

letters



WASP white

Do I have a riddle for you! What contains more stars than Hollywood, and has got a nice black cover and first page, so if you accidentally write an address or phone number on it you won't notice it? What's got a couple of pictures of people with complexions ranging from burnt toast to WASP white (irrespective of creed or nationality) plus various parts of their heads removed, mixed in with all those stars, but who really cares considering that they too could suddenly become stars?

Moreover, what saved us thousands of dollars in Student money so that our elected candidates could have more cash on hand to spend in the style in which they have obviously become accustomed?

Finally, what great Student Union Novel was published this year, rivalled only in the field of crass absurdity, by the two commie pamphlets distributed several years ago, called a yearbook?

Lady Editor, if you don't have the answers to these questions, then you haven't picked up your very own edition of the "U of A Complete and Unabridged Hustler's Handbook". If you have picked it up, then you're probably cursing like me—and that's not ladylike.

I fear no retaliation from those responsible, for you'll never recognize me by my picture, and the address is wrong.

Tom J. Donaghy
Sc. 3

far out

"Covered parking with a plug-in . . . only twelve dollars/month."

Wow! What a bargain, especially since campus is sold out . . . Right? Clutching the Gateway ad and my money I hurried over to Newton Place to snap up this veritable bargain among bargains.

Yes, of course they would be glad to rent me a stall for the three weeks left in the month. So, after glancing through the usual legal jargon and bullshit on the contract, I signed the dotted line.

Now the moment of truth had arrived. Stall number 1312! I drove upwards and onwards in a never-ending spiral, past numerous empty stalls. At last gasping for air in the rarified atmosphere, I began the long, painful re-entry, down a labyrinth of stairs.

Fantastic! What I had envisioned as a short drive and walk to campus had turned into an endurance test. Ten minute drive to Newton Place, a ten minute death-defying ride to the fringe of the atmosphere, then a short 15 minute jog down 13 levels and merrily across-country to campus. But the best was yet to come!

After requesting, and being refused a lower spot, although it certainly appeared as if some were available, I attempted to give a month's notice to vacate the stall Dec. 15, for Christmas vacation. AHA! . . . cackled the secretary in the parking office, waving the contract in my face! (ah yes, the Contract) "The contract requires one month's notice from the END of the month!"

"Far out" Quoth I! Despite (or maybe because of) the empty condition of the lot, no compromise was possible, and I had to pay the full month of December, thus proving that in our great Just Society hard pressed corporations are continuing to care for the consumer public by reinforcing that most basic of all business ethics . . . "caveat emptor".

Thanks Newt. -enjoy my six bucks!

P.S. Anyone want a parking stall for 15 days--cheap! and COVERED WITH A PLUG-IN!
Grant Corriveau
Sc. 3

sell-out

While trying *Gateway* readers' patience with yet another letter regarding the current GSA-SU fee dispute may not prove particularly useful, it would be difficult to allow the recent ejaculations of Tony O'Malley (21 November) to pass without comment.

All things considered, O'Malley probably ought to be congratulated for his personal courage in confessing membership on the GSA Committee which originally negotiated the \$10.00 fee paid the SU by graduate students. Owning up publicly to participation in such an irresponsible, short-sighted sell-out cannot have been an easy decision for him to make.

As has been pointed out in an earlier letter to *Gateway* the clever bargaining of O'Malley & Co. has resulted in a situation where graduate students have little if anything to say about the operations of a building whose mortgage they must help amortize or about the nature and administration of "services" for which they are forced to pay. It has been clearly demonstrated in the past months that a mere unilateral decision by SU is sufficient to dismiss the GSA from offices they occupied in that building and to curtail or alter severely those services. In a word, graduate students are a financial captive audience for whatever gang of apprentice Provincial Premiers or future Chamber of Commerce presidents happen, in a particular year, to form the SU Executive.

It was to help free graduate students from this preposterous situation that GSA Council (not the GSA Executive, as O'Malley seems to imply) voted to encourage that the \$10.00 be held back this year. The decision was taken only after it became clear that, while the SU Executive was willing to invite the GSA negotiator to their plush offices and treat him to

the culinary delights of the Faculty Club, it was not willing to entertain seriously the possibility of a more equitable arrangement. GSA was not motivated by what O'Malley claims are the "snobbish views many graduate students take of undergraduates" or by any attempt to separate the interests of the two groups, but rather by dismay and frustration over the actions of individuals who pretend to represent undergraduates.

It should be added that in all the discussions which have taken place to date neither the GSA or the SU has been able to produce a signed and dated document describing all the details of and properly attesting to the agreement which is supposed to be in effect. Perhaps O'Malley, the star-negotiator, can explain to graduate students why, in spite of the serious financial obligations involved, no such document was considered necessary.

He might also elaborate on his claim to believe that four years ago "the graduate students reached a satisfactory compromise with the Students' Union." This is particularly puzzling since GSA minutes (4 March 1969) clearly show that when the agreement to pay SU \$10.00 per year was outlined briefly and ratified by Council, he cast one of the three recorded votes against the motion! Conceivably, something has happened to alter his opinion in the past few years. Possibly he has mellowed with age. Probably he is just inconsistent.

