

green has difficult job

Geoff Green is the new student council president. His campaign promises seem to indicate little else than his total lack of experience in student council activities.

"The first thing I want to do is rewrite the constitution and by-laws of the UNB student union", he told a Brunswickan interviewer last week. He went on to discussing his plan to double the size of Council.

Constitutional provisions, council priorities and simple parliamentary rules of order are regularly ignored, overruled by a concensus to "get things done and go home". When issues become dull to counsellors they pressure the chairman and the president to dissaude other people from discussion. If people from the back of the room wish to speak, this easily is handled by danying them the floor and moving to the vote.

We hope Mr. Green spends some time with the people on Council now before he considers doubling their number. Perhaps he can inspire them in a way David Cox could not. Cox indicated in his final address to Council that the job of president consumed far too much time for a full-time student to sacrifice.

The task ahead of Geoff Green is great. He will be hard-pressed to administer Council as a group of functionaries. Should he seriously attempt to implement his program, the task will be immeasurable.



the way it should be

The CBC and the government have received a barrage of complaints after CBC's public affairs show, *The Way It Is*, showed a film last week, which, Patrick Watson said, was meant to confront people.

The critics are really hung up about what they call the "sex orgy, glorifying disorder and chaos, attacking decent order and good government . . . paeon of praise to anarchy."

What has sex to do with good government or anarchy. It's nineteenth-century thinking to infer that sex on television will destroy the Canadian government.

And the critics also yapped about common decency and lamented loudly the CBC's complete lack of it. What has sex to do with common decency? These people are adhering to the nineteenth-century adage, "You can do it to them, but you can't say it to them."

And many complained that the film was strongly anti-American.

Or was it anti-violence and anti-war? The Chicago episodes showed perfectly what could and probably will happen in Canada if these supporters of repression have their way.

The film was meant to confront people and obviously it did. But the critics didn't think about what they saw they just reacted with typical righteous indignation. Too busy being indignant to think. Afraid that if they thought, they might end up rocking their own little security-boat.

The most hypocritical aspect of criticism is that *The Way It Is* has always and will always be attacked by the same people. These people want it banned from the air and want the CBC cleaned up.

If so, why don't they spend that hour between 11 and 12 Sunday night exerting their greatest effort, instead of sitting in an easy chair watching CBC programs.

Brunswickan

One hundred and second year of publication. Canada's Oldest Official Student Publication.
A member of Canadian University Press. Authorized as second class mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa. The Brunswickan is published weekly at Fredericton campus of the University of New Brunswick. Subscriptions \$3 a year. The Brunswickan office is located in the Memorial Student Center, UNB, Fredericton, N.B. This paper was printed at Bugle Publishing Ltd., Woodstock, N.B.

Editor-in-chief: John Oliver
News editor: Danny Soucoup
Photo editor: Ben Hong
Features editor: Peter Graham
Sports editor: Ian Ferguson
Business manager: Rob Oliver
Circulation manager: Ian Dryden
Production manager: Steve MacFarlane

Staff: Dave Jonah, Corrine Taylor, Glen Furlong, Kink Savage, Doug Perry, Joanne Barnett, Jim Belding, Dave Lewis, Danny Chuck, Alberta Tompkins, Roger Bakes, Wendy Dionne, Joanne Barnett.
Photo: Doug Pincock, Dave McNeil, Henry Straker, Ken Tait, Tom Hoskins.
Sports: Dave Bashow, Barb Roberts, Mike Peacock.

Letters to the editor University favours action which serves its purpose

Editor:

Events on the campus last week again raise questions concerning the policies and practices of the University Administration and their minions. I refer in particular to repeated attempts by certain groups of students (apparently drunk from too much smoke) to oust the Strax supporters from Fortress 130 (131?) by force. In the course of these actions university property was intentionally destroyed, the physical well-being of many students was threatened, and the normal functioning of the University was impaired. Yet, Deans were not dispatched to the scene to lecture on the inappropriateness of "mobocracy", no senior faculty member sped to Baily Hall to restore order, security guards stood idly by and enjoyed the spectacle (in fact they admitted rioters to Bailey Hall fully aware that these barbarians were determined to intimidate the occupants of Liberation 130 by the threat or actual use of

violent means), privileges were not suspended and injunctions were not served, and finally a committee of enquiry (faculty) was not created to determine who might have counselled these students to disobey university rules (it being an article of faith at U.N.B. that students are incapable of independent judgement.) The failure of the Administration to act in this matter is an direct contrast to their response to the Library incident. An explanation of this disparity seems to be required.

There are several possible explanations but most of these appear to be untenable. For example, it might be argued that the Administration is disinterested in maintaining University property. The large proportion of budgetary resources used for purposes of Campus beautification suggest this is not the case. Or, perhaps there was no time to respond. This explanation must also be dismissed because the action was obviously well-planned and the authorities were notified moments after the attack be-

gan. The only plausible explanation is that the Administration chose not to intervene (perhaps in the hope that the attack would be successful) and therefore will condone violence, disruption and property damage when these serve their purposes. The disparity in the Administration's response to these wanton acts of violence and destruction and their actions in the Strax incident, demonstrates (if further evidence is needed) that personalities and political beliefs are the main basis for disciplinary and punitive action at UNB.

By the selective application of rules and regulations the Administration has proven beyond any possible doubt that they are more concerned with the preservation of privilege than with questions of justice and academic freedom. The wall around the campus seems to be growing higher.

John F. Earl
Economics Department

Forester says Ip Se Dixit has wrong facts

Editor:

As a result of certain statements and inferences that were made in an article in last week's Brunswickan, I felt compelled to write to correct apparent misconceptions.

The article by Ip Se Dixit, *Alcohol in the university community* made several statements, about foresters and their activities, which were incorrect and which indicate the possibilities of error when attempting to report second-hand hearsay and information.

In reply to your statement about drunkenness and illegal, encouraged drinking in the forestry lounge, I will state that in the four years that I have attended UNB in the faculty of forestry, I have never seen nor heard of any students who has been encouraged to drink illegally (or

at all, as a matter of fact) in the forestry lounge in the forestry and geology building.

You seem to imply that rules, made by the university for all the buildings and students, do apply to neither the forestry building nor the forestry student. The students know that this is not the case, that forseters have no special privileges, and that they are required to follow the established rules as every other student must.

You continue in the article to use an excerpt from the Brunswickan (Oct 29) concerning an STU student who was burned in the forestry building in an attempt to substantiate your point.

No one knows for sure who threw the water except the fellow who actually did it. The statement by the

student who was burned indicated that he really didn't know if the fellow who did it had been drinking in the forestry building. Neither any member of the Tommies' group that was there that night nor any member of the Brunswickan staff can state for sure that there had been drinking that evening. Thus, any statement to the affirmative is only hearsay and circumstantial, and cannot be used effectively in any unbiased article because it is strictly speculative reporting.

The incident on our part was realized to be quite serious and unfortunate and attempts were made to rectify the situation immediately to prevent it from happening again.

I would not be so naive as to state there has never been any drinking at any time in the forestry building, but certainly not in the outlandish pro-