

The faculty — what is their position?

By Stanley Urman

Academic Vice-Principal John O'Brien received a standing ovation after delivering a speech to the special faculty meeting on Saturday. O'Brien may regard this outpouring of emotion as the overwhelming consent of the faculty to the administration's actions. If he does, he is wrong!

When the Anderson case first came into the limelight, most professors, like the administration, thought the issue would die down with the passing of time.

The events leading up to the Sunday hearing crystallized the issue in the eyes of many of the faculty. The dispute was reaching a potentially explosive head and the time to chose sides was nearing.

Professors like Genovese, Klein and others jumped into the fray for the administration but most tried to remain on the sidelines to see how things developed.

Confrontation comes

At the Wednesday hearing the expected

confrontation materialized resulting in the student's occupation of the computer center.

Professors finally realized the gravity of the situation and began to openly state their positions.

A "Faculty for Justice" petition was drawn up and circulated among the faculty members. The twenty-five professors who signed the petition demanded that a new hearing committee agreeable to both sides be set up as soon as possible.

Another petition called for a general faculty meeting to discuss the problem.

Some faculty members even signed the sheet listing the five demands of the striking students.

Lecturer resigns

Sociology lecturer, Pat Pajonas, tendered her resignation stating in part that she could not "ally herself with an institution whose administration has perpetuated through ineptitude and secretiveness such injustices that have occurred."

On Thursday evening the council of the Sir George Williams Association of University Teachers held a meeting which resulted in the expression of the "full confidence of the SGWAUT council in the impartiality of the hearing committee in its' hearing of the Anderson case."

A motion of confidence in Academic Vice-Principal O'Brien was subsequently passed.

With the weekend approaching, some faculty members continued their efforts trying to solicit faculty support for the black student demands but they were meeting with little success. A general faculty meeting had been called for Saturday, and most profs wanted to wait and see what happened then.

Massive snowjob

The Saturday meeting was everything the administration hoped it would be. O'Brien gave his well practised propaganda message and most faculty gobbled it up. In the question period that ensued, careful attention was paid as to who was

allowed to ask the Vice-Principal questions. Dean McLeod, chairman of the Biology Department was permitted to ask two questions while persons who have come out in support of the students, such as Prof. Munoz, were not recognized by the chair.

Contrary to published reports, not everyone at the meeting gave O'Brien a standing ovation. Estimates from those present say from 50-60% rose to 'honor' O'Brien.

Faculty members are now attempting to unite those professors who disagree with the administration's handling of the affair. They do not have an easy task.

Many are afraid to sign anything that is contrary to the administration's wishes for fear of losing their jobs.

Others may want to sign a position paper but haggle over working.

One thing is certain. Contrary to popular belief, not all faculty members support the administration. Further to

(Continued on page three)

the georgian

We saw you Mr. Callaghan.

Vol. XXXII, No. 35, Tuesday, February 4, 1969

SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY

The myth of impartiality

By Victor A. Lehotay

A publication called the **Statement** has come out with three issues in the last five days in an attempt to present an unbiased account of the crisis situation at this university. This would be justifiable if some attempt had been made to ensure that those responsible for this publication were in fact unbiased. But who appointed these people? They appointed themselves. Moreover, the administration has unquestioningly accepted these people's opinion of themselves as "honorable men", to the extent of providing them with approximately \$1,500 to date to put out their publication. Would a self-appointed committee of the black students be given a similar amount to publicize their own position? We asked Professor Callaghan this question in an informal discussion and it was his personal opinion that they would not. In fact, when **the georgian**, (which is not self-appointed but is under the veto power of both the S.L.C. and students), undertook to present the black students' case, rather than having its expenses paid, it was threatened with legal action.

Morality or Legality?

The only argument that can be extracted from the elaborate verbiage of the **Statement** is that the Hearing Committee

may or may not be just, but it is legal. It is legal because Quebec law puts all legal authority into the hands of the Board of Governors who put it into the hands of Acting Principal Clarke. In the same breath it is admitted that for the past several decades university teachers have found this situation unsatisfactory and have just recently approved a document allowing for more just treatment of faculty members by the administration. Obviously therefore, legal or not, university teachers can draw up documents determining their freedom. Why can they do this? Because they are organized into a body. Students, not being organized into a body, act illegally when they ask that their demands be met. This is one of the underlying issues. It has to be kept in mind that the "Procedure for Dealing with Complaints Against Faculty Members", which forms the basis for many of the arguments of the **Statement**, was drawn up by SGWAUT, a faculty body; students had no say in it, and in fact it **makes no provisions for handling student complaints against faculty.**

This document has as its moral principle, that faculty members must be judged by their peers. Students, on the other hand, are never judged by other students, but by faculty or administration. Thus we must conclude that they hold themselves to be our peers, in which case it is not unreasonable to ask that we should occasionally sit in judgement over them.

