

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief ..... Al Scarth

managing editor ..... Dan Carroll

sports editor ..... Joe Czajkowski

news editors ..... Peggi Selby,  
Sid Stephen

photo editor ..... Dave Hebditch

**STAFF THIS ISH**—Amid a flurry of snow flakes, poison pen letters, heated controversy, cold shoulders, tapping typewriters, midnight oil (cheaper by the gallon), jovial janitors, fatigued photographers, wretched reporters, and evil editors, not to mention miserable management, lewd layout, censored slot-men, sufferin' sportsmen, incapacitated casserolers, fed-up fine artsies, and reactionary readers (at last!), the Thanksgiving Thursday of the Dynamic Daily finally arrived to Save Our Skins. The exhaustive experiment drew to its successful conclusion with the help of bountiful bods who your sleepy-eyed, slithered-out, signing-off-for-the-week-snake will not even attempt to name or enumerate. Tanx to all —30— of you. Sigh-ned, Harvey G.

The Gateway is published daily by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for Monday edition—6 p.m. Sunday, Advertising—noon Wednesday prior; for Tuesday edition—6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Thursday prior; for Wednesday edition—6 p.m. Tuesday, Advertising—noon Friday prior; for Thursday edition—6 p.m. Wednesday, Advertising—noon Monday prior; for Friday edition—6 p.m. Thursday, Advertising—noon Tuesday prior; Casserole—copy deadline 6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Friday prior. Short Shorts deadline, 3 p.m. day prior to publication. Advertising manager Percy Wickman, 432-4241. Office phones 432-4321, 432-4322 and 432-4329. Circulation—15,000. Circulation manager Brian MacDonald, 432-4321.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1969

## Consider all positions before taking a stand

It's rotten being attacked on personalist grounds or blamed for something when people don't know how you're thinking. Council takes collective stands and receives collective responses. But once in a while, you have to disagree.

There are two broad aspects to this whole Yearbook question before campus. I think they should be clarified before the intended main aspect is obfuscated by emotionalism.

A majority of Students' Council has taken a stand against the Yearbook. I think that in itself is a good stand. Yearbooks as we know them at most campuses, are being eliminated because priorities imply choice; and for the "value" of the Yearbook in relation to more active priorities, one can legitimately question a deficit expense of \$44,000.

However, as a second aspect, a majority of Council members also stood against a refund and a referendum. This rather logical progression of motions took an illogical turn and has caused a very logical reaction.

The "logical" progression of events were as follows:

**Main Motion:** "That Students' Council 'delete' the Yearbook". While there was some debate as to the wording of the motion, in essence it meant that Council would take a stand against the Evergreen and Gold.

**Second Motion:** Stated that a refund should be given to students who wanted it. While it doesn't state on the I.D. Cards that you receive a Yearbook, some of us felt that if the book is to be discontinued this year, a refund be given. There was debate. Some of it revolved around the situation of College St. Jean. (They negotiated a fee with the Union for full membership that was to include a Yearbook—for that reason they discontinued their own.) The suggestion that the deal would be re-negotiated is ridiculous—because the majority of campus would not be eligible for the same sort of refund.

**Third Motion:** Asked Council to hold a referendum on the Yearbook question. This is a fundamental principle. The Council was re-allocating 10% of its income without officially polling its constituents. The motion to have a Council initiated referendum failed. The feeling must have been that if the students really want it, they'll petition for it . . . well, we've got it.

The results of this whole mess is a whole mess—it's a justifiable emotional reaction to an "emotional" council decision. It was an "emotional" decision because of the group dynamic process that helped make the decision. The isolated Council members, re-enforcing each other forgot impor-

# The year of the yearbook -

## Students' council must become representative

Theoretically speaking, the Students' Council is an elected body, representative of the membership of the Students' Union. By-Law No. 1, relating to the powers and duties of the Students' Council, states that "All members of the Students' Council shall be responsible for the adequate representation of the student body as a whole and of the particular groups they may represent." (Section 19[a]). Recent actions of the Council, and of the Executive in particular, however, have served notice on the student body that this duty to provide responsible government must be viewed as secondary to the personal philosophies and ambitions of the councillors. Council has judged itself competent to interpret the By-laws in a way consistent with its own ends, despite the fact that its interpretation is

inconsistent with logic and common sense. Its recent interpretation of the duty to provide "responsible government" gives it the authority to disregard a clearly-defined statement of student opinion if this opinion is in conflict with a particular councillor's concept of what student opinion should be. This callous, disrespectful, and irresponsible attitude is the root cause of the unfortunate state of the Union at this time, beset with the possibility of bankruptcy, riven with dissension inside and out, a rudderless ship drifting aimlessly on a sea of discontent and disinterest.

There are those Councillors who would argue that the uproar over the cancellation of the Evergreen and Gold and the marshalling of student opinion against the Council is symbolic of the awakening interest, and that Council's action is laudable for that reason alone. These are the people who believe that apathy grants freedom from responsibility; these are the people who would equate disenchantment with involvement.

This is the Council which was concerned with "communication" and "grass-roots involvement"; with "morality" and "representativity"; with the "arbitrary decision-making" of the University administration. These are the same Councillors who have recently:

(a) resolved to ignore the results of student referenda

(b) declined to ask the student body for a statement of its opinion,

(c) refused to compensate the student body for a broken promise, although allowing that "there might be a moral obligation involved";

(d) attempted to use the former lack of student unrest as an excuse for the implementation of their particular political philosophies.

(e) made themselves guilty of the same arbitrariness and irresponsibility for which they continue to condemn the Administration.

(f) euphemistically described a heavily-financed indoctrination program as an "educational priority" of the Union.

