

## Somewhat sincerely

Upon reading Miss Jackson's article "Doing more than Coping" (Gateway, Oct. 2/73) my first impression was to write a letter in anger and disgust at her comments regarding student GFC members. But since I have met Miss Jackson and was at that time impressed, I had second thoughts.

According to her analysis I am on GFC so I am on an "ego-thing". Furthermore, I am "obnoxious and ill-prepared". Even though I attend the meetings, apparently on one would like me because:

1). I don't shoot my mouth off about each and every issue so that I can listen to my own voice and other students can take pride in my noise they're hearing, even if I'm not saying anything.

2). I'm not pulling all the student reps together and voting the way they do, even though

What I am doing makes me even more "obnoxious and I hereby apologize for:

1). I listen to the intelligent and logical arguments presented, recognizing what I feel are the important factors, no matter who is voicing the argument.

2). I vote on the issues as my conscience dictates after taking in all the views of my friends and student-associates (enemies?).

3). I am involved in trying to improve the educational system at U of A, while trying to attend a few classes and I consider the view point of administration, faculty-staff, and students.

In conclusion, I can only say that I recognize my sins, but I

*This issue: Chile, another point of view;  
car complaints;  
an actual editorial;  
Peter Flynn speaks;  
a lame duck waddles into print;  
Jackson's back; and more letters on Page 6.*

Love ya.

can not stop doing them. It's worse for me too, because it seems the Gateway endorses Terry Jackson's view and just may condemn me, come judgement day. My only question is do the students condemn me too?

Somewhat Sincerely  
Gary Harris  
Arts III

## Fun fair at GM

If it's fun-fair stuff you're seeking, sure G.M. has something new; They mass-produce a line of jokes built specially for you. They call these items 'Fun-cars' for they're made to fall apart. Completely unpredictable 'bout when they'll stop or start.

CHORUS: Oh the Envoys and Firenzias/And now the Vegas too/Make a circus out of motoring/A monkey out of you.

If you buy their little fun-car there'll be many shocks in store./So be prepared for thrills and spills, catastrophes galore./Like any other fun-fair you will lose out in the end./They'll rook you sides and centre so you cannot win my friend.

### CHORUS

You are just the poor consumer and a pawn in G.M.'s game/Another fool to be ripped off-Nonentity's your name./If you're fond of peaceful living, then you'll take this tip from me/Stay clear away from Oshawa--they're not your cup of tea.

### CHORUS

The Dissatisfied Firenza Owners are continuing in their efforts to get fair compensation from General Motors of Canada. Up to date, the response from General Motors has been an insult to the intelligence of these owners.

In the absence of any effective legislation at either Federal or Provincial level, which could be used to help dissatisfied automobile owners, the only recourse left for consumers is through publicity to counter the huge advertising campaigns of the big corporations. Only if the consumers themselves are concerned enough and the 'Media' interested enough will these corporations be pressured into more responsible marketing practices.

Perhaps as a contribution to our efforts you would be prepared to publish the enclosed verses to be sung to the tune of "The Wearing of The Green".

If people have complaints about automobiles, please write to the Automobile Protection Assoc., P.O. Box 117, Station E, Montreal, Quebec.

Yours sincerely  
Elizabeth N. Cook



editorial

## MEETA

Elsewhere on these pages, you will find a story on Television north formerly MEETA. If you have not read it already, I would suggest that you do so before going any farther into this editorial.

Assuming that you now have a basic knowledge of the calibre of Television north's programming, I'm sure you agree that there is something for everyone.

Isn't it unfortunate that TV north service is restricted to Edmonton's 44,000 cablevision subscribers? TV north is part of the Alberta Educational Communications Corporation, which is funded by the provincial government.

Isn't it unfortunate that the majority of Albertans can enjoy only a miniscule portion of a service their taxes pay for?

The AECC operates TV north, TV south, and radio station CKUA. Basically, this provides educational programming on cablevision in Edmonton and Calgary. The AECC, a provincewide network, reaches other provincial centers by buying time on local tv stations.

Unfortunately, finances restrict the purchases to early morning time slots. I have nothing against paying for broadcast time. After all, it is part of this society. It's all right for private stations.

But why must TV north, paid for by the taxpayers, have to buy time on the CBC, also paid for by the taxpayers?

The CBC is supposed to be the people's network, but it seems to have lost sight of its original mandate. Many of the programs on TV north can only be seen on cable because TV north can't afford to buy time to broadcast all its programming.

Negotiations for low price CBC broadcast time, that's low price, not free broadcast time, have been going on for quite a while. They don't seem to be successful. Even if they are successful, the taxpayer would still end up paying twice for educational tv service.

TV north is your right. You have paid for it. You should have access to it. It features high calibre programming. It is a fantastic alternative to commercial tv.

