

Candidates short-sighted on referendum

"No way, Howard. We won't pay more for tuition when this deal expires. Back in 1985, in return for contributing student dollars to your capital campaign, we got you to agree to keep our tuition indexed to inflation.

"But sure, we'll gladly hand over \$200,000 of our members' money so we can pay for budget items you're responsible for. And no, it doesn't bother us that the referendum which passed the \$25 fee was so rigged by the Dalplex administration that the Council couldn't stomach passing it for the original three years.'

A logical position? Not really. But both candidates for DSU president support the referendum while at the same time vowing to keep the cost-of-living-indexed tuition agreement.

How can Dr. Clark take the DSU president, the strongest voice of students on campus, seriously when they tell him "the buck stops here" when throughout their campaigns they've been gladly handing over all the bucks the starving administration needs?

As VP of the Students' Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (SAHPER), Shannon Hessian's support can at least be understood.

But what about Dave Shannon's platform of "logical process" and "strategic planning"? What about his and Terry Crawley's supposed anger over the nickel-and-diming incidental fees slapped on everything from re-reading exams to letters of permission? What would you call an extra \$25 fee tacked on to fulltime students' fees just for coming to Dal?

Shannon and Crawley support the fee as a temporary measure to improve school spirit, but its success can only mean more user fees - maybe for the library? After all, students use the books the most, right?

As "No" campaigner Robin Hamilton said yesterday, the students are paying for the administration's mistakes - for example, putting the fieldhouse floor over rubber

Dalplex director Tony Martin's proposed distribution for 1989/90 includes about \$30,000 a year to meal and travel allowances for varsity teams, as well as making up for the 2.5% budget cutback that all departments had to absorb this year - all departments except athletics, which was far-sighted enough to engineer their personal referendum to provide a ready cash reserve. (And what is the proportion of varsity students to the rest of the 10,000member student body, anyway?)

As for last year's referendum process, it was a bungled mess of administrative meddling and rumours of intimidation during the campaign which left students with an impossibly complicated array of "choices" on the ballot, resulting in the referendum's squeaking through.

In a four-page letter to Dr. Clark last April, the-DSU President Caroline Zayid outlined the bad faith shown by administration negotiators. Apparently "impatient or nervous" at what they saw as slow process in the talks, administrastion officials organized the signing of a petition with the 10,000 signatures necessary to call a referendum. After listing several complaints she received from students about the campaign process, Zayid closed by telling Clark she could not "state too strongly the suspicion and ill will that has been creaated by the conduct of members of Administration regarding the student referendum

This is what the DSU president has to deal wth. A firm stand on refusing special fees now would help Shannon with his stated principle of "stating what your goals are and working by coalition". Hessian has said she'll raise campus spirit, ensuring that "not 1000 but 10,000" students will turn out for rallies to support the tuition agreement. Okay, okay, the figures are election rhetoric. But if she is basing this strategy on what worked for her during the strike, then the glow of a successful student protest may be clouding her vision. Students won't turn out in the same numbers for an issue like negotiations over what seems to them 'only' roughly a hundred-dollar yearly increase in tuition fees, if they're not being hurt by something as drastic as no classes and a possible delay in summer jobs.

Both candidates should rethink theur stand if they really want to protect students' long-term interests.

Heather Hueston

OPINION **Elections** plagued with apathy

by Scott Matthews

It's time for another round of student elections and nobody seems to care who is being elected. Surprise, surprise.

The people that get elected affect the daily lives of students as well as the overall image of the university within the community. Every election in recent memory has had student apathy as one of its main themes. It is time we took a serious look at what student apathy has done to the operations of Dalhousie University. Since students are the

only ones who can bring about change in the university they have to be informed of what is going on.

The Commerce Society, who could be expected to implement the best accounting controls and management procedures seems to have the worst. Commerce students are currently paying the highest student fees and I (as a Commerce student) would like to know why. Renovations to the Commerce House last year were approximately \$40,000, but how

Continued on page 8

You are the few, the chosen. Gazette Staff. Determine the editor for next year.

