party of Alberta and leader of the opposition at short note consented to speak. I believe we owe Mr. Lougheed a vote of thanks for speaking to the campus given such limited notice.

Finally, "A little envy shows a long face!" (Old Chinese proverb). The Conservative Party is to be commended on their efforts both in recruitment and in leadership. Political awareness benefits the students on this campus (a little homespun philosophy). Does a childish attitude permeate Mr. Fowle's lines?

Again to Mr. McKenzie and his committee, thanks for a job admirably done!

E. B. Monsma
chairman,
students' union
planning commission

P.S. I am deeply insulted as Mr. Fowle left the chairman of the SU Planning Commission out of his list of card carrying Progressive Conservatives.

suggested improvements

The opening issues of Edmonton's hope for 'un nouveau journalisme' have seen the return of a familiar deficiency. Readers will sense how a certain element is passing from the pages of our paper. What has happened to the high tradition of triviality, inanity, and immateriality? Where are to be found the non-essential, the irrelevant, the vague and the mediocre? Have they vanished into mere words? It is my personal conclusion that The Gateway has become too serious-minded, and is leaning dangerously into a scholarly abyss.

Now having characterized in broad and general terms the unfortunate condition which I feel prevails, and hoping to remain unexpurgated to the end, I propose to offer my (first) small contribution to dam the flood of erudition, insight, and worthwhile comment. It will take the form of an inane and irrelevant little quiz, designed for no one in particular and for no defensible purpose.

IDENTIFY ANY TWO OF THE FOLLOWING QUOTATIONS AND (WHERE APPROPRIATE) OFFER ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS AND ANALYSES.

1. "Well now, if we are to look at the overall picture. . . ."

2. "This nation of Canada, and its distinctive national characteristics. . . ."

3. "The latter of whom I am both neither one of which. . . ."

4. "Discordant and incomprehensible sentiments. . . . (ad nauseam)"

It is my fervent wish that this small beginning will encourage, if not inspire, souls of like ilk to come forward with continued assistance to bring back to The Gateway what is only right and proper.

Yours anaesthetically, "Arts?"

John Murray Love

whatfor

DON REED

well, all you freshies
should be properly
oriented by now,

at Waterloo, this
means you know where
the toilets are.

I especially want to
welcome the batch
that think they want
to be archichokes when
they grow up.

you should only
live so long.

23