

The dreaded Student AIDS comes back

by Kim MacLeod

I feel that it is about time the masses of helpless victims suffering from the dreaded Student AIDS came out of the closet. No longer should we sit around our dingy abodes watching reruns of Three's Company and wallowing in self-pity. Not until the myths surrounding this plague are shattered will we be able to move out of our living rooms and into the main stream of society.

The most common myth is that the Student AIDS victim has somehow brought this horrid, degenerative disease upon himself. Had he skipped those occasional trips to the nearest McDonald's, resisted that urge to buy new underwear, or stopped having his hair cut, his pockets would be overflowing with excess cash. This extravagant student myth has kept us in bondage for years, restricted by bureaucratic brainwashing at its best. The reality is that hard work and scrimping are not going to be rewarded by Mr. Donahue and his team of red-tape pushers. Traditionally, the more that you and your family save, the less aid you receive, and vice versa.

Despite the bitter reality, students continue to rush madly from door to door each spring with a fanatic zeal exceeded only by a caffeine-addicted Jehovah's Witness. Throwing pride in the gutter, I have kissed feet until my lips were chapped for the sake of a summer job while a more devious, and ultimately more successful student had each unin-

terested manager put their name on a piece of paper and spent the summer eliminating unsightly tan lines. A quick trip to the sea shore shows any casual observer the difference between those who believe the myths and those who do not. The employed students lay on their towels in a state of nervous exhaustion while that sun eats at their doughboy skin. Meanwhile, the "bad" apples who are shirking responsibility frolic on the beach, playing frisbee in their addidas suits.

Something is definitely amiss in this picture. Where is the justice? Where is the happy ending? Certainly, it is nowhere near the Student Aid Office, for, in the eyes of the government, those who "suffer" from a "lack of funds" due to "inadequate employment opportunities" must be subsidized to a greater extent than those "lucky Devils" who found work.

Using the same twisted mentality, some malicious set of computers concluded that living in residence was infinitely more expensive than residing on one's own and that the "Maintenance Allowance" must be granted accordingly. This is not only a ludicrous financial suggestion but also one which creates rather repugnant results. Those who are accepted into residence year after year are given more money than those who try to make it on their own and gain a certain degree of independence.

The current system of money allocation is a crime. Worse still,

it is one for which there is no Supreme Court, no uncorrupted judge, and no impartial jury. In a quest for justice one becomes lost in a maze of rhetorical gibberish designed to convince you that "you lack an understanding

of the procedure," "you failed to live up to your financial responsibilities," or, by some genetic mutation, you are simply ostracized by the term "ineligible." There is no light at the end of the dark tunnel of poverty, only pos-

sible comfort in the fact that you are not alone.

You are not a freak of nature, but rather, part of a mass of faceless paupers, an innocent victim of Student AIDS.

Tuition Fees Decided SOON!

by Tim Hill

As many students may be aware, discussions are currently taking place at the University in order to determine what tuition fees should be recommended to the University Board of Governors for the next academic year. We look forward to these recommendations being made in late March. This should enable you to make your views known before and after the event, and to plan your finances for next year. Our primary goal in terms of procedure is to avoid another year where the decision is made in mid-summer without broad-based input or response.

As matters of substance we will be raising our concerns regarding the ever-increasing gap between the average student's resources, and the cost of his or her education. We will be advancing the argument that it is appropriate that the University recognize its responsibility to ensure that Dalhousie does not become inaccessible to those

students who lack substantial family support.

A major difficulty faced by student representatives in this and past years has been the lack of accurate and up-to-date statistical information to support these arguments. Last year the student union was able to put together a

reasonably comprehensive document that has since been viewed by members of the federal and provincial governments, the Nova Scotia Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education and our own Board of Governors and Faculty Association. Thanks to the participation of over two hundred and fifty students in Howe and Shirreff Halls, and the assistance of students using the Student Union Building, we have been able to update and expand this document for 1984. The Students' Union of Nova Scotia, which recently submitted an extensive brief to the N.S. Royal Commission, will be using this up-dated document when its representatives appear before the Commission on April

12th. At Dalhousie we will be using it during the tuition fee debate.