It is even more difficult to imagine what O'Malley means by his contention that SU performs adequately "in directly representing graduate students on and off campus." Perhaps he is unaware that the President of that organization was responsible some weeks ago for bamboozling the UAB into hassling the GSA with respect to the validity of graduate student identification cards. Perhaps he has forgotten that thanks largely to that same President the GSA currently has no vote on the Board of Governors. Perhaps he feels well-represented by a swindle like *Second Look*, or by a vacuous rip-off like the tenure-study SU recently commissioned, or by vanishing student activity days, or by an SU President who has bothered to attend GFC only once since he has become eligible to do so. If this is the kind of representation for which O'Malley is happy to pay \$10.00 per year, that is his own affair. Responsible graduate students, however, are beginning to have second thoughts about it.

Responsible graduate students are also beginning more and more to take the time to pick up a telephone and call the GSA office or read the GSA Newsletter or contact their departmental representatives or even attend Council meetings now and again when they want to find out what, in fact, is going on. This is proving to be a much more satisfactory approach than that of some graduate students who merely crawl out of the woodwork from time to time in order to bitch and moan *ex post facto* about a decision they had every right to help formulate in the first place.

The decision to encourage graduate students to hold back the \$10.00 fee until the SU was prepared to negotiate seriously was taken in a meeting of GSA Council. All Council meetings are open to all graduate students. Where were you, O'Malley? Come to think of it, where have you been in the past three years?

David A. McMurray
Grad Studies

forums

point

clarification

The GSA executive has recently "expressed concern" with a report in the Gateway about the last meeting of the Board of Governors.

M. A. Adam, president of the GSA is technically quite correct in reporting that "the Board did not put any conditions on its approval" of the GSA's application for incorporation.

The amendment proposed by Louis Desrochers, university chancellor, was, as even he admitted, unclear in its phrasing, and the official amendment recorded in the minutes very nicely preserves the ambiguity.

But the discussion which preceded it and which it was intended by some members to record, was not nearly so ambiguous.

As guarantors of the mortgage on SUB, the board will be stuck with paying for the building if, as Gerry Riskin warned in a thinly veiled threat "the Students' Union finds itself in a situation where it cannot meet its obligations," that is, if the grad students do not pay their fees.

The Board members were noticeably nervous. Their solicitor had counselled that "it would be contrary to the interests of the Board were the Lieutenant Governor in Council to incorporate a Graduate Students' Association at the University . . . without first insuring that the financial arrangements among the student organizations and the Board were settled."

Although university president Max Wyman moved that this recommendation be ignored and the application for incorporation be sent without any conditions, other board members were not eager to be left paying for SUB.

Vice president W. D. Neal, for example, said that it should "be clear that incorporation did not remove the GSA from the Students' Union."

Board member A. D. MacTavish said that if the \$6 building fee (mortgage payment) were paid by GSA members to the Students' Union, "the rest can be left to the two associations."

Other board members expressed sentiments in phrases even less quotable but with similar intent.

On the other hand, a number of board members wanted the two questions considered completely separately.

To complicate matters, board members picked up the figure "\$10" and were using it to refer alternately to the entire Students' Union fee levied on GSA members (which it is) and to only the building portion of the fee (which it is not).

Into this confusion, Desrochers introduced the amendment to the motion so that as he said, the support of the board for the GSA's incorporation "would not be construed as a change in policy."

The official amendment recorded by board secretary—to whom Desrocher very offhandedly left the wording of the amendment—preserves the ambiguity of the entire discussion: board support "is not to be interpreted as affecting the current financial arrangement between the Students' Union and the Graduate Student Association which levy a certain amount of money each year upon their members to discharge the financial liability for the Students' Union Building."

I was amazed to see members of the board who had argued that the fee discussion should be separated from the incorporation motion vote in favour of this amendment.

The "current financial arrangement" between the SU and the GSA, at least the only one ever given recognition by the board, is that GSA members are required to pay as part of their fees, \$10 to the SU.

Desrocher asserts that his intention not to change that policy by recommending incorporation.

Unfortunately, taken out of the context of the discussion from which the motion originated, it can well be read by Adam and others to imply that the Board is simply making no ruling at all on the fees question at this time.

As a grad student with some fellow-feeling for the complaints the GSA has brought against the actions of some members of this year's SU executive, I would like to believe that interpretation is correct.

But to do so would be naive, and would not help the cause of the GSA.

Terri Jackson

Letters to the Gateway on any topic are welcome, but they must be signed. Pseudonyms may be used for good cause. Keep letters short (about 200 words) unless you wish to make a complex argument. Letters should not exceed 800 words.

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students of the University of Alberta. Contents are the responsibility of the editor. Opinions are those of the person who expressed them.

Staff this issue: Jim Adams; Belinda Bickford; Anna Borowiecki; Allyn Cadogan, sports assistant; Kimball Cariou; Betsy Ewener; deena hunter, arts; Terri Jackson, editor; Sylvia Joly, typesetter; Harold Kuckertz, Jr.; Loreen Lennon, arts assistant; Helmut Mach; George W. Mantor; Bob McIntyre, footnotes; Colleen Milne, headlines; David Ross; Arthur Savage; Candace Savage, news; Larry Seidman; Margriet Tiros, typesetter; ron treiber, production; Brian Tucker, sports; Lawrence Wilkie.

gateway