

**Mugwump**  
By **DERWIN GOWAN**  
**Journal**

We're going to have some fun this week. You see, the student elections are not over yet (7:30 Wednesday), and we're going to see if the guy writing this column knows what is going on or not.

I predict that Kevin Garland will be our new president. Jim Murray didn't put any posters up and Stephen Whalen's are a little too professional looking to suit the fancy of your average Joe Blow student.

Mike Bleakney, Chris Nagle, and Allan Patrick will take the Senate seats. Bleakney and Patrick have acquired notoriety through their positions on the SRC and CHSR, and Nagle is an incumbent. Delores Crane and Doug Stewart are newcomers, and will have to wait till next time around.

Brian Pryde will be the comptroller. Not only does he have the advantage of being assistant comptroller, but some students will be turned off because Doug Stewart is running for two positions. Power hungry.

Brian Forbes will win the valedictory. Barb-MacKinnon wrote more than the other two candidates in The Bruns last week, a bad sign for a would-be speech maker, and she has won too many scholarships to retain the goodwill of the average struggling student. Gary Ladd didn't have anything to say on his posters, another bad sign for a would-be speech maker. Maybe that's why Forbesey didn't put any up.

The Computer Science seat is a little more difficult. They are both in favour of the fee increase, both believe in AFS and NUS, neither is in favour of differential fees for foreign students, and both claim they will work closely with the Computer Science Association. But there is a way. Jones is in favour of the student increase, Steeves is unsure.

Computer Science students like quick answers to questions. Whoever heard of a computer answering "maybe". Jones will take it.

We will remain members of the Atlantic Federation of Students. After all, our last NUS referendum passed with an increased majority, and the propaganda mongers have been at it again.

The \$10.00 student fee increase doesn't go through. With a sudden burst of sanity, students will ask themselves, "Whoever heard of a politician making higher taxes part of his or her platform."

Our sports editor doesn't know who is going to win the physical education seats. Since they were both out of town on a drunk last week, we couldn't contact them. However, we're sure both of them have the qualifications to make fine councillors.

It's now 8:00 p.m. and the last polls close in about one-half hour. I think I'll stand by what I said above. Anyone who wants to let us know how their predictions stood up to mine is welcome to drop us a letter.

Now I have a problem. Sarah just pointed out that I said Murray wouldn't win the presidency because he didn't put any posters, but Forbesey will win the valedictory contest, although he didn't put any up.

I think I'll have to start all over again now.

As a way of weaseling out, I could say that the presidential candidates put up typical normal political posters. Overkill is a good way to describe Whalen's posters. Therefore, Kevin's posters will win the job for him.

In the case of the valedictory, one overkills and the other underkills, and the one who keeps his nose clean and his mouth shut will win.

I never did like weasels.

Now somebody asks, how about who should win, and not who will? In that fine old Mugwump tradition, I can only say, "Que, sera, sera".

The polls just closed (8:30 p.m.) and I better shut up. I might be accused of cheating.

**Surely you jest, Bruns?**

Dear Editor

Your article "I.R.D.C. fines Aitken" (January 28, 1977) was a well-done presentation of the actions of the I.R.D.C. There is, however, one thing I feel I must criticize you on. Your use of "spokesperson" was out of place and entirely incorrect.

I am all for equality, but "spokesperson" is simply not a proper word. I realize you feel

compelled to use such terms to keep out of sexist accusations, but in doing so, you are not using correct language. There is nothing offensive in using "Madam Chairman" instead of "Chairperson".

The Men of Aitken should feel personally insulted from the implications of this "word". Since it is used to describe a neutre group, the personal pride of Aitken should feel challenged.

Secondly, "spokesperson" is used, although incorrectly, to describe women in particular. In this case, the use of the "word" implies that there are women living in Aitken and testifying for its defence.

Of course, reporting such incidents of vulgar behaviour is not easy, or pleasant, but at least the writer could use proper English in his description.

Thank-you,  
Neil Smith

**Optional Student Union fees?**

Dear Editor:

During our petition campaign the most frequent question we've heard is "What is the SRC going to do when it loses all that money?" (This petition protests the defeat of the following motion by a one vote margin - "Whereas not all students benefit from membership in the Student Union and whereas students should have the freedom of choosing union membership be it resolved that, above and beyond \$15.00 towards the SUB mortgage payment of the SRC fee be made optional to all students.")

