

WORDS FROM THE WISE ...



To The Gazette:

I am writing this because I'm fed up with the slanted, inaccurate reporting of your "informed" Council reporter Dale Parayeski, and elitist stance taken in your editorial of the November 3rd issue.

Last year, the Gazette bemoaned last year's Council for passing last year's budget in fifteen minutes, with little or no discussion — you condemned this as high-handed, since the Council was ultimately responsible for spending one-quarter of a million dollars of student monies. This year, you berate our "slogging" pace (four hours) in passing this year's budget, while admitting that relevant questions were raised. Since most students at Dal are reasonably intelligent, I don't feel it necessary to spell out the absurdity of the Gazette's waffling stances any more than that.

I'm also not of the habit of defending my peers, but Parayeski's attack on Bob Hyslop is so erroneous that perhaps the record should be set straight.

Bob Hyslop was not the only one who questioned the need for a yearbook — all Council members did. The fact that Pharos editor, Bob Jeffries hasn't even submitted a budget for this year should make all students wonder about the validity of having a yearbook, or having Jeffries as its editor. That Council unanimously requested a budget from Jeffries no later than its next meeting should be to Council's credit, not its scorn.

Hyslop also didn't "attack" OutReach Tutoring's budget, but merely questioned certain aspects of its content, as he should have, if he was to perform with any amount of credibility in his role as Law

Rep on Council. Mike Lynk, head co-ordinator of OutReach Tutoring, addressed Council to clarify any points raised in his budget and Council, including Bob Hyslop, voted in favor of passing OutReach's budget as originally presented.

Again, Hyslop did not "instruct" Parayeski (or anyone else on the Gazette, for that matter) to print his side of the story, but merely stated that the Gazette at least now knows there are serious questions being raised regarding the paper's policy, and that he hoped, just this one time, that Gazette might wish to provide students with a glimpse of the other side of the story. That hardly sounds like instructions to me.

I reserve comment for the moment on your reporter's rendition of Hyslop's "attack" on the Gazette, to swing my attention to your editorial.

As Council reps, we know we are unrepresentative. I blame this on poor University and Union orientation of incoming students, which introduces apathy to the student from her/his first days in this institution.

But for the Gazette to say that we (Council reps) are uninformed and disinterested is to discredit the intentions of many reps who ran with the hope of changing the cop-out artists such as Andy Watt and Vicki Adamson who, as members of last year's Council, knew more than anyone else how the system worked. Yet, they preferred to quit in the middle of this year's Council instead of applying their collected knowledge to help clear up the impasse we now find ourselves in. These are the people that are disinterested.

But name calling isn't going to correct anything — action is.

The Committee on Alternate Student Government, which the Gazette called for, will investigate alternatives, including those offered by the Gazette. Since changes of the present structure will require massive constitutional changes, the students, not Council reps, will be called upon to make the final choices in the system under which they shall, in future, be governed. This fact the Gazette prefers to ignore.

So now that students know they are not voiceless, let us turn to other points raised in your editorial.

1. Finances — I have no idea how we might publish the University's financial situation, but the Union's budget certainly isn't a closed book. The Gazette has a copy of the budget — print it!

2. The Task Force Report — again, the Gazette has a copy of this report. Is the real reason then that students don't know the contents of this report because the Gazette has shirked its responsibilities by not bothering to publish or analyze this report? Is it because the Gazette hasn't bothered to show at Committee meetings, when it was invited, to discuss the Task Force Report? Is the Gazette going to deny that it does not receive invitations to these Committee meetings?

3. The Report on Undergraduate Education — I find it incredibly funny that I have a copy of this supposedly buried report. If Gazette was fulfilling its responsibilities, by covering Senate meetings (which are open), the Gazette would know that portions of this report are being pressed into legislation at this time. Further, on November 14 there will be a Faculty meeting which shall, hopefully, revamp the entire first year programme along the

basic guidelines set forth in this report. So much for the report gathering dust.

4. That Council "washes over" student-faculty disputes such as the Sociology/Anthropology department is not because we don't care about the students' problems but because we are setting precedents by bringing student problems before Council. No other council before us has ever considered doing this. The problems are not solved at the Council level because we have been stalemated by the unwillingness of Union president Brian Smith to become involved in these problems. Mr. Smith, unfortunately, is not a leader — he is a mediator — and some Council reps are not yet willing to take a stand on their own without the sanction of the Union president.

