

Letters

Grads reply

To the Gazette:

The editorial in last week's Gazette seriously misrepresented the position of the DAGS Council in the present conflict with the Student Union. Since the piece contains attacks on the personal integrity of DAGS Council members it is necessary that I reply in detail.

It is stated that the Gazette was informed that the ballot for last Tuesday's referendum would contain three options. Such a ballot was never envisaged by the Council. Apparently I am supposed to have said something about a multichoice ballot at an open meeting on November 19. However, if you read the report on that meeting in the November 20 issue of the Gazette you will see a reference to a one question ballot, but no reference to any other kind of ballot.

To have offered our members a range of options to choose from would have been farcical. The results would be ambiguous and open to any number of interpretations. The Student Union used such a deceptive method in its referendum on the increase of Union fees in October 1974. However, DAGS does not conduct its affairs as the Student Union does. Our members were asked whether or not they supported the position of the DAGS Council that ten dollars of the fifty dollar Student Union fee paid by graduate students be allocated to DAGS and that the consequence of continued intransigence on the part of the Union will be the withdrawal of graduate students from the Union. The results of this kind of referendum could not be anything but clear and unambiguous.

The Gazette now seems to support the Union's proposal that major societies be allowed to apply to the Union Council for partial support of specific programs. Two weeks ago the Gazette said that this proposal was unreasonable because it would involve "making the

grad students crawl for money to the students council". In this earlier edition the situation was described perfectly. Over the last few weeks, however, the student press seems to have lost its good sense.

The Union's cost-share proposal, which the Gazette rightly condemned at one time, is inadequate for a number of reasons. The programs that DAGS has in mind (e.g., subsidizing typing of thesis and other work, improving wages and working conditions of graduate teaching assistants, subsidizing day-care) require permanent funding. This is not provided in the Union's proposal as it has been presented. Furthermore, the costshare proposal would give the Student Union Council the right to approve or disapprove of DAGS policies. For practical and for reasons of principle this is quite unacceptable. We will not allow our programs to be subject to shifting priorities of succeeding Student Union Councils. Priorities for the expenditure of a portion of the Student Union fee paid by graduate students should be determined by the graduate students' association.

Finally, the Gazette accuses the DAGS Council of imposing an unreasonable time limit on the Union Council. As the Gazette knows, negotiations between DAGS and the Union have been going on since June. Seven months is plenty of time for an organization like the Union to change.

Yours sincerely, John Cheyne, President, Dalhousie Association of Graduate Students.

thoughtless?

To the Gazette:

The editorial of December 4 can only be considered a thoughtless and imprudent outburst that has substituted assucation for analysis. In place of an informed discussion of the issues of decentralization and

major society autonomy, the editorial constituted a vicious assault on the character and intelligence of both graduate students and their representatives.

The Gazette is most certainly entitled to express its opinions. I believe its analysis to be shallow and short sighted. Nevertheless, the style of presentation was both emotional and vindictive. In the short term the Gazette's position can only serve to further polarize already divided camps. But regardless of the outcome of Tuesday's referendum, the editorial establishes a precedent for sensationalist and polemical journalism that will long be remembered.

In sum, I can only express my very deep anger and regret regarding the Gazette's editorial statement. Though the intended target of the diatribe was the Dalhousie Association of Graduate Students, the real victim was a sober and reflective student press.

Sincerely
Paul M. Evans
Department of Political Science

Slanderous or what?

To the Gazette,

There is much to be lamented in the December 4 Gazette editorial

concerning the graduate students' referendum. The defamation of graduate students and their DAGS council is inexcusable. Several points made in the editorial indicate that the writer was either sorely misinformed or merely determined to completely misrepresent the Cont'd on page 7