Committee Members Uncertain of Themselves

That there should be two students on the Hearing Committee was not an un-negotiable demand, as it is made out to be. The suggestion was also made that people from outside the university might sit on the Committee. Both of these ideas came after a realization by black students that some of the faculty members chosen for the Committee were either not impartial, or themselves ex-

pressed uncertainty about their own impartiality! Further, it has been said that at first black students took the position that the Hearing Committee should be composed of faculty members, and later changed their mind. It just happened that the Committee **was** composed of faculty members to begin with. This was never an explicit demand on the part of the students.

The **Statement** says that the black students "informed Professor Adamson that Mr. Leo Bertley is on the Hearing Committee." Acting Principal Clarke called this a **unilateral** decision on television yesterday. But how can the **chairman** of a Committee be **unilaterally informed** that someone is on his Committee? Obviously it was up to Professor Adamson to secure Professor Anderson's consent for this candidate.

Verbal Agreement and Precedent

Above all, it is claimed that the definite and openly admitted verbal agreement between the students and Professors Da-

vis, Marsden, Buckner and Clarke cannot be construed as binding. But if the Principal is the only person with legal authority in the university, if in other words there is no **legal code** that requires written agreements, then verbal agreements must be construed as equally important. Not only was there a verbal agreement that both parties must agree to the composition of the Committee, but a **precedent** was set when the first changes suggested by the black students were accepted.

These facts have been wilfully obscured. The administration is now attempting to hide its mishandling of the case by claiming that there was no **possibility** of negotiating further with the black students. This is how it justifies going ahead with the hearings against all common sense, against the opinion of much of the student population, (evinced by the statements of support issued by various associations), and against the opinion of

(Continued on page three)



Four cloaked students carrying signs expressing the sentiments of certain other students of this university, visited the cafeteria yesterday morning. Another sign read: "Support your administration - do nothing."

STUDENTS' LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEETING TONIGHT

7:30 P.M., H-333
TO DEAL WITH THE S.L.C.'S POSITION ON THE "ANDERSON AFFAIR" REPERCUSSIONS

the georgian

The georgian is an editorially autonomous newspaper published by the Communications Board of the Students' Association of Sir George Williams University, Montreal. The editorial offices are located in room 647 and 649 of the Henry F. Hall Building, 1455 de Maisonneuve, Montreal 25, Quebec. Telephone: 879-4585 and 879-4581. Telex: 01-26193. Advertising offices are located in room 639. Messrs. H. Krupp, M. Rosenfeld, telephone: 879-4462.

Editor-in-chief.....David A. Bowman
Associate Editor.....Chris Hall
Managing Editor.....Stanley Urman
Business Manager.....Alan S. Zweig
News Editor.....Anne McLean
Contributing Editors.....Victor A. Lehotay
 Arnold Zeman

Supplement Editor.....Don McKay
Sports Editor.....Steve Halperin
Photo Editors.....Lenny Ritter
 Larry Clemen
Desk Editors.....George Bibby
 Simone Rawas

Members of: Canadian University Press United States Student Press Association
 Typeset and litho: Journal Offset Inc. 254 Benjamin Hudon, Montreal, 9. 331-9721.

Questions That Are Being Asked

(1) Why are there no students on the Hearing Committee?

In this university, when a student is accused of a misdemeanor relating to his role as a member of the university community, he is judged by an ad hoc committee made up of students, faculty and administration representatives. Yet, when a member of the faculty is charged with a breach of ethics or something similar, he is judged by faculty members alone. To quote from a faculty statement on reorganization of university government, "Participation by students in the decision-making process is necessary." Why can no students be permitted to sit on a hearing committee examining a faculty member? This is a question that is being asked. We certainly don't have the answer.

(2) Why is there no negotiation regarding the Hearing Committee?

This is what the black students wish to know. One of their 5 demands states "That the Administration arrange a meeting of themselves, Prof. Anderson and ourselves to settle the composition of a Hearing Committee." What the black students are demanding, is that there be negotiations. The next move must be made by the Administration.