Choices: Sandy MacKay, Lyssa McKee, Scott Neily

Alison Auld Karen Bergen Eric Brown Alex Burton Paul Carver Lynda Cassels **Connie Clarke** Lisa Clifford Laurie Cook **Brian Dorey Andrew Duke Shelley Galliah** Amber-Leigh Golding Erin Goodman Jean Haliburton **James Hamilton Jeff Harrington Heather Hueston** Lorna Irons

Alison Johnston **Ruth Legge Kenny Lewis Donald Macinnes** Sandy MacKay **David Mansvelt Robert Matthews** Lyssa McKee **Jessica Meijer Chris Murray Scott Neily Kirsten Nichols** Arielia Pahlke Scott Randall **Ellen Reynolds Ryan Stanley Geoff Stone Michele Thibeau**

Mike Thompson

Screening of candidates Thursday, March 16 4:00 p.m.

Brian Lennox

Voting

Friday, March 17 9:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m.

Students still angry

I'm Nobody! Who are you? Are you - Nobody - Too? Then there's a pair of us? Don't tell! they'd advertise - you know! How dreary - to be - Somebody! How public - like a Frog -To tell one's name - the livelong June -To an admiring Bog!

by Paula M. Clark Elizabeth A. Power

When the Dalhousie Faculty strike of 1988 is mentioned one thought that comes to mind is:

God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to

change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the

difference. This paper evolved as a result of

the lack of serenity in the lives of Dalhousie students. Is it lack of wisdom that has impeded them from speaking out on their own behalf? Or is it lack of courage resulting from fear of repercus-

The Administration put Dalhousie's image ahead of concern for students.

sion that has made it essential for me to guarantee the anonymity of student contributors?

Students at Dalhousie University have recently gained important insight into this poem by Emily Dickison. Having examined the consequences of the Dalhousie Faculty Association (DFA) strike with respect to students, we could logically deduce that students have been treated as and, in fact, are "Nobody" at Dalhousie. However, contrary to Dickinson's exclamation "How dreary - to be - Soembody! Dalhousie students do want to be Somebody. They want to be learners at a secondary institution obtaining a quality education; that is what they paid for. Certainly in this post-strike period, many Dalhousie students are presently reflecting upon their choice.

Emily Dickenson

The DFA and the administration have provoked much propaganda concerning the recent DFA strike. Students have voiced their opinions as well, yet by and large, the DFA and administrative, points of view have been far more pervasive than that of the students. Nonetheless, as the students are said to be the most injured party, it would only be fitting to examine their point of view as they pick up the pieces during the aftermath. This paper will therefore examine what Dalhsouie students feel about the strike. Given the fact that these students are from nine various faculties and/or deprtments and in various years of study, an interesting cross section of the most numerous group of people at Dalhousie, ie., the student body, is represented. It is also relevant o indicate that these students do share one thing in common: they are unhappy with what has happened and especially so, as it was at student expense.

The headlines may have read "DFA voting on contract; life returning to normal." However, discontentment seems to rumble underneath that calm front. A major grievance repeated time and time again was that of the

lack of effort on behalf of the administration to help students during the strike.

What students said about the administration:

• washed its hands of student responsibility, thereby leaving studnets to clean up the mess themselves.

• put Dalhousie's image ahead of concern for students.

• tailed to make an across-theboard decision as to whether or not classes should be cancelled, thereby hurting studnets.

• created an ethical dilemma for students: cross the picket line and break the strike or miss essential material in ongoing classes?

 did not clarify potential repercussion either of these choices would have on the students. What students said about the

DFA: • seemed to be concerned, but how concerned were they?

• was vocally concerned about student interests, vet was it any more than a patronizing "we'll do what we can for you?

The head people of the **DFA** sold student souls to get what they wanted

• was concerned during the strike, handling student interests along with their own. However there came a point when the DFA put themselves ahead of student concerns.

• was concerned, but the head people of the DFA sold student souls to get what they wanted. Student reaction to the Settlement

• glad, and moreover, relieved that the strike had finally been Continued on page 8