



S.G.A. TO CHARGE FEE

SPECIAL MEETING PASSES BILL

by DAVE TABOLT
Special News Writer

S.G.A. Adjourns



RONALD BATCHELOR
OSGA PRESIDENT

UNIVERSITY PARK
All nineteen nonwealth campus Government associations were represented at the Fall Conference of the Organization of Student Government Associations (OSGA) at University Park last Friday, November 15.

BEHREND LEADER PRESIDES

Presiding over the day meeting will be A President, Ronald Batchelor, who is the student Behrend student attain this office.

Mr. Batchelor was student body [OSGA] President at Behrend last year and was elected to a post last Spring. Here, he also was member of the Keynote Society and Behrend Readers, President recipient of the Bull Award.

PROBLEMS DISCUSSED

Some of the problems discussed were those of regional communications and coordinators, OSGA's role in encouraging minority groups to attend the nonwealth Campuses, continuation of transfer students to the University Park, and housing problems of transfer students.

The Student Government Association passed a bill calling for a three dollar activities fee at a special meeting on November 14. The following day, they told the CUB that they "might not be able to do it at all". At that time, they were looking into the possibilities the newly passed bill allowed.

OSGA treasurer Jim Burger indicated that the bill may be useless because "there's already an activities fee." This fee is part of the regular tuition.

The bill recognized this possibility with a clause for making the fee mandatory if possible.

Burger estimated an income of \$2,400 if the mandatory stipulation is applied and \$1,500 if it is not.

According to Burger one proposed use of the money was for student activities including: the Winter Carnival, Valentine Dance, new clubs and the Dorm Council. With an activities fee ticket, a one-half price would be granted for all affairs.

Burger also said that the fee had been suggested to members of OSGA by several students during the past few days. It was unanimously approved by the twelve members attending the meeting, the exact number needed to constitute a quorum.

One of the students who had suggested the measure was dissatisfied with the final product. Dave Will, activities committee member said, "It was done all wrong. There was no investigation of the student opinion and it was railroaded through."

OSGA secretary Kathy A'Loe, however, protested the criticism. "I think it's a good idea to have it. Through this fee it may be possible to have some name entertainment here."

Gary Lackovic and Arnie Caldwell, S.G.A. Chairman and President of the student body were attending the OSGA Fall Conference at University Park and were unavailable for comment at this writing.

EDITORIAL

Sounds great but...

by Concetta Rizzo
Editor-in-Chief

The OSGA's bill for an activities fee was the prodigious conception of several student body members. The OSGA accepted it as the best method for improving their financial state. By all means it was the easiest.

However, exactly WHAT was guaranteed by this bill?

It seems everything (in the form of promises) and nothing (in the form of contract). Although I cannot say that the promises are futile, I can question their sincerity. Just what would stop their fulfillment from being dropped at the waste side?

If it was not evident while you read the above article, a copy of the bill was not affixed. It seems Mr. Tabolt was denied a copy by the OSGA secretary, her reason being that the minutes were not official. ACCORDING TO THE CONSTITUTION A BILL IS MADE LAW AFTER IT IS PASSED BY A MAJORITY OF OSGA. The bill is law as it reads unless it is vetoed by the President of the student body or upon presented evidence of unconstitutionality, the Student Judiciary judges it as such.

I find no excuse for a bill concerning the student body to be hidden. My notes from the meeting [I attended the menagerie] revealed the bill to read: An activities fee of three dollars to be paid winter term (which may if possible be mandatory) by students, faculty and administrators.

The uses of the money as described by Mr. Burger were discussed and as treasurer I have no doubts concerning his plans, however he is only one member. THE FACT REMAINS THAT THERE IS NO RESOLUTION TO CHANNEL THE PROMISES.

The mistake made was obviously that of no committee stage for preparation of a bill that perhaps could be more stipulated or designated to a control point (such as the activities committee). This is even more evident since they are investigating a law.

Obviously the bill would have been better off had it been proposed in writing by those who originated the idea, maybe more thought would have been applied.