



GFC members crowd the exits of the GFC chambers after the lengthy tenure debate.

GFC decides tenure to stay

by Terri Jackson

Worse than summer TV re-runs, yesterday's GFC debate on tenure finished off the amendments remaining from the first special meeting in November, only to defeat the main motion so labouriously amended.

Students who had opposed tenure in any form during the first debate found themselves defending the present system of granting tenure after a probationary period rather than support the proposal before them to grant "instant tenure" to staff members on appointment.

The "instant tenure" proposal was defeated after three hours of discussion by a 25-57 vote.

In urging defeat of the motion, arts dean R.G. Baldwin apologized to council members for asking them to commit "legislative suicide" by rejecting the amended and re-amended proposal.

He argued however, that, "no other permanent contract, except marriage, is considered without some probationary term."

"In substituting dismissal procedures for denial of tenure, I'm afraid we're substituting divorce for a broken engagement," he quipped.

The only other levity in the otherwise staid meeting was provided by two members of the academic staff who bemoaned in James Haddow's words, the "continued and vindictive attacks by students on the academic staff."

B.M. Barker, representing the academic by association, said that he was "tired of listening to vague allusions to incompetence of people who have never had to meet the pressure of being competent."

"They're simply students," he said. Ballot counting at one point in the meeting saw the chambers partially emptied, as members went out for cups of coffee to fortify themselves for the

large number of amendments still to be considered.

Student complaints voiced recurrently throughout the long debate centred on student powerlessness in making their assessments of professors carry some weight. A motion for GFC to consider new regulations governing selection, appointment, salaries and promotions at a later meeting might have dealt with these dissatisfactions, but was ruled out of order under the terms of the special meeting.

Still a staunch defender of the proposal under consideration, university president Max Wyman argued that the probationary period does not yield enough information to make a decision valid for 10 or 20 years, yet the procedures for making tenure decisions are increasingly subjected to challenges on "legalistic grounds."

"We should not pretend that we can make those decisions better on the basis of a probationary period," he said. "It would be better to acknowledge that we're not prophets."

Defeated with the main motion was an amendment designed to give increased protection to staff members on temporary or sessional appointments.

The amendment had stipulated that after three years of such appointments, the university would be forced to decide whether it intended to consider the individual for "appointment without term" (tenure) or not to rehire.

It was defended by its proponents as a way of preventing departments and faculties from keeping staff members on tenterhooks from year to year for long periods as to whether they would ever be hired on a permanent, tenurable basis.

Summing up the entire debate, D.F. Cameron, chairman of the committee which had submitted the original proposal, quoted Mark Twain in saying, "he who would swing a cat by the tail will only learn those things that can be learned by swinging a cat by the tail."

the gateway

Tues. January 23, 1973
Edmonton, Alberta vol. 63 no.32

BOOZE..

the flesh is willing
but the red-tape is deep

Everyone must have decided ahead of time that the results of the liquor referendum were assured.

Only 20.4% of those eligible to vote cast a ballot in last week's tally of opinion on having full-time liquor outlets on campus. But of that group, 82.4% (4771) voted "yes". Just under 16% voted "no."

Those who worked up a thirst casting their vote for freedom will probably not be able to assuage it on campus until next fall at the earliest, in the opinion of Darryl Ness, students' union general manager.

Before a bar can be set up, the Board of Governors has to apply to the A.L.C.B. for a liquor licence for the campus. Then, individual groups, like the students' union, will have to apply to the Board for permission to run a pub.

"But I'm sure we'll have an outlet," Ness says. He admits, however, that he as "no idea" about where it will be.

The liquor commission set up by the students' council to run the referendum has discussed the possibility of setting up a bar in RATT on a trial basis. Ness suggests that location might be the most practical because there are already facilities there for serving food. "But who knows how many other stipulations RATT doesn't meet? Setting up a bar could be costly."

It is unlikely that the SU will set up a bar in HUB because they would then be in competition with restaurants and commercial lounges in the building. Besides, the commercial tenants would have "first refusal" on any additional lounge space in HUB. That means that if the SU did want to sell liquor in HUB it would have to give the firms which are already in the business their first option on the new site.

Besides this confusion about the location of a pub, there is also some doubt about whether or not the SU can afford to go into the booze business. Of the universities from the Western U.S. who were represented at a Pacific Western regional conference in Washington, six of which had pubs on campus, only one was making money. "For the first three or six months, they went like wild fire," Ness reports. "But after that, business cooled down."

He predicts that there may be more demand at the U of A than in other places because there are few liquor outlets close to campus and the liquor regulations are relatively strict. cs

Mantor elected by 6.5 percent

George Mantor came from behind in a close election to win the right to represent Arts students for the next two and a half months. But the result may not be representative of the entire faculty because fewer than 6½% of eligible students chose to vote.

Mantor, who received votes from 3% (76 of the 2580 eligible voters,) defeated Larry Panych of the Y.S. who led the field of four through the first two of the three counts of the votes on the preferential ballot. Ironically, the gap between the two was slightly smaller after the third count than it was after the first. (First count: Panych 57, Mantor 45, Tanner 43, Bell 16; third: Mantor 76, Panych 67.)

A close contender was Jim Tanner who after the first count was only two votes behind Mantor. He remained in second place after Bell was eliminated but was himself taken out of the running after the second count.

Counting votes on a preferential ballot requires the candidate with the smallest number of votes after each count to be disqualified. The second choices then are tallied and added to the totals of the remaining candidates.

Panych lost from a lack of "luke-warm" supporters: he was shown as a second or third choice by only 7 of those who made Tanner or Bell their first choice. Mantor, on the other hand, collected 26 second or third choice votes.

Mantor, who will sit with Y.S. arts rep Chris Bearchell, has pledged himself to improved communication with students. He hopes to "pressure students' council into taking a firm stand about issues which directly affect students." He is also an advocate of increased support for student services. cs



Proceedings of the special tenure debate were telecast to the Board of Governors chambers in University Hall in anticipation of overflow crowds which failed to appear.
photo by Michel Ricciardi