The document substantiates many of the assumptions generated from past surveys at Dalhousie. It indicates that cost remains a significant concern to many students. It also reveals that we at Dalhousie have the highest tuition fees in Canada, while Nova Scotia has one of the poorest assistance programmes in Canada. In fact, the provincial bursary and summer employment programmes provide less support in real terms now than they did two years ago.

Faced with the information available from these and other sources we are confident the Board of Governors of our University will choose to serve the best interests of our students. Let it not be forgotten we are the University, and if the University is to continue to be deserving of public support it must serve the whole community, and not erect artificially high financial barriers that exclude some segments of that community.

you were saying . . .

Under attack

To the Editor:

There is an unwritten rule associated with our offices that the President and Vice-President should not endorse any candidate or candidates in the Student Union elections. We intend to abide by this "rule." However, certain candidates in the current election have characterized recent student representation as "irrational," "radical," and "unrepresentative." We are concerned at this unwarranted attack on a council we believe to be one of the best of recent times. On behalf of our colleagues we would make the following observations.

This council has pursued programmes and policies designed to both enhance the University environment for students, and to improve the image of students in the general community. Our success can be measured by the success of our entertainment programmes (i.e., both Super Subs and events such as Gene Roddenberry), development of facilities (i.e., the proposed lower campus lounge and CKDU-FM radio), and success in external relations (i.e., 1500 jobs added to last year's summer employment programme). We have lived up to our promises in a rational and representative manner. If being radical is not meekly accepting measures that incur suffering on members of this student union, then we are radical. We prefer to think we are representing the interests of the people who put us here—you the students.

What really concerns us is not that we should be criticized—our jobs require a thick skin. The real concern is that individuals with little or no real knowledge of the "real world" facing students should adopt such phrases to comeflage this lack of knowledge. Our solace comes in knowing from experience that the students of Dalhousie

are discerning and have insight into the issues. The 20% who vote have traditionally exercised good judgment and made reasonable decisions at the ballot box. This year will be no different.

When our "political" world degenerates into the hypocrisy commonly found outside we are concerned. When such hypocrisy gains credence we are appalled. We leave it to your good judgment.

We do not endorse any candidate. We merely wish all candidates, well nearly all candidates, luck at the polls.

Sincerely,
Tim Hill
Susan McIntyre

UBC (L.B.C) 1960

To the Editor:

As a student of U.B.C. (L.L.B. 1960) I became interested in any means of lightening my workload, and happened upon the study of mnemonics. This study concerns the science of memory. It has occurred to me that many students, including my own children, would benefit from a book on the subject. I would be grateful, therefore, if your readers would drop a line or a post card containing their favourite mnemonic. By this I mean a "memory crutch" such as the one known to all students of music, viz: F.A.C.E. being the key signatures of the treble clef. Students of geology will recognize the mnemonic for the Moh's Scale of the hardness of minerals, viz: Toronto Girls Can Fight And Other Queer Things Can Do, which is a memory device to enable geologists to remember the relative hardness of minerals which are as follows: Talc, Gypsum, Calcite, Feldspar, Albite, Orthoclase, Quartz, Titanium, Carborundum, Diamond.

If your readers would care to send me their favourite mnemonic together with any knowledge of its author, I shall do my best to give credit where credit is due.

Respectfully yours,
W. Grant Hughes

REDUNDANT

To the Editor:

Re: Summer Street and Spring Garden Development

The issues concerning the above as expressed in the *Chronicle* are redundant if not irrelevant. The issue is purely and simply one of money. The developers wish us to believe that their interests are altruistic, i.e. the strengthening of the tax base; as if one or two buildings will have that much impact. For this they are willing to add one more tacky box to the three already existing between Robie and Summer on Spring Garden thus helping us to divest ourselves of our Victorian architecture. A concerted attempt to retain and preserve the latter exists in most major cities in North America at present, but not here, especially in so obscure a place as next to the Public Gardens where it will hardly even be noticed. This is not to say that United Equities represents purely moneyed interests, nor to accuse the medical profession of a wrong sense of priorities; nor to accuse the Dalhousie Administration of ineptitude due to bad spending thus resulting in this university accruing the largest deficit in Canada - none of the above come to bear on divesting this city of its architectural heritage. The group that has freely relinquished other things and worked tirelessly to retain the qualities that make Halifax unique deserve to be remembered and commended. In fifteen years yet another box-like construct will be remembered for being just that, if at all.

J. Westley,