



Mugwump
By TOM BENJAMIN
Journal

Bad news is in store for those of you who like to quaff the occasional bottle of ale — without leaving campus.

A meeting of the pretentiously-named "Committee on Alcohol in Residence Life" has produced a report which could have startling ramifications in campus drinking activities.

The main thrust of the report is that drinking events on campus must conform to standards set down by the provincial liquor governing body.

Some of the "rules" which the report said were to be enforced as of January this year are:

"It is understood that pubs are to be a non-profit operation and that sales are to cover costs only."

"No cover charge is permitted. The Commission has clearly indicated that money cannot be collected at the door; but, if funds are required to cover costs of a band or other special activities, advanced ticket sales are permissible."

Now that's a switch.

Many pubs on campus would come under the definition of "non-profit", although they certainly weren't intended to during the planning stages.

The collection of cover charges has been standard procedure at campus pubs for years.

This puts the whole report in a rather strange light. Either pubs have been operated illegally on campus for several years or the liquor commission has made some recent changes which are very detrimental to campus drinking events.

Either way, drink up — while you have the chance.

+++++

As could have been expected, no comments have been forthcoming from the provincial government concerning the proposed student demonstration on student aid.

It seems that whenever a controversial issue evolves in this province the appropriate government members are out of town. Let's hope they arrive back in time for the demonstration.

+++++

Indications are that the granting of \$3,000 to the Law Students Society to establish a lounge with the graduate students may not be the fait accompli Law students once thought it was.

It appears that the agreement drawn up between the Law students and the SRC might not be exactly constitutional.

One local lawyer has said the executive council members had no authority to disburse funds in that manner, so a concerted effort could probably result in the invalidation of the agreement.

The lawyer continued to say that if necessary, the Law society could probably be sued to regain the money.

Now that would be an interesting case, knowing the Law students' penchant for fighting parking tickets and threatening to "slap writs" on all and sundry.

Some practical law experience from the defendant's side might do our esteemed Law student some good.

+++++

Our very own elected representatives put on an interesting exhibition at Monday's SRC meeting.

With representatives in attendance from several other provincial universities councillors quickly lapsed into a childish display of petty animosities.

The few level heads remaining on council are probably ashamed to admit they still sit on that body.

A great deal of time was spent discussing the merits and demerits of participating in the proposed demonstration on student aid. The discussion quickly degenerated into arguments about the validity of three-year programs and other irrelevant trivia.

Many councillors also showed a callous disregard for their constituents, making it obvious in many cases that they had no idea of what students on this campus really want.

+++++

The long-awaited housing report from ex-SRC vice president Gary Stairs has finally arrived, all three pages of it.

The report was apparently prepared late last summer but was not presented to council due to difficulties regarding Stairs' honoraria.

By this time only about three pages of the nine-page report are still applicable, as most of the material was rendered irrelevant due to the passing of the Residential Tenancies Act and the preparation of other housing reports on campus.

Wants campaigning procedures changed

Dear Editor:

It's that time again when election platforms, posters, hand shaking and grass root politics face the students of this campus. It's enjoyable to observe the candidates and see just exactly what they can come up with in order to get the students to vote for them.

On that point, it would be a good idea to make a few comments and suggestions. The process of campaigning is set up in order to let the students know their candidates for what they are. How is it then that some candidates appear so obvious while others are respectively running a much lower profile campaign?

The answer lies in the fact that some run their campaign on the money allotted them by the SRC. Most positions receive \$15.00 while the presidential candidates are given no more than \$25.00. Is it not fair then to allow the candidates to run their campaigns on this set sum of money and call it good enough? In point of fact some university campuses do enforce such a regulation. Here at UNB, however, the usual practice seems to be to flood our senses with posters, buttons, outlined campaign formats.

Why, as one gentleman remarked, "Mr. --- is running one hell of a campaign, I see his picture and

name everywhere, I can not even go into the "can" and have a "crap" without seeing his face staring down at me."

And what happens to this mass of information after the campaigning and elections are all over with? Year after year students get more and more fed up with candidates who were so careful to have all their posters put up, and in very obvious places to be sure, yet these things seem to hang around for weeks, of no benefit to anyone and really being just an all-around eyesore.

As a student, it would be nice to see each candidate appoint a few members of his delegation to do away with these items within a few days after the election. Since there will be another election in just a few months, the litter if allowed to collect would reach the point where notices of importance, pictures, doors, windows, hell, even buildings would be submerged beyond belief. We don't need, nor do we want this sort of thing to continue!

Thus, getting back to campaigning, it would seem only reasonable if candidates were to leave outside money where it is. After all, the candidates will debate in public (hopefully before the election), and in all other matters such as air time on CHSR and space in this newspaper, each candidate is allowed the same right to space, it's up to him to use it if he or she so desires.