Council has recently been concerned with the students' lack of parity on Administration committees. When can the student body expect to achieve parity on the Students' Council?

It is entirely possible that the Evergreen and Gold would not survive a referendum if students were given a chance to weigh the merits of alternate use of their money. Student interests and needs are changing with the times, and Council's actions should be a reflection of those changes and an attempt to provide for those needs. It is not, however, a function of the Council to define those needs on the basis of a personal set of values and then to take irresponsible and radical financial and political steps to implement the "answers". Our self-appointed arbiters of morality and righteousness

are much more Puritan in their actions than their free-thinking veneer would suggest.

The real damage done by this action is to the Union itself. Any reputation for credibility and representativity that the Council might have had is put to serious question in the present case, and some really worthwhile programs and projects will no doubt be dragged into disrepute by association with the yearbook decision. Whether or not the Students' Council in its present form can right itself and point itself in the direction of increased relevance to the electorate is a decision which must be made now, either by the Council or by the student body.

Frank T. MacInnis  
Law Representative  
Students' Council

## He's had it!

All right Bill Farion (Sci 3) I have had it! You "cannot see any reason why I should have to pay a day-care centre for some uncouth women's brats."

Granted, I don't think that yearbook funds "saved" from cutting the yearbook should be used on a day-care centre, or anything else, for that matter. I don't think they should have even axed the yearbook now.

But, you have a lot to learn about day-care centres! From your comments in the paper, you seem to feel that they should only be used by "liberated feminists" who wish to go shopping.

Do you know how much it costs per month, Mr. Farion, to put one child in a city or privately run centre.

And this is by a serious woman (or man!) who wants to attend school or work in the meantime!

It costs about \$45 per month.

A campus run day care centre would use very little of your money, Mr. Farion, because it would be co-operative, and it would enable a single man or woman, or married couple to further their education and be in the same economic strata that you are striving to be in.

A day care centre on campus would be only for university students! By being against a day-care centre on campus, Mr. Farion, you are against equal opportunities for education by all people.

I agree with you that some members of the council used bad timing in making the yearbook decision.

Would you have been so upset about it if the council had made the move last summer?

The money to be used by day-care centres and field works, and yearbooks, should have been budgeted from the first and then acted upon consistently, not piecemeal, as it is.

Ellen Singleton  
Women's Athletics  
Rep. on Council

## A statement from David

We tried for a compromise. We tried for 5,000 copies for graduating students and other copies would be by individual subscription.

There was even an additional suggestion that a referendum be held to determine whether all students including those who are not graduating should get yearbooks. This would at least have allowed us to plan for a new direction yet still have the yearbook that many of us want to keep.

But given the choice between a union that has justly been accused of irrelevance perpetuating itself in the same irrelevant way, and a yearbook, I felt compelled to choose the former. By this I am not suggesting that the yearbook in itself is irrelevant. I am just simply saying that the yearbook does little or has little effect on the university, on the student while he is at university, or the educational system in which he spends most of his time. To have a union that is worth its salt, we will once in our lives have to face up to some of the criticisms that are levelled at us.

The council, and through it, the students' union, has been accused of elitism, of being irrelevant, of not concerning itself with student needs, of not communicating with the students and of offering little that is attractive to those who might become involved.

Studies have shown that not even the service aspect of the union affects a great many students. There will be no magic solution, but something different has to be tried. To exist under the same budgetal limitations as in the past and this includes the yearbook costing a full 44,000 plus dollars, would block an effective change to relevancy in the students' union.

And students' council would become a caretaker government administering the old, doing nothing new.

I do hope a compromise might be reached so that we might have both a yearbook and a relevant union, an earlier decision which was attempted but failed.

David Leadbeater  
Students' union president

tant things: contractual agreements (legal questions), informed student opinion (political questions) . . . Therefore, not a political decision.

There hasn't been this much interest in the Union . . . ; but the focus to some extent is misplaced. The budget priorities are lost in a morass of methods and conduct confusion. But what has resulted from all this is Council's fault. Basic human reaction requires that people object to forceful change. I think that many people are reacting to the "force" and method of change—and not to the change itself. In other words, when the action is basically emotional, the reaction will be based on emotion. Council can't expect anything else.

And all this is hiding the initial issue—that of budget priorities. If S.U.B. is to expand, if Housing projects are to be undertaken, if the Union is to take a more active role in an educative function, cutbacks will have to be made someplace or fees will by necessity require increase. I think the priorities are good ones. The thing needing specific clarification is the fact that the ongoing administration and operation of the Union is not mentioned.

The ridiculous irony of the situation is the fact that the Students' Council that wants more money for education priorities, didn't conduct an education campaign to introduce people to the whole idea.

Politics is people and the people is reacting. Council tactics said 'Up against the wall . . . ' and were reacted to by 'Up against the wall you . . . !' Now councillors are being forced to react to defend some things they might not believe.

I guess I'm saying that personalist attacks and emotional debate anywhere, are destructive . . . So before the issues are lost, separate them and consider them . . . for change.

Bob Hunka  
External Vice-President

## Adds to injury

On the front page of Tuesday's Gateway is an announcement that "there will be no student yearbook at U of A this year"; on the second page is a reminder to graduates to get their pictures taken for said yearbook "as soon as possible".

Irony has its place but, as one of the many who paid two dollars for their pictures, I feel this is adding insult to injury.

Larry Mitchell  
sci 3

## This is Page Five

Once again, The Gateway plays havoc with the arabic number system to bring you the opinions of the day.

We would also like to mention here that as a general rule, typewritten letters will start receiving preference.

Our hieroglyphics experts are on strike right now and the typists are suffering from severe eye strain.