(3) Why were the police not called into the University when the students occupied the Computer Center?

Why should they have been? No police were called into the bookstore last year when students occupied that area. In fact, no charges of any sort were laid when bookstore Manager, Jack Silver, was involuntarily confined to the bookstore. However, the "involuntary detention" of John O'Brien resulted in charges of conspiracy, kidnapping, and extortion.

(4) Why did the University use the security measures which they did on Sunday, January 26th, the first day of the hearings?

Why doesn't the University Administration identify the "elements" they felt might attempt to "occupy parts of the Hall Building"? If the administration decided not to call police into the Computer Center why did they feel it necessary to have them on campus because of the "danger" of an occupation? There is an obvious lack of consistency here.

(5) Is there racial discrimination in the admission of students to Sir George and in other aspects of our University?

There most definitely is a quota determining admission of West Indian students to this university. In fact, the quota of West Indian students to be admitted has been substantially reduced.

(6) Is there no alternative to the present Hearing Committee?

Black students can not and will not participate in hearings being conducted by a committee they feel to be partial. By participating in these hearings and then appealing to a higher body, they would be conceding the legitimacy of the first committee.

Faculty...

(Continued from page one)

that, a petition repudiating the administration's statements is circulating this evening. It reads:

DISSENTING FACULTY STATE POSITION

The following members of the Faculty publicly repudiate the Administration's one-sided statements which are being distributed to the students in various editions of STATEMENT. The so-called "ad hoc group of students and faculty" which drafted the Administration's viewpoint were hand-picked people known for their unswerving allegiance to the Administration. Those one-sided statements are being released to the student body as the "voice of reason". However, they are solely the voice of the Administration in the Anderson affair. Some faculty members were discouraged from working with the Administration's "ad hoc" groups. The Administration wishes to set up "codes of behaviour and ethics for students" because, as Dr. O'Brien said in the Faculty of Arts meeting on Monday, January 27, 1969, there is a "crisis in authority" in the University.

We repudiate Faculty meetings that are stage-managed by pro-Administration Faculty members to give support to Dr. O'Brien. For example, when Dr. O'Brien addressed the special meeting of Faculty on Saturday, February 1, dissenting Faculty members such as Professors Munoz and Orton were not recognized by the Chairman of the meeting, Clare Callaghan, Vice President of the Sir George Williams Association of University Teachers (SGWAUT). This was even though some pro-Administration Faculty spoke twice at the meeting.

We repudiate the completely subservient role of the Faculty company union the SGWAUT to the Administration in the Anderson case. It should be noted, in trying to understand the role of SGWAUT, that its membership includes as well as Faculty, "The Principal, the Vice-Principal Academic, the Deans and the Assistant Deans of the Faculty, and Schools" as well as "All former members of the Association connected with the University."

We ask all honest and principled Faculty members to stand up and denounce the above-mentioned unjust actions of the Administration. The demands of the Black students are just and moderate. They should be supported.

David Orton
 V. Kovalski
 Stan Munoz
 Leandre Bergeron
 Pat Pajonas
 George Predelli (Chaplain)
 Mair Verthuy

The petition will continue being circulated in the hope of drumming up more faculty support for the students.

Myth...

(Continued from page one)

number of faculty members. (The faculty did not take a unanimous stand in support of the administration; the meeting was held closed so that dissident elements could be kept from airing their views).

Face-Saving Poor Attitude

If then the Hearing Committee is theoretically legal, because Acting Principal Clarke can legally make arbitrary decisions, but it is generally agreed that this is not a good thing to do; and if then the justness of the Committee is admitted to be questionable, what reason can the administration have for going on with the present Hearings? Their rationalization is that they wish to handle the case with dispatch, in all fairness to professor Anderson. But it is obvious that the handling of the case with no matter what dispatch, but without the agreement of all parties, can only lead to move ultimate delay, and has in fact led to a great deal of adverse publicity. If the administration truly had Professor Anderson's best interests at heart it would immediately negotiate with the students.

It was suggested in yesterday's editorial, (although it was not very clear because of proofing mistakes), that they are trying to save face by letting this obviously useless hearing come to an end rather than publicly disband it. It can only be said that to be trying to save face during a crisis of such magnitude is a very poor attitude.

The Fifth Demand

It must be made clear, however, that capitulation of the administration on even the first four issues will not bring about negotiations. This is because the bringing of criminal charges completely unproportional to the act is regarded by students as a purely political act the aim of which is to provide material for compromise. Unless every attempt is made to retract these absurd charges, the students will have no faith in the administration whatsoever.

