

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing

editor ..... Ronald Yakimchuk

news editor ..... Miriam McClellan

sports editor ..... Bill Kankewitt

make-up editor ..... Dan Carroll

photo editor ..... Al Yackulic

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—It seems that not too many of the loyal staffers survived the rally at noon. Those who did and came to help were Phil Lenko, Randy Jankowski, (spelling mistakes and all) Peggi Selby, Cathy Morris (no hang-over to-day), Andy von Busse (who escaped to cover a meeting), Bev Yacey, Opey, Bob Anderson, Joe Czajkowski, (wearing a different shirt), Ken Bailey (whose red circles saved him at noon) and Al Scarth, to whom yours truly, Harvey G. offers his sincere congratulations on his new position as next year's editor (this means a party) and Rolf Stengl (who came late).

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—8 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—8 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—12,000.

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

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

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1969

## Editorial

# We need strong leadership in the next student government

The incidents at Tuesday's election rally point out emphatically the need for a strong students' union president. And a strong students' union. This is critical if this university is to have a student government responsible, mature and able to deal with minority groups such as those which effectively disrupted the rally.

What occurred was a breakdown in dialogue, communications and creative discussion. If these minorities are listened to—and they must because they are students and they do have sound ideas—then we must have a students' union that can deal with them and prevent incidents that border on ugliness.

The key person in the student government is the president of the students' union. This year, students have at least two excellent choices—Rolly Laing, law rep on students' council, and David Leadbeater, vice-president of the students' union. We believe both are capable of running a strong students' union. Rolly Laing has been one of the better student councillors last term. He has shown that he is responsible and mature and has an open mind when dealing with important issues. He has contributed substantially to discussion within council.

**Our choice for president however is David Leadbeater.** He has the edge, we feel, in two departments. First, he has more experience in student government. He was arts faculty rep two years ago and moved up to vice-president the past year. Few quarrelled with his abilities in either capacity.

We are also impressed by David Leadbeater's willingness to take stands on issues of vital importance to the students at this university. David Leadbeater supported re-entry into the Canadian Union of Students at a time when CUS was an unpopular word on campus. He believed strongly that CUS could be reformed and become an effective student voice. His political

career could have been smashed by his stand.

He also refused to support student participation in the \$25 million university fund-raising affair. David Leadbeater felt he could not support the campaign and said so publicly. This stand could also have had a large bearing on his future in politics. But these stands indicate a toughness that is urgently required in student government. David Leadbeater has this toughness and the leadership qualities to keep the students' union mature and responsible while being progressive.

For academic vice-president, **we support Liz Law.** Her opponent is Earl Silver, a newcomer to this university. Both maintain that their platforms are almost identical and have similar views as to change within the students' union structure. Because the candidates are ideologically equivalent, we like Liz Law because she knows the structure at this university. She has been involved in student activities at this university and has always been interested in the students' union.

Bob Hunka and Eric Hameister are contesting the office of vice-president of external affairs. Both are good men. We feel however that Bob Hunka's experience in student activities gives him the edge over Eric Hameister. Bob Hunka was a prominent student leader in high school and has worked for the students' union. He is outspoken—a good trait when one is in student government.

Dennis Fitzgerald is our choice for treasurer. We believe he is more experienced in student government and in the workings of this union than is his opponent Tom Paine. Dennis Fitzgerald worked hard as science rep on students' council and worked on the finance board and on the University Financing Investigation Committee. We believe he is qualified to handle our money.

Remember—you may not agree on our choices but you must agree it is a students' privilege to vote.

GATEWAY 232

Dear Editor,

I've been trying to think of a cartoon on the SGWU riot and I just can't. As writers sometimes have difficulty in finding words for their ideas, similarly, am having difficulty in steadying my brush.

Besides, I usually try to make my cartoons amusing, and I find nothing amusing about this situation.

I'm sorry -  
Opey

# The Hall-Dennis report — how much will Alberta adopt?

By PETER BOOTHROYD

If you haven't seen "The Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario", alias the Hall-Dennis Report or **Living and Learning**, I recommend you put a reserve on the copy in the Education library.

The report has been out for half a year now and last summer received quite a bit of publicity. But the nature of the report ensures that it will be topical for quite some time. Certainly now that the Alberta government is studying the report, it is important that everybody concerned with education understand what the report says.

Here are excerpts:

**The heart of the problem of providing a general education in a democratic society is to ensure the continuance of the liberal and humane tradition. This is far more basic to our society than the worship of intellectual pursuits and scientific endeavors for their own sake. It must be recognized that the nourishment of such a precious commodity as freedom requires that the educational process . . . include at each level of growth and development some continuing experience in making value judgments.**

**It is presently possible and already demonstrable that children can be totally immersed in learning situations where a variety of facts can be crammed or programmed into their heads in a short period of time . . . We must ask ourselves before rushing into such dramatic approaches, at what price to the child such methods are justified. . . .**

**The child arriving on the school scene in too many instances has been treated not as a major actor, but as an intruding spectator at a command performance.**

**In many situations the child has been expected to learn, memorize, mimic, regurgitate, and duplicate the pearls of wisdom to which he is exposed. He is expected to be stuffed or programmed like a computer at any hour of the school day, and to be filled with enthusiasm for every golden nugget cast in his direction. If the child fails to benefit from the curriculum provided, the assumption often made is that the fault lies with him, and that he is a misfit.**

**The range of differences and abilities among children is so wide that it is neither possible nor desirable to or-**

**ganize them into classes or groups based on external measures of ability . . . the needs of the child lie at the heart of the educational function, the prime purpose of which is to serve those needs . . . the teacher ought to be considered the champion of his pupils in the whole realm of educational administration. Yet the present organization or both supervision and business administration in education implies an almost militaristic distribution of authority, status, and responsibility, which is not in keeping with this emphasis.**

These are not statements from an SDU pamphlet, or from some way-out professors of education. They are from the 221-page report of an official government commission composed of 24 professional (and straight) educators.

It will be interesting to see how much of the report's suggestions actually are implemented in Alberta. It will be necessary for teachers to become less autocratic, and for administrators to fight off both politicians and researchers who are in debt to the computer manufacturers. In the end, it will probably be necessary for the students themselves to implement the decisions against the vested interests of all these people.

Many of the report's criticisms are as relevant to U of A as they are to Ontario's schools. The farce of value-free social science and the related politic-free students' council, the cramming-of-facts approach to lectures, the neglect of students' individual needs for the sake of the bureaucracy, are all too evident here.

These things aren't going to be changed by reactionary Deans, a business-oriented Board of Governors, or by the majority of faculty who really do see their role as casters of "golden nuggets". We're the ones getting it in the neck, so we're the ones who will have to make the changes.

Getting more acquainted with **Living and Learning** will help. If you want your own copy—and at \$5 it's a bargain with photos, cartoons and lot's of colour—write the Ontario Department of Education, 44 Eglinton West, Toronto 12. It's good to find out that your frustrations aren't unique, and that at least some educators lay the blame on the educational institutions themselves.