

labelled the visit of Tory M.P.'s Flora MacDonald and Jake Epp as 'old Hat' talk but little or no action'. It is difficult to decide here whether Joel was trying to tell us about the bear pit session that these politicians participated in or whether he was merely editorializing. Certainly he did a poor job of the first and a questionable job of the second.

To begin with the reporting, let me correct two misprints. Jake Epp represents the riding of Provencher (not 'Provencia' as Joel would have it) while Flora MacDonald represents Kingston and the Islands (there are more than one). As for their concern in the house, Joel might have added that Flora is not only interested in reform of the penal process but is also the Progressive Conservative critic for Indian Affairs and Northern Development. As for reporting what was said by these members Joel merely states that they "amazed the audience with their 'avoid the issue in question' tactics. The only avoiding of the issue at hand done here is by Joel

who absolutely refuses to report the agricultural, regional development, financial, penal, etc. comments that were made by MacDonald and Epp. Joel does note that decentralization and regionalism were discussed but not what was said about these issues. Curiously he leaves the impression that these were the last issues discussed whereas in truth they were among the first. That however, is due to Joel's editorializing binge in which he had to re-shuffle the order of the cards so as not to have his thunder stolen. Joel's point, and one that a genuinely worth consideration, was that, due to the regional interests in Canada, the federal concept for this Dominion may be irrational. This is a question all Canadians must continuously ask themselves and in truth it is not always easily or even satisfactorily answered. The answers given by the M.P.'s were, I would admit, disappointing partially because they were stated in functional rather than ideological terms. Yet surely Joel had closed his mind in any case and made no attempt to even follow

the arguments of the two representations. Finally, as to reporting, Joel "quotes" a question by Fred VonDreger of the Political Science Department which challenges the politician to back up their platitudes with actions or at best plans of action. For someone who wasn't even taking notes at the time to quote is very dangerous. Fred's question comes out inaccurately then, and its intent has been garbled by Joel. Our reporter (?) never does mention the response of the M.P.'s to Von Dreger's series of questions (yes there were more than one) but then that's par for the course as far as this article (editorial?) is concerned. Having pointed out that nothing of what MacDonald or Epp said is reported and that Joel spent about one-third of the article expounding one of his particular beefs we must conclude that this piece is poor reporting. Is it any better as an editorial? Well, I do appreciate Joel's right to be sceptical of Epp and MacDonald, yet again he is being highly

son't to pg. 9

On Long Articles

Frequently, students and faculty members approach me with suggestions of how to improve and enhance the quality of the "Cadre". For the most part these suggestions are helpful and made in good faith: however, there is one suggestion which is occurring with alarming frequency: to omit long articles.

The Oct. 23rd editorial on underdevelopment explained how capitalist values gave rise to anti-intellectualism. I'm not going to repeat it here; I'll assume it was read and understood.

I can state to you people, you know who you are, and that under no conditions will an article be rejected simply because its length may impinge on the very limited patience of you who complain.

The very nature of those issues with which we are involved do not admit of brief compact formulas; they require considerable comment for a position to be made clear. We assume that those some issues are of interest to other people and, due to their

interest, raise no objection to a lengthy article.

If you lack the discipline and stamina to read a long article - even though it may be important - then you are of that large group that ought not be in a university the nature of which demands intellectual stamina, patience, and devotion. You're the one who is here for the degree - because you lack the IDEA; that is, the degree, obtained in the quickest and simplest manner, for purposes of future prestige and security. You're the same one who contributes little or nothing to the intellectual growth and development of others as well as yourself. You're the living manifestation of the decadence of capitalist domination of western education.

In a sense you're not to blame since this is all you've known throughout your educative experience but, you cannot be exonerate either since this would thwart any respons-

ibility to change.

Since you are not yet by any means, students, we will hereafter provide something else for you. The long articles, or any article which is intellectual or philosophical, will not be intended for you - these articles shall be for those who appreciate them.

What we suggest you read from now on is: "Odds and Sods"; Advertisements; "lost and found"; "manpower"; etc. since these require little or no strain on the intellect and will cause you a minimum of frustration.

As for the rest of you - those noble souls whose courage, patience, and stamina, remain; we shall continue on our present course with more and, perhaps, longer arguments on those issues which are pressing for our attention.

-Stan Dalton