A rally will be held today at 1 p.m. on the mezzanine to discuss the latest developments in the "Anderson affair". Delegations from McGill and UGEQ will be in attendance.

Letters

Non-Canadians take note!

Editor: the georgian;

To: The Black students and their supporters.

From: French Canadian students of S.G.W.U.

Attention: All those who are not Canadian citizens.

Go ahead, ask for the support of the separatists.

They will be most happy to help you in your occupation of the Computer Centre.

You are helping them do what Raymond Lemieux and the M.I.S. couldn't; upset a Quebec English-language university from within.

It is not your case they are fighting

for, it is their cause. You are being used. The separatists must be laughing.

Just as Gabon suffered due to its interference in Canadian domestic affairs so might foreign students at this university suffer from their alliance with the separatist cause.

If you prefer to finish your studies outside Canada you would save yourselves a lot of time just by dropping a note to the Immigration Department.

Marc-André Cedam, Com. III

Richard E. Robert, Arts III

Paul André Dumont, Com. III

Guy Béliveau, Com. III

P.S. - Copies of this letter will be sent to the Immigration Department and the Press.

The view from Prof. Buckner

Editor: the georgian

Since my role in organizing and coordinating the security forces for the Anderson Hearing on Sunday, January

26th, has been publicly called into question I would like to explain my reasons for taking on this job. First of all, I realized when I considered the job that it would be unpopular, and that negative personal consequences would follow. Since I decided to take the job in the face of this knowledge I accept responsibility for my decision, and am not upset that many should doubt the propriety of a professor organizing security. I doubt it myself.

When I was called in to discuss "security arrangements" on Friday, January 24th, I found that some of the people present were advocating stringent security measures, based on what I felt was an entirely unrealistic view of the situation -- a view appropriate for a revolution, perhaps, but hardly in line with the restraint and reason which had been evident in the actions of the Black students. I was afraid of what might happen if the security for the hearing were organized to respond to a revolution, and if the person in charge was a "hard-

liner" who might panic and call in the police. Therefore I took charge and organized as little security as I could get away with -- given the climate of fear and the continued presence of those who thought it a revolution. As it turned out my view was correct, and even the minimal security precautions which had been taken were unnecessary. Throughout the weekend I continued to fight off and veto arguments for more drastic security. I believe that this may be confirmed by inquiring of anyone present during that time.

On Monday, January 27th, I turned the operation back to normal building security.

I am unhappy that my actions are viewed with distaste, but I expected this reaction before I started, and I take responsibility for my decisions. I will be glad to present my views in more detail to anyone who asks.

H. Taylor Buckner
 Assistant Professor
 Sociology

rear view of our crisis

1691
w9iv
1uo fo
2izir3

By Victor A. Lehotay

Love me I'm a liberal

A liberal is a radical who is always afraid of not being radical enough. In other words, it is a person who has been pressured into it, a person who is radical only in **response** to a radical situation, and who would immediately revert to conservatism if this situation did not exist. By contrast, the real radical is the person who **is** the radical situation, it is a person who is oppressed or poor or different and whose mere existence constitutes a threat to the society which has made him that way. Radicalism is not an opinion, it is a relationship to society. No one **chooses** to be radical; it is something society does to you.

On the other hand you **do** choose to be a liberal, which means trying to act like a radical although you aren't one.

Most so-called student radicals are in fact liberals. They are so by definition because their sympathy for the poor, the oppressed and the downtrodden is never more than a **sympathy**, or an identification. They themselves do not **become** poor or downtrodden; they are getting a degree to make more money, they live at the home of their middle class parents or have middle class apartments of their own, they eat well; they may occasionally feel suppressed but no one really discriminates against them. The typical student activist becomes a radical only when society makes him into one: when the police shoot at him, when he can't get a job

because he is hairy, or when he decides to drop out, forego his degree, and goes off to fight a revolution in Latin America. The majority of activists carefully avoid and fear becoming true radicals; that is, they fear becoming outcasts and losing their middle class birthright.

In a sense it is easier to be a true radical. You do not have to worry about whether you are being dissident enough, no one will tell you that you don't understand the problem, you do not have to watch if your real attitudes are showing through, and no one can call you a lousy liberal. If you are black, people will be afraid of being thought a racist if they accuse you of racism; if you are poor you are not likely to be called a capitalist pig.