If you don't have cablevision, chances are you'll never see TV north.

You've read about some of the programs featured. It is very likely that you would like to see a lot of those programs. Aren't you going to do something about it? Sunday on CBC doesn't quite contain my idea of quality programming. Sympathy and support can be offered by calling TV north at 434-9441 or dropping in at 6240-113 St.

Satya Das

## Law and order

A number of recent articles on the Law and Order Report have done a disservice to readers in completely ignoring the fact that the U of A has always had a student discipline procedure; it is a change, not a new system, that has been proposed.

I would like to review some of the objections to the report and apply the same criticisms to the old student disciplinary procedure.

The three-man panel is a knagaroo court: this statement seems to be supported by some members of the Student's Union, who offer no alternative but suggest the proposed three man tribunal and appeal board be turned down.

The claim that the tribunal offers less justice than the old procedure of a hearing before Deans Council is simply incredible.

Under the new system, a student can get a transcript to base an appeal on, can take in a friend or a lawyer, faces two students and one other person.

Under the old system, no provision is made for counsel,

the sole record is summary minutes, and the student faces 25 administrators, including the president of the university as chairman.

From any point of view, the old system is the bigger "kangaroo"- it is expensive (one hour of Deans' Council costs about \$350 in salaries alone), and in no way do the individual Deans constitute peers, no matter how fair the individuals themselves may be.

The structure is too bureaucratic and complex: This argument also emanates from some Student's Union members, and once again is doubly incredible. Twenty-five paid administrators trying to reach a common mind is a bit bureaucratic and complex, but complexity is no fault per se.

Any disciplinary procedure must be able to gear up and provide a clear and undeniably fair hearing when campuses explode in conflict. Does anyone argue that if violent confrontation ever infects the sleeping masses at the U of A that Deans' Council will be less prone to railroad out "ringleaders" than a student influenced tribunal?

Expulsion is a serious penalty; counsel and transcripts are cheap prices to pay for making sure justice is served.

The report is an administration tool to repress students: This unsupported argument is simply factually wrong.

The Law and Order Committee was one committee where student participation paid off; anyone who doubts that should call either Provost Ryan, an administrator on the committee, or Charles Richmond, a student on the committee.

It was students who successfully pressed for a complete end to existing regulations that set different standards for women (against

administration advice); it was students who successfully pressed for written reasons for denials of applications; it was students who successfully pressed for two-thirds student membership on tribunals. The Graduate Students Association endorsed the report.

If this be cruel "oppression", then oppress on!

The rules are unfair to students, and besides faculty members don't have rules and disciplinary proceedings: The latter half of this argument is once again factually in error.

Doubters may approach an oppressive administrator and get a "Faculty Handbook", part of which has contractual status - it details exactly how and why a faculty member can be dismissed.

Once again, however, the reaction ignores the old system and treats the regulations as something new.

All of the regulations are leftovers from an incredibly long list of archaic in-loco-parentis standards developed in earlier years. Perhaps the current list could have been pared even more (and still can be under the standing review committee) - but it is senseless to choose the old list over the new.

I would suggest that the students who oppose the Law and Order report drop knee-jerk concepts like oppressive administrators and repressive rules, and instead evaluate the Law and Order Report as an alternative to the illogical set of rules judged by Deans' Council.

We need to escape ad-hominum and nihilistic arguments and take a strategic approach to real and possible changes. After years of issues that seemed remote from campus, the Law and Order Report is the fruit of working for change in our own backyard.

For our own sakes, lets not blow it lightly.

Peter Flynn  
GFC Representative

## Letters



## The Gateway

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. It is published by the Students Union twice weekly during the winter session on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Contents are the responsibility of the editor, opinions are those of the person expressing them. Letters to the editor on any subject are welcome, but must be signed. Please keep them short, letters should not exceed 200 words. Deadlines for submitting copy are 2 P.M. Mondays and Wednesdays.

editor-in-chief.....Allyn Cadogan

|                  |                |                   |                |
|------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| news .....       | Brian Tucker   | production .....  | Loreen Lennon  |
| .....            | Nadia Rudyk    | photography ..... | Sandy Campbell |
| arts .....       | Walter Plinge  | footnotes .....   | Colleen Milne  |
| advertising..... | Lorne Holladay | sports .....      | Paul Cadogan   |

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Peter Best, Rick Bilak, Belinda Bickford, Dave Borynac, Joe Czajkowski, Satya Das, Bernie Fritze, Bob Goetha, Paul Jones, Tony Joyce, Darlene King, Harold Kuckertz, Jr., Alan Mathews, Jim McLaughlin, Greg Neiman, Evelyn Osaka, Margriet Tilroe, Garry West, Edmund Wong, Barry Zuckerman.