All right, so what does the Gazette want, except perhaps to discourage interested, concerned students from correcting the faults of the Union? As a former Gazette staffer, I know that most "collective" decisions regarding the paper editorial policy are made between 10:00 p.m. Sunday and 2:00 a.m. Monday, a fact no Gazette member will deny, yet none will admit publically. These absurd hours reserved for enunciation of policy effectively keep that policy in the hands of an elitest few of the Gazette. This not only makes a farce of your concept of "collectivity", but sets up within the only "voice of conscience" the students actually have on campus a sense of omnipotence in that voices members. This analogy is not unlike the world of tomorrow in Orwell's "1984" or Skinnerian psychology — human gods dictating to the masses the way to truth, life and happiness.

I do not necessarily support a

student newspaper because I believe in the stands the Gazette takes, but only because I feel that it is the duty of someone to provide students with another viewpoint; a check on a student government that could grow excessive in its misuse of power.

Knowing Bob Hyslop, I do not believe that he opposed the Gazette's budget because he saw no need for a check on Council, but because he questioned whether or not the Gazette is effectively fulfilling that role. It is to this end that he spoke against my motion to the paper's budget approved in total. He made no effort to drop the Gazette budget from consideration, as Parayeski suggests.

Neither Hyslop nor myself, nor any member of the student body wants to see the Gazette be given "a licence to print any kind of garbage" you see fit. Until this latest issue, I and many Council reps still believed in the integrity of the staff of Gazette, and did not believe we were, in fact, issuing that licence.

Examining your November 3rd issue, students may want to question us whether or not our trust (and theirs) has been misplaced.

Ken MacDougall,
Arts Rep
Editor's note:

GAZETTE REPLIES

Ken MacDougall's long letter contains a couple of good points but unfortunately they are lost in all his other irrational and inaccurate comments, so they certainly deserve a reply.

In the second paragraph, he says we "berate" Council's "slogging" pace. Please show us where we berated anybody's pace? Your statement that we condemned last year's budget with little or no discussion is a complete falsehood and if

anyone cares to look at our back issues from last year, they are quite welcome to do so.

And while we are speaking of "erroneous attacks"... while all Council members asked that a detailed budget of the yearbook be drawn up, only Bob Hyslop and Bob Mohn put forward and approved a motion that the yearbook be abolished. That is exactly what Dale Parayeski wrote and that is exactly what the minutes said.

True, Hyslop did not "in-

struct", he "suggested in front of witnesses" — to use Hyslop's own words — that his arguments be printed.

To blame your unrepresentativeness solely on the orientation programs, or lack of them, is slightly unrealistic. If you would take the time to talk to some of your fellow reps, you might find that they would freely admit they are uninformed and disinterested. Your comments about those who have quit Council are somewhat true but did it occur to you that maybe the reason they quit in

their second year in the "system" is that working for change from within is next to hopeless?

The fact that students would be required to accept or reject any constitutional changes re: student government were explicit in the editorial.

1. Finances: look elsewhere in this issue.

2. Task Force: We have published the report — all the recommendations were printed in the September 22 edition and

a further article was published on October 6, though it is true that our analysis is incomplete.

3. The Report on Undergraduate Education — Thank you for correcting us. If someone would like to give us the report that we could not obtain during the summer we would like to let students see what sort of education they will be "given" in the years ahead.

Now we would like to comment on your attacks on our "collective." Your point about editorial decisions being made in the early hours of the morning is very interesting. You are right — on some occasions LAST YEAR editorials were written too late. But true, we were all to blame to a degree — copy was late coming in, people sometimes did not even show up on production day. We were guilty. But your statement that policy was always in the hands of an elitist few is not true. A collective is only what the members make it, and you too, Mr. MacDougall were once a member of the so-called collective.

To the Gazette:

The article regarding the resignation of the photography department heads gives more evidence to 'sour grapes' than valid reasoning (i.e. "council wouldn't give a shit if we came in with a budget of \$7,000.00 as long as it was padded and we only got \$50. in salaries").

Claims of past incompetence are among the numerous gripes of Mr. Roza and Mr. Novack. Having been the director of

photography last year, it is only natural that I regard such claims as rather opinionated.

Mr. Mills should have spent more time researching his article. Some information that might be regarded as factual, is more representative of fallacy.

All in all, the article provided a highly biased view of Mr. Roza and Mr. Novack's resignations, whatever their reasons.

Bob Jeffries



EXPORT "A"
CANADA'S FINEST CIGARETTE