It is a difficult and delicate matter to be a liberal, and one wonders why there are so many of them.

The answer is that most people do not have the guts to be radicals. The fact is, most **radicals** don't have the guts either; they are radicals because they were born that way, be they black, ethnic, poor or whatnot, and most of them would like to get out of it rather than take up the radical position their situation invites.

Secondly, although they may not have the courage, or the means, to dispossess themselves, or do not think that this would really help anyone, many people, many students in particular, **are** concerned. They cannot help but be concerned. The bomb is hanging over their heads, they read about starvation every day, their classmates are rioting. It is true that for many of them activism is merely a status symbol; not having political opinions is more of a social disgrace than not having a car. But on the other hand, why has politics become a status symbol if not because it is important to people? Today it takes a moron's insensitivity, (something a great many people seem to possess), to be unaware that everything is hanging in the balance. However they rationalize it, people feel the need to do something.

The real question about liberals is, **do** they do anything? The majority of people in the student movement, the peace movement, etc., have not been real radicals; they were not from the ranks of the dispossessed. And yet I feel these people have done a great deal. Thus, while I think "liberal" should continue to be a dirty word, in order to shame liberals into an increasingly more radical position, it is not as dirty as "apathetic", as some people, by what logic I do not know, seem to have concluded.

Senate source of Mc Gill unrest

The McGill Senate met in emergency session last Saturday, and rejected a student proposal for an agenda dealing with "the large issues" before the University, preferring instead to spend five hours discussing recent disruptions of University business.

Students have disrupted several important meetings. Last week they refused to allow the first open meeting of the Board of Governors to proceed when the Board had failed to place the issue of student housing on the agenda.

The following motion was passed by senate:

"Senate, while believing that the recent disruption of various meetings was not justified, resolves to continue its examination of the large issues before the University and appeals to all members of the University to act with good faith and reason."

Student Senator Ian Hyman claimed that the real disruption of University business could be attributed to the inability of Senate to deal with important issues, some of which have been on the agenda since November. His suggested agenda for dealing with these issues was voted against by all but the six student representatives.

Expected disciplinary action against the disruptive elements will probably not be taken.

La Semaine Du Quebec

La Semaine du Québec will try and show
Quebec in its various aspects: political, social and cultural.

Tues.
Feb. 4 1:30
H-110

Mr. André Laroche,
member of the Executive Council of the Parti Québécois and professor of political science at the U. de M.

3:30
H-635

Student Panel
Where is French-Canada Going?

8:15
H-937

The movie
Lefebvre

Wed.
Feb. 5 12:30
H-110

Mr. Bernard Landry,
representative of the Ministry of Education.

3:30
H-435

Le Chat dans Le Sac,
movie by Gilles Groulx.

Thurs.
Feb. 6 1:15
H-110

Teach-In with:
Prof. Nish & Igartua,
historians (SGWU)
Prof. Dubuc, economist (U de M)

Mrs. Andrée Ferrati,
of the Front de Libération Populaire.
Mr. Raymond Lemieux, of the Mouvement d'Intégration Scolaire.

Fri.
Feb. 7 2:15
H-435

Paul Dalpé, vice-president of the CNTU

3:30
H-435

La Vie Heureuse de Léopold Z.

Mon.
Feb. 10 8:30
Theatre

Evening with Georges d'Or, in avant-première.

Tickets \$2.50

An exhibition of Quebec literature will be held on the mezzanine in collaboration with Montreal publishers. They will be available to examine or to buy.

CANCELLED
in support of the occupation

THE
P A M - P A M
IS
GOOD-GOOD
RESTAURANT - COCKTAIL BAR
WE SERVE 16
DIFFERENT KINDS OF COFFEE
1425 STANLEY AV 8-3090

VALENTINE CARDS
FEB. 14th's THE DAY
NOW'S THE TIME TO SELECT
WHILE STOCKS ARE COMPLETE
SPECIAL SELECTION OF:
• CONTEMPORARY
• FAMILY & RELATIONS
• SWEETHEART
JUST TO MENTION A FEW
SABERTONS LIMITED
1477 St. Catherine W.
10% DISCOUNT ON STATIONARY

BIAFRA
TEACH-IN
Student Christian
Movement Hall
3625 Aylmer St.
Feb. 8 at 6 p.m.

