The Letters/Opinions section of the Gazette is meant as a campus forum for all Dalhousie students. The opinions expressed within may not necessarily be those of the Gazette staff or editorial board. We welcome all submissions, but reserve the right to edit for style and content. It is the Gazette's mandate not to print racist, sexist or homophobic material.

LETTERS CONTINUED

hall meeting, are all illegal activities. Although municipal police were in attendance (standing inside the building that the federalists were trying to enter) both they and the riot squad did not intervene until after two men were on the ground in a fist fight. The police also refused to lay charges against the offenders.

How can we explain why the police deliberately allowed citizens to be harmed? Why weren't the rights of these people protected? The Government of Quebec has openly let it be known that the men and women in question are "enemies" of the people of Quebec. They are called partitionists — not loyalists. They are vilified in the media and are blamed for whatever harm comes to them.

While this was happening in Montreal, the former Premier of Quebec was making bigoted comments in Edmonton, against three ethnic groups residing in Quebec. On November 26, Premier Bouchard refused to criticize his predecessor, arguing instead that Mr. Parizeau is an eminent citizen who deserves our respect.

If only federalists residing in Quebec could also be free to say whatever they want, wherever they want, in whatever language they choose. If only all citizens, and their votes, were considered to be of equal value. Alas, such is not the case in Quebec. Has the Constitution of Canada already been amended to give special status to francophones in Quebec?

Francophones who voted "no" in the last referendum are not publicly attacked by Jacques Parizeau and by other fanatics. Consequently, I imagine that the police would have intervened much sooner if dozens of English-speaking thugs with a convicted terrorist killer as their leader had been waiting to intimidate and assault French-speaking senior citizens.

While the Prime Minister of Canada plays golf around the world, federalists in Quebec are receiving threatening phone calls to their homes. Obscenities are being painted on their doors. Mr. Villeneuve and other zealots are publicly identifying individuals whom they think should be killed.

Fellow Canadians, ask not for whom the bell tolls.

CATHERINE BLAKE Montreal, Quebec

Daily News Rebuttal

To the editor,

I should like to reply to the scurrilous attack apparently made upon part-time professors by columnists in the Daily News. They are reported to have said that we are acting like Ontario teachers; we want to strike not to raise our wages

(above the poverty line), but to plot to get education out of the hands of students, parents and administrators—where it belongs.

Recent events here, of course, demolished this particular argument. It seems that a computer has taken control of education at Dalhousie. Report has it that it wishes to abolish all classes. Clearly, if part-time teachers enter into a mammoth struggle for power in education, their only suitable adversary would have to be this computer.

The second argument of the columnists is that a strike by part-time professors in Halifax would make Canada uncompetitive and cause friction.

The argument develops through the following steps; students are happy now, even if they are in fact taught by hordes of part-time professors; demanding higher wages means students would have to pay higher fees; student loans would be greater; there are even larger hordes of students than part-time professors, so a lot of money would be involved; to afford such loans governments would have to borrow money; leading to balanced budgets and a lot of inflation; Canadian goods would cost more and no one would buy them; and, finally, chaos would ensue.

Some of their arguments are spurious. They argue, for example, that Halifax has the richest students in the country, since they can afford to pay the highest average tuition fees in Canada. Since they are the richest, they are also the happiest, (if you deny these premises it is questionable whether parttime professors are at the root of student unrest).

On the other hand, it is true that there are hordes of part-time professors cluttering up the environment, especially in university neighbourhoods. Together, with TAs, the part-timers constitute a respectable percentage of the super-city population.

Another misplaced argument of the columnists is to the effect that part-time professors are leading TAs astray. This is nonsense. TAs "join" voluntarily, since they will naturally graduate and themselves become mostly unemployed part-time professors!

There is not room to argue further. I end only by mentioning that we have heard unsubstantiated rumours about the computer, which has recently taken over Dalhousie.

First, that it is programmed to recommend a small reduction in part-timers salaries, down to \$3,000 a course. Second, that it is programmed to vote in favour of raises for administrators, and, especially, to itself. It already costs as much as would all part-time teachers and TAs over a ten year period — more or less!

DON HAMBRICH

Depending on your honour

Generally I am not much inclined to the kind of cynicism which states that "business ethics" is an oxymoron. But, I must confess that the events of the last few weeks have made me question my faith in human nature.

As most people on campus know, last Wednesday the Dalhousie Association of Graduate Students (DAGS) executive, almost entirely made up of students from Dalhousie's Masters of Business Administration (MBA) program, collectively resigned; apparently in response to the overwhelming support of Dalhousie's graduate students to keep the Grad House open.

The DAGS executive, who had argued against such a move, apparently couldn't stomach the principle of democracy and so immediately resigned. Perhaps it could be argued that the executive merely felt that they could not adequately represent a population so clearly at odds with their own opinions. But, the vindictive way in which they resigned, without even waiting to establish an interim executive or arrange for new elections, calls to mind the behaviour of the spoiled kid who owns the marbles and, if he cannot arbitrarily make up the rules, by gumbo he will take them home and play with

But I digress. Reprehensible though this behaviour is, it is not what I am writing about today. Today I am writing about business ethics, and what concerns me is not so much the childish resignation of the DAGS executive, as the sleazy legislation they pumped through DAGS council days before their resignation.

First a little background. Grad students at Dal pay special rates of student fees, 60% of which are used by the DSU and DAGS to fund their activities. The remaining 40% (approximately) are then allotted to the various grad societies of Dal's many departments. Well, at least this is what usually happens. Due to some quirk in the undetermined past, the MBA society has always received 100% of the fees which MBA students pay to the DSU.

Wow, you might say. Why should the MBA society get 100% of their fees back, while every other grad society gets only 40%? When the disparity came to light this year, the injustice of it was perceived by all, including those MBA students who were members of the DAGS executive and council. Nonetheless, the MBA society stated that they had made financial commitments which

required that the society retain most of the money it usually received from DAGS for this year.

And so, during a meeting called on short notice and not adequately publicized, which was attended only by three members of the DAGS executive, all MBA students, and six councillors, three of whom were also MBA students, DAGS council voted 6 to 3 (guess who voted which way) to maintain MBA society funding at 90% of the fees paid by MBA students for the next three years.

Now I can understand that the MBA society had no reason to suspect that their suspiciously high funding would be cut this year, and that financial commitments made before the issue came to light would still have to be met. So, maintain their funding at a high level for this year, or establish a special fund to bail them out of a situation which their poor business sense had gotten them into. But why maintain it at 90% for the next three years? This is pure, unadulterated sleaze in action.

Taken in conjunction with the resignation of the DAGS executive, the comparison to the rich kid who

owns the marbles is fully realized. Before resigning, the former DAGS executive signed a legally binding contract which will ensure that the funding of the MBA society will be maintained at 90% for the next three years. Then they went home.

Why should the MBA society exist as a parasite living off the fees paid by the rest of Dalhousie's students? Why should MBA students not have to contribute their student fees to the running of the DSU and DAGS, just like other Dalhousie grad students? Why shouldn't MBA society funding be set at the same rate for next year as that of every other grad student society?

My faith in human nature remains intact, however. We cannot allow the activities of a limited group of MBA students to tarnish the image of all MBA students at Dal. And so I confidently call upon the MBA community to use their voice. Speak out against a dishonest, unjust arrangement and force the MBA society to voluntarily withdraw from this corrupt contract. Your honour depends on it.

GREG BAK





