

Brunswickan

Editor-in-Chief: Allan B. Pressman
Business Manager: Charles Khoury
Managing Editor: Bernie Rosenblatt
CUP Editor: Steve MacFarlane
Sports Editor: Yogi Beyeler
Office Manager: Mike Start
Photographer: Don Grant
Features Editor: Frank Loomer
Contributors: Bob Vincent, Tammy Ross
 Emerson Mills, Pete Harding
Typists: Christine Zachary, Kathy Steiner

Established in 1867, the *Brunswickan* is Canada's oldest student publication. It is published weekly for the students of the University of New Brunswick at Fredericton, N.B. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the Student Representative Council. Subscriptions \$4 a year. Authorized as second class mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa. The *Brunswickan* office is located at the Memorial Students Centre, UNB, Fredericton, N.B., telephone 475-5191. This paper was printed at Capital Free Press, Brunswick Street, Fredericton.



Editorial

... and the walls came tumbling down

The SRC has done it again. By so poorly handling the withdrawal of the Graduate Students' Association, and the Law Society's motion to examine their position, they have seriously jeopardized their meaningfulness on this campus.

To argue, as Council President Beach does, that Post Grads and Law Students cannot be equated, but undergraduates and Law Students can, is ludicrous.

Surely he does not realize that to generalize in such a manner is foolish. Active and aware Post Grads will benefit, and have benefited from Council, as much as, if not more than most undergrads.

If a Law Student is not concerned with student affairs he will benefit as little as Beach thinks the Post Grads do. Beach talks of student - professor relationships as an additional factor of consideration. If he thinks a Professor of English 2000 has the same rapport with his students as a Professor at the Law School, he is more out of touch with the situation than we imagined.

The question is not one of representation, but one of service to a significant number of the student body. whether the SRC is of any value to the GSA is not the question. Indeed by supporting the withdrawal as the SRC did, it is obvious that they did not feel they were.

But did they rectify the situation? They did not. Instead they acted like mad doctors, who because the patient had indigestion, removed half of his stomach.

We feel the SRC was providing a service to the Post Grads; in particular by supporting the idea of the Married Student Co-op. It is evident that a larger percentage of Post Grads are married than undergrads.

In addition the SRC leapt into the situation, as they have so many times in the past, without considering long term effects.

What effect will the GSA withdrawal have on benefits they were before entitled to? No one on Council seems to know or care.

When questioned about constitutional implications of the GSA withdrawal, Beach said "these are just technicalities."

Sir, they are far from that.

By their actions the SRC has seen fit to set a dangerous precedent. The SRC cannot in good conscience allow Post Grads independent status and refuse the Law Society the same.

The Law Society has taken a logical step . . . As the walls of ignorance and naiveté that surround the SRC begin to tumble around them, all faculties would do well to take a long look at themselves and their relationship with the Students' Representative Council.

Letters to the Editor

SENIOR CLASS PARTY MARRED

Editor:

The fall Senior Class Party was quite successful; however, the occasion was marred by one incident which merits consideration. Someone removed a bottle of liquor from the bar which forced the management to stop selling drinks. Worse the management may now refuse to allow other campus organizations (including the class of '68) to hold upcoming functions at the Beaverbrook. This is truly detrimental to all.

The return of the empty numbered bottle could influence the management's final decision. The bottle could be returned to anyone of the undersigned - no questions asked!

Senior Class Executive

Rob Asprey, Sue Kinnear, Brian Gold

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

Editor:

Please add my name to the list of students whom Mr. Peter Hunt describes as enunciating "hate literature".

At the same time, add my signature to those who wish that Mr. Stephen MacFarlane would reconsider his decision to resign. Whether he supports the anti-administration position or not, he must realize that the right to dissent is as important a function of our democratic system as the right to vote, a fact which Mr. Hunt overlooked. Thus, he should not be persuaded to resign due to loud outcries of one type or another. Remember, those who make their opinions known are usually the extreme element of society, like me. And it is seldom that those holding moderate views make them known.

I would like to debate the Vietnam question with Mr. Hunt and Mr. Demetre, however, space forbids it. Instead, chalk up my vote as being anti-administration (as Mr. Hunt and other Hawks would put it) and as desiring the cease to the slaughter of thousands of Vietnamese (as I like to phrase it).

In addition, add my support to those who desire continued freedom of the press, the BRUNSWICKAN included.

Yours Sincerely,

Michael Peacock, Phys. Ed. 3

ANTI-CALENDAR HARD TO SWALLOW

Editor:

In a recent issue it was noted that sometime during the coming academic year, we will again press our views in a "course evaluation". A priceless freedom of the campus is that of dissent; and I would like to register a protest.

Although envisioned with the best of intentions, the previous course evaluation was an utter farce, accomplishing nothing; it was not even completely carried out. It wasted lecture time and slighted many capable professors. Criticism was not objective, and the end result was a ham-handed ultimatum of serio-comic censure.

A more "sophisticated" evaluation is promised for 1967-68, which will not berate an instructor's academic merits; I find this rather hard to swallow, in view of the continuing concept of creating an "anti-calendar". What is the standard by which you judge?

By way of a substitute, is individual evaluation so worthless? Most instructors have time for some individual counselling, and welcome suggestions and critical comments, which can then be assessed properly. There are generally excellent reasons for widening or narrowing the scope of a course, and the including or excluding of relevant material within it. The disciplined, experienced mind knows; and is always ready for individual constructive criticism.

This viewpoint may seem reactionary, perhaps heretical, but there must be others who agree. Since this evaluation is apparently inevitable, I invite dissenters to, like myself, pass in their evaluation sheet unmarked.

Respectfully submitted,
 Bruce Wallace, Arts II