The SRC would survive the passage of the above motion and would be a better government for it. It would not "destroy" the student union as Jim Smith keeps insisting (scare tactics). We believe in having a student government but not one which has compulsory membership and therefore is unresponsive to students' needs. Optional membership would create a feedback situation. If the SRC did what the students wanted it would get more members; if it didn't, it would get fewer.

In the current student union budget, income of about \$245,000 is realized. Of this one third (\$81,000) of your fee goes to pay the SUB mortgage. This would not change for the above motion makes only payment above and beyond \$15.00 to the SUB mortgage optional. Someone has to pay for the building and every student will still have the right to use it.

The crunch is, over one third of your \$45.00 (in this case \$84,000 of the total union budget) goes towards what we call a bureaucracy and what they call an

administration. The money goes to: salaries for permanent employees, honouraria, conferences, N.U.S. and A.F.S., office supplies, capital equipment, etc. This is much too great a proportion and could be cut substantially.

Of the remaining third of the revenue, \$32,000 goes to the Brunswickan and C.H.S.R. while \$50,000 goes to faculty and departmental clubs and organizations. We feel that the Brunswickan and C.H.S.R. have priority in that they serve the most students and their budgets should not change. In the case of faculty and departmental clubs the situation should change somewhat. When clubs approach the Administrative Board for money they are granted money largely on a dollars per member basis. If student membership were optional the A.B. would grant money on a dollar/student union member basis.

If union membership were made optional two I.D. cards would be issued. One would be a student I.D. card issued to non-union members. Such a card is necessary for the library, buses, movies, etc. Union members would get a student union card (which would also be a student I.D. card) which would entitle them to all privileges of union membership. Non-union members would have to pay more for admission to SRC films and pubs, the yearbook, Winter Carnival and Orientation events, the Student Directory, the Student Handbook, etc.

No other facilities on campus would suffer from a lower Student Union budget. The SRC does not contribute any money towards the Aitken Centre, the gym and

athletics, or intramural sports in any way. The University Administration pays for all these things.

Possibly the greatest and most lasting benefit would be a sense of awareness and participation on the part of student union members. Perhaps if students have the choice of membership those who do join will feel a little more spirit and worry a little bit more about where their money goes. Maybe they'll watch for news in the Bruns a little more closely, and when election time comes around perhaps they'll get out and vote.

Each fall the SRC could mount a membership drive explaining the advantages of union membership and in this way attract students. We feel that a substantial number of students would pay their SRC fee with this in mind. The union budget would be cut but not drastically, and the students who didn't want to join because they wouldn't benefit would have the freedom of choice.

So Jim, we're not trying to destroy the union, we're trying to save it.

Yours sincerely  
Alan Hildebrand  
Donald Driscoll  
Darlene Arsenault  
Lothar Michiel Schiese  
Earl Shirley  
Bruce Jamer  
Gary Cornish  
Gildar Arseneau  
Norman Lund  
Jeff Bresa

**"Brunswickan cries wolf"**

Dear Editor:

We've all heard what happened to the boy who cried wolf. Now, it's The Brunswickan's turn.

The SRC feels that The Brunswickan staff should apologize to Steve Whalen. The Brunswickan condemns SRC interference (I call it good, sound and

moral advice!), mentions editorial freedom, violations of constitution and of course censorship.

You folks (all 0.4 per cent of the student body) are really something. And now that you are so-called 'under attack' you call on us for help.

How's this for help... Don't be confused as to the purpose of the request to apologize. It was not a personal attack on The Brunswickan staff just a comment on a style of editing that was regarded as poor taste by many people and the SRC (vote 14-1-1).

Do you feel any better? You cannot use editorial freedom and censorship to confuse the issue. Stick to the argument.

"It was not a personal attack..." We regard people as morally responsible for what they do and we regard them as the legitimate object for any praise or blame in respect of it.

It was a personal attack. It was also an attack on the individual's editorial freedom: You in fact are

trying to censor his speech, his press through your satirical comment:

And your reasoning - your tired of people crawling out of the woodwork and getting elected because we don't consider candidates for SRC carefully; we elect them on their pretty posters. You certainly make it obvious what you think of us ... but of course this is merely a 'satirical comment' on the style with which we elect ... not on the student personally.

I guess I understand now...

1) The Brunswickan cannot behave irresponsibly and is incapable of making a mistake; only politicians (SRC), students (electorate) and faculty (UNB) are capable of irresponsibility and making mistakes.

2) The Brunswickan has a duty to do what is right. And you have the right to disregard good advice. So you consider it your duty to disregard good advice?

Sincerely,  
Paul Sidney