

## Letters to the editor Tar Heel in error on Supreme Court story, headline

To the editor:

In the July 6 *Tar Heel*, the headline of the lead news story, "Supreme Court finds CGC rules valid," was totally incorrect. Some parts of the story were also worded in a misleading fashion.

Rather than finding the CGC rules to be valid, the Supreme Court declared all previous ruling on the case to be null and void. Specifically, the July 1977 ruling of the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals that declared the minority protection clauses unconstitutional is no longer legally applicable.

However, the Court did not actually rule on what has come to be known as the Uzzell case. Rather, the Court remanded the case back to the circuit court instructed it to review the case again, in light of the Supreme Court's Bakke decision.

How will the Bakke decision affect the disposition of the Uzzell case, especially in view of the circuit court's previous ruling against the minority representation clauses? That clearly depends on the circuit court's interpretation of the Bakke decision. Since this latest Supreme Court decision is very broad, it is extremely difficult to predict the outcome of the case in circuit court. But whatever the outcome, both parties will be able to appeal the decision again to the Supreme Court. Obviously we are talking about a legal battle that could last for at least another year.

Since the Supreme Court did strike down the Circuit Court ruling which declared the minority representation clauses unconstitutional, Student Body President Jim Phillips will be appointing two minority representatives to the Campus Governing Council this fall. The other minority representation clause in question, that of minority representation on the Honor Court, has been continued throughout this court battle, and thus will not need to be reinstated in the fall.

Craig Brown  
Executive Assistant to the Student Body President

...

### Bus pass blues

To the editor:

Recently, we, the highly manipulated but most patient souls who regularly ride the Chapel Hill bus system, have had to swallow one more bit of inconvenience in order to get to and from campus every day. Once again, the University has waited till the last few days before last year's passes expired to issue annual bus passes and consequently precipitated a great rush to the traffic office with the usual long lines and frustrating waits.

Now, when we students slip up a bit, a nice \$5.00 fine gets tacked on to our tuition when, for example, we register late. The converse ought to be true too, I think, but unfortunately isn't. When the University slips up, we are still the ones to be penalized, usually with massive inconvenience. Apparently, the inconvenience of students is just chicken feed in moving the bureaucracy (particularly the traffic office, which is always the biggest logjam on campus and the least respectful of our time and patience) to become more efficient and considerate.

Last year, possibly, the university could argue that by waiting in line, we were saving \$18 over the normal fare, and perhaps this was a good deal and worth the wait. This year the savings is only \$4, and the cost of an annual bus pass is in the range where it is worth considering parking on campus. So, realistically, the University isn't doing us any favors now and most likely is only worsening the parking crisis. Besides, we are all just part of one big cost-incentive equation, and favors aren't included.

167-40-1775  
Durham



## Carrboro "Cs" Red

# Student Stores on campus has just about everything you'll need this summer. Stop by soon. You'll see.

There's more in your Student Stores

Open 8-5 p.m.  
Monday-Friday  
Closed Saturdays