John McCluskey

States other side of story

I am writing with regard to the front page article in The Brunswickan of Friday, January 9 by Peter Krautle titled "Law students will receive lounge". I am deeply distressed by the many inaccurate statements in this article and I wish to provide you and your readers with the correct facts.

The most obvious fallacy in the article is the headline. The Law Students' Society has received \$3000 from the SRC but the lounge is still in the planning stage and negotiations for a site are still going on. It is rather difficult to "receive a lounge" when there is no place to put it at the present time.

The monies available have also been reported incorrectly. The GSA has pledged \$2000 of its present budget for this venture and is prepared to add at least another \$1000 from next year's budget. The LSS has approved \$1000 from its budget and has received the \$3000 grant from the SRC. Additional money and services are being sought from other sources, such as the administration and alumni, but the figure of \$5000 is rather presumptuous.

As for the facts surrounding the SRC grant of \$3000, Krautle has committed several errors in his reporting. At the December 8 SRC meeting it was the LSS alone that asked for a \$1000 grant for the proposed lounge. This fact is contained in the SRC minutes on page 5 of the same issue of The Bruns. When this request was voted down, the LSS alone went to the SRC executive and worked out arrangements for additional financing. The GSA had no part in this affair. The GSA executive was informed of the \$3000 grant only after negotiations between the LSS and the SRC executive were completed.

The \$3000 allotted to the LSS in trust for the establishment of the GSA-LSS lounge has a few strings attached. An amount, not to exceed \$2000, of this allotment is to be a secured investment in the equity of the lounge and membership cards will be available to the general student body on a limited basis, upon written application. As for SRC plans to take a dormant role in the running of the lounge, the SRC executive has formally agreed that full control and management of the policies and operations of the lounge shall forever be in the hands of the GSA-LSS.

The aim of the GSA in this venture is to establish the lounge along the same lines as the Faculty Club, as mentioned in the article, and it will definitely not be another Social Club. The intent is to provide graduate students, law students and other students with like

interests with a common meeting place for various activities, not just another drinking establishment.

In conclusion, I must take offense to your remarks in Mugwump Journal directed towards law students. I attended the December 8 meeting of the SRC where approximately 50 law students were in attendance, sat quietly through the debate on the \$1000 grant, and left at the end of the meeting in an orderly manner. Your snide remark on their being "much too childish" makes me wonder about your competence in commenting about such events.

In reply to your comments about the membership in the GSA-LSS lounge, memberships will first be offered to graduate students and law students. Applications for membership will then be received from other students and acceptance will be based on factors such as age, year of study, etc. In other words, we hope to attract students such as fifth year education students, seniors and older students who have returned to university and who have similar interests with law and graduate students.

Yours truly,
Robin Bunner

Against fascism

Dear Editor:

I consider it my duty to state that only one organization in this entire country is willing to fight against fascism. That organization is the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist).

Sincerely,
Maurice Spiro

'Pro' criticizes paper

Dear Editor:

As a former Bruns staffer, I fully appreciate that student writers must be given lots of time to work up to a clear and concise style of writing; I also realize that criticism of movie reviewers is dicey business at best, since they are expressing their own opinion.

However, I must comment on Lynette Wilson's review of "Once is not Enough", which was really too much: (pun intended)

Lynette, you've got a right to your opinions concerning the film, but you must clean up your writing - phrases such as "a relatively sane level of maturity", using David Janssen's first name "to make it sound cool and all", and titling about using shock, shock-swear works like 'hell'. You also seem to make excessive use of the words "anyway" and "good", and the phrase "I mean."

You seem to know that your writing is at times inadequate; you use lines like, "I don't make much of a comment by saying", and "Impressed would be an insufficient term". Try to find the perfect

word or phrase, and don't hesitate to use a thesaurus.

Take your time writing, and be very critical of your own work.

Last of all, Lynette, take all criticism with a grain of salt. Your predecessor, Danielle Thibeault, was under fire for two years, but she never gave up, and she defended her work - but not blindly. She worked ambitiously at honing her style.

I must also take a stab at Sheryl Wright for running the last paragraph of that story, which advises people to go see the film, when "Once is not Enough" was finished playing and "The Eiger Sanction" was almost over!

And finally, a note to news editor Derwin Gowan: In the second paragraph of Burt Folkins' front page story on student aid (Jan. 9) Mark Giberson was titled "president of STU". Msgr. Donald C. Duffie holds that position; Giberson is the president of STU's student council. Tsk, tsk.

Sincerely,
Lorna A. Pitcher