FREE DESSERT UPON PRESENTATION OF THIS AD!
delicious french pastry at no cost with our special
CHARCOAL BROILED SIRLOIN STEAK \$1.75
HAMBURGER STEAK \$1.20
including: tomato juice, lettuce & tomatoes, bread,
butter, french fried or baked potatoes, tea or coffee.
FULLY LICENSED *Golden Steer* STEAK HOUSE FREE PARKING
1304 ST. CATHERINE WEST (opposite Ogilvy's) UN 1-4545

THE SCAN
HOME OF THE LIVE GROUPS
NOW APPEARING TILL SUNDAY
THE SOULS OF INSPIRATION
11 A.M. - 8 P.M.:
1918 - PRICED MEALS BEER...35 A PINT
SCANDINAVIAN CLUB 1183 CRESCENT 866-0475

"ALL CREDIT CARDS ACCEPTED"
GUARANTEED
REPAIRS & SERVICE
by
Certified Mechanics
AUSTIN
VAUXHALL TRIUMPH
MERCEDES MG
RENAULT VOLVO
VOLKSWAGEN JAGUAR
NORAD
AUTO CO.
5710 UPPER LACHINE RD.
(corner Harvard N.D.G.)
489-9721
Students: Present this
ad to the cashier for
a 10% discount. Great!

DAN'S TOBACCO SHOP
FINE PIPES BY:
BUTZ - CHOQUIY
DR. THOMAS
SAVINELLI
CAVITY
844-6605 2025 UNION AVE.
JUST A SHORT WALK FROM S.G.W.U.
IN THE MORGAN PARKADE BLDG.

PUSSY GALORE
BAR-RESTAURANT
"SEXSATONAL" "THRILLING"
-THE GEORGIAN -THE STUR
"FUNTASTIC" "HAS TO BE SEEN"
-THE PUPER -THE GAUZETTE
2170 BISHOP (BELOW SHERBROOKE)

Come up and Relax
LADIES ARE WELCOMED
Montreal Billiards Ltd
1644 ST. CATHERINE ST. W.
BILLIARDS - SNOOKER - SKITTLES

UNIQUE COMBINED FITTING AND LABORATORY ESTABLISHMENT
MEDICALLY SUPERVISED
CONTACT LENS CENTRE
1610
SHERBROOKE WEST - 935-5291
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION TO STUDENTS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT...
AT GREEN ACRES.
Montreal's Country Day Camp invites you to join its staff of uni-
versity calibre for positions in any of group counselling, section
head, and specialist in swimming, riding, arts & crafts, pottery,
graphics, sculpture, archery, science, nature lore, tripping, Indian
lore, campcraft, jazz dance, trampoline, drama, and music.
For further information and application form call the camp office at
488-9149


Leonard Cohen is a
Beautiful Fink.
The operative word here is beautiful -- it's the drop-outs who put
down a soul-man like Leonard. We don't. Neither does Judy Collins in her
latest pressing of Leonard's songs. There's Simon and Garfunkel, too.
Joni Mitchell. The Incredible String Band. The Collectors. Carl Orff.
Contemporary and classical drama. Musicals. Jazz. A choice 10,000
record collection. Membership's only \$3 a year and 50¢ per stereo record
weekly, 35¢ for a mono. Everyone's gathered: why don't you make the trip,
too? Call Monday to Saturday, 9:30 to 6:30; Thursday and Friday till 9. The
password's SOUL.
THE RECORD CENTRE INC.
2000 CRESCENT (CORNER de MAISONNEUVE) 845-3541
Over 10,000 Memberships issued -- now in our 10th Year

ARLINGTON
SKI SALE
DISCOUNT
ON HEAD SKIS

Head 160 Reg. 130.00 Spec. 99.⁹⁵
Head 260 Reg. 150.00 Spec. 119.⁹⁵
Head 320 Reg. 170.00 Spec. 139.⁹⁵
Head 360 Reg. 185.00 Spec. 149.⁹⁵
Fischer Alu Reg. 145.00 Spec. 119.⁹⁵
Fischer Quik Ski Reg. 39.95 Spec. 29.⁹⁵
plus reductions up to 50% on:
Buckle Boots Ski Jackets
Ski Boots Ski Slacks
Fur Hats
IT'S **ARLINGTON** FOREVER
1235 ST. CATHERINE STREET WEST.
HEAD
GS
SLALOMS
DOWN
HILL
Reg.
200.00
99.95
SECOND IN
APPEARANCE
ONLY
PHONE
842-1115