

# **But settlement** yet to be ratified

The threat of legislation. The spectre of inquiry commissioner Brian Outhouse shuttling back and forth between two exhausted bargaining teams, first warning the administration of a publicity debacle if there is no settlement (never mind lawsuits), then warning faculty that if they refused his terms, he would promptly file his recommendations with the province, who would then enact them in back-to-work legislation.

But that legislation would take two weeks to happen, effectively scrapping the term and losing the

To avoid this, the DFA executive was persuaded by their bargaining team to sign the tentative agreement. The DFA's chief negotiator says signing that agreement meant that they agreed the members should then go back

Tell it to the profs. One history professor feels betrayed by the executive that sent him back to work first and told him the details of the deal later. He feels coerced into ratifying the deal because it would be too unfair to throw students back into a strike again. He

also will give make-up classes, although the DFA executive also agreed to the administration's refusal to compensate profs for doing so.

The deal the DFA achieved reflects major concessions. They asked for 12 per cent scale. They got seven per cent. They asked for 16 per cent in career development increment (CDI, or steps). They got 3.7 per cent in 1988-89.

Professors, while content to see the wage gap closed and nonmonetary issues settled, also note that the cost of living (what they call the income maintenance) is 3.7 per cent. That's far below the six per cent won by St. Mary's faculty in the first year of their three-year contract, and the six per cent won by Acadia faculty.

Economics professor Melvin Cross agrees that the DFA made these concessions to get a deal and protect the students' term. Did the DFA compromise too much? "No comment," says Cross.

One professor who will comment is Mike Shepherd, whose computer department is wearing black armbands to protest the deal. He says he'd rather have been legislated back to work than agree to the deal.

He's insulted that they administration won't pay for the professors to make up courses because they feel students won't care if they get these lectures or not. But

Election '88:

## Canada divided

unbelievable! I'm told I shouldn't be surprised but I am. Where were all those avid opponents of free trade who were on the radio and ty for the past seven weeks?

Opposition to the deal wasn't just a creation of the media. Look Arlantic Canada, we obviously against the deal. The east went to the Liberals reversing a traditional Conservative trend.

In fact, the Conservatives received only 43 percent of the popular vote across the country, despite a resounding majority The results of this election, which became a referendum on free trade, are deceiving. One cannot dispute that the Conservatives got a whopping majority of the seats but this doesn't mean Canada's a country united in favour of free trade. Fifty-seven percent of the vote against free trade indicates that we are a country split down the centre.

The Liberals have conceded defeat and the NDP have agreed that obstructing the deal further

he's also angry that the DFA executive agreed to this

Students are also left out in the cold by this uncertainty over make-up classes. We can only

is useless since "the people have decided". At this point it may not be feasible to think of defeating the deal since Mulroney plans a quick passage through the senate before the end of December. Even getting through the Liberaldominated senate probably won't pose problems for the deal.

It's beginning to look inevitable that the Free Trade Deal will be implemented by January 1st or soon after. According to David Peterson, we should start preparing now for the loss of jobs in retraining and apprenticeship programs, especially in the textile and food production industries.

Opponents of free trade have not changed their minds and they have elected representatives to oppose the deal in government. Those representatives should not be conceeding defeat but continuing what they have been given a mandate to do: ensure that our fears about the deal will not be realized.

- Ellen Reynolds

wait for the next senate meeting to resolve this messy situation, which has resulted from a hasty settlement.

Heather Hueston

#### Letters

### **Profs** "shat on"

To the Editors:

So, the strike is finally over. We can all get back to classes and things will be normal again. At least that is what the University Administration would like us to believe. Most of us were both shocked and relieved this morning to awaken to the announcement that classes were on today shocked at the virtual lack of notice given to us and relieved that the strike is over and we can get back to the business of learning. Most of the Faculty were equally shocked to hear that they were no longer on strike and I

suspect that most lectures that were given today had an obvious "thrown together" air about them. However, I don't think that they were relieved to back to work today. Something (or should I say "nothing") just isn't right.

An agreement was reached, I guess. I sat in our Departmental Lounge today and listened to a very discouraged and demoralised group of professors. The issues they kept discussing were not money-related, even though the tentative contract fell short of their wage demands: Most seemed to think that they gained ground on some important issues, not the least of which was the question of equality of pay for women faculty. No, they are angry over the post-strike attitude towards them and towards the students that the Administration seems to be expressing. They are totally shocked and upset that the Administration is going to just ignore the past three weeks that the plan for making up lost time is to just act as if anything that would have been taught during that time simply isn't important. As one professor aptly put it: "We've been shat on.

The Administration had promised students throughout the entire strike that they would live by the Senate resolution that students who respected picket lines would not be formally penalised. I guess they're sticking to their word - you can't be penalised for missing something if its really "nothing"; namely, coursework and knowledge that the Administration is willing into nonexistence.

Last week I attended a forum held by Donald Betts, Dean of Science, to discuss possibilities for making up the lost time. He mentioned such scenarios as adjusting the lengths of the A and B terms, rescheduling exams, extending the school year and (the least popular) cancelling the spring break. While students were not happy at any of these prospects, I got the general feeling that everyone at this forum was willing to "bite the bullet" to further their education vote at the end of the forum showed that students were even willing to lose their break week to make up for the lost time. Alas, this whole excercise appears to have been "academic". The Administration seems to have taken the view that Dean Betts expressed at one point during the forum when he told a story about how he had received a "first class mark" in a course even though he

had not attended a single class after Christmas. The Administration is telling us that the time we spend in the classroom is not important. In fact, they are telling us that going to lectures does not have any effect on our education at Dalhousie. I beg to differ, but I get a helluva lot out of my professors' lectures and I'm willing to put my neck out and say that a lot of other Dalhousie students find lectures invaluable, if not essential, to learning.

What does this sort of attitude say about the seriousness of Dalhousie's new focus on undergraduate education? Essentially we have been misled about the value this University places on learning. It is clear that during the past three weeks we have paid tuition for absolutely nothing - but that's what we would have gotten anyways, according to the Administration. Why do we push ourselves to get assignments done, to study for midterms and exams, when really - they are nothing. Stop. The work we do is not "nothing". Most of us put serious efforts into our studies and expect to be taken seriously when we express our concerns about our education. It becomes discouraging to us, however, when we are told that what we would have been studying if there had been no strike is not important enough for us to worry about making up lost time. How can we motivate ourselves to do "nothing"?! It is clear that the cliched statement that "the Administration believes the University is here for them" has shown itself to be a truth at this University once again. They'll

tell us, I'm sure, that what has been decided is the best thing for the University. Meanwhile, in the background, some professors are dusting off their resumes and looking for jobs at other universities. They are looking to find a university where they can do something, rather than the "nothing" that they are told they have been doing all along at Dalhousie. I think I'll follow them because I'd like to do something

- Mark MacLean

## Sacrificial lambs

To the Editors:

I just do not understand!

There was a time when students formed an institution, hired their teachers, and called it a

Today, the Administration decides who will go to university, and the Faculty decides if in fact we shall be permitted to keep going, after we have paid our thousands of dollars to go.

And well, if the Faculty goes on strike, if the Administration refuses to settle, well, that's just too bad for the stupid student that couldn't predict a strike this year! I don't know about the rest of the students, but this year is costing me \$30,000. Ten thousand dollars to go to the University and simply exist here while I study and the twenty thousand I could be making if in fact I was working this year and not in school. AND let's

