



**Mugwump**  
ED  
By WERTHMANN **Journal**

Ah! Is it ever great to back on the ol' typewriter. Sorry I missed last week, but after all, it is your fault. How can I get my two cents worth in if you people out there insist in writing such long letters to the editor (that's me!)? Mind you, I really can't complain seeing how near the beginning of the year all I did was bitch about not getting any letters at all.

However, do try not to ramble on... response I encourage, but surely you can cut the length of your letters. If you don't, we have to pull some and we certainly don't want to do that.

A word of caution to all of ye who fear the evil weed. There is a dangerous and vile substance being circulated around this campus known to all as Columbian. I understand however, that it is mixed with weaker substances of the same nature and one would think it reded harmless. But don't listen to those who doubt. It is a filthy and unhealthy practise, no matter what it's called. I know... because it had managed to corrupt me very recently... and I am just managing to confess now while it still doesn't have such a strong hold of my rationale.

Woe is me! The words are becoming harder to say... the dreaded weed has corrupted my being... I am going... going... help!!!

~~~~~

Enough of melo-drama. Now down to brass tacks. I had the good fortune today to talk to a person who is planning to run for office in our student government. However, I couldn't bring myself to sign his nomination papers because of what was said in our ensuing conversation. I was dismayed to hear his views of such important issues as student aid, summer employment and the like. He flatly stated that such issues are not of concern to student government representatives.

Can you imagine saying such a thing? Well, maybe that isn't such an unusual stand to take for our "leaders" on this campus. The student government has now, I realise, taken a "corporate" oriented stand on student politics. Government here is more concerned with "business" and the efficient use of our money. Now there is nothing wrong with that type of concern, but for the life of me I can't see how that becomes the one and only most important aspect of student government. Those aforementioned issues plus the question of housing, parking, course evaluation, food services, the rising costs of tuition and books, understanding the Fiscal Arrangements Act and many, many more have not been looked into. Such issues should be the one and only most important things of concern before our elected representatives.

I would urge the audience to take note of what I have just stated, and react to it. I am extremely unhappy with the actions and attitudes of the SRC. Hopefully some of you will take the time and effort to look at the SRC and make a personal note of evaluation of this organisation.

If you don't, you will find that our government will be made up of people like that SRC hopeful I talked to.

Perhaps it is time for a purge. At this point, it is hard to say. Maybe I am overreacting to a pretty poor situation. But this has tones of the recent election in Quebec -- on a much smaller level to be sure; but none the less, the parallel exists.

To finish off, a quotable quote from one very popular student leader: "I must be getting bigoted in my old age." This is from one who lives on jokes that are not only racist in nature, but downright disgusting. What are we going to do, folks?

~~~~~

Hello, Gene. I see you got home safely. It sure was nice to see you this weekend. ...ditto from the rest of the gang. And a very special hello to Kealin. C'mon down!!

...a poem

Dear Editor:

Thank God The Brunswickan has gone from no letters to the Editor in the first several issues to quite a few now. Perhaps this (thankfully) means that people are willing to stand up for what they believe, but:

lady dunn proctors,  
emotional defense is not constructive criticism,  
ignorance is no excuse,

majority rule like sherriff hall?  
issue guards with automatic weapons with a standing order,  
to shoot to kill all drunken animals irrelevant factors are not pertinent facts;  
objectivity is not the reporting of the status quo,  
idealistic seeking of change perhaps is.

Sincerely,  
J. David Miller

Gauntlet getter defends himself

Dear Editor:

I have just finished carefully reading some of last week's criticism directed towards me and my previous week's article entitled 'EUS Throws Down Gauntlet to SRC' and I would like to take an opportunity to defend myself and my article. More importantly, however, I also would like to clear up the misunderstanding that has arisen over the article's intent and purpose.

First of all, I should clarify two points about the article. First, the choice of the title was not mine but rather the choice of someone at the Bruns office. If the title had been mine, I would have carefully avoided the use of any reference to the EUS. The EUS (Engineering Undergraduate Society) did not have anything to do with the writing of the article. The article was written on my own initiative. Secondly, I am not a 'Bruns Staffer'. Check the staff list in the front of this paper because, unless I've been 'promoted' in the last week, my name will be absent from the list. I am just a contributor.

Having cleared up those points I now would like to move on to the task of defending myself from the irate criticisms of Steve Berube and Jim Smith. I say 'irate' because it seems that they got angry first and then read my article as they surely didn't read it very well.

I'll discuss Steve Berube's criticisms first. Steve seemed very upset about my lack of knowledge on student government, saying that I knew 'little' and that I should do some 'research' on student government. He then went on to write that he's be more than happy to provide the information if I'd contact him. He missed my point entirely. My point is this: not only am I in the dark about the SRC and the senate, all of Head Hall is in the dark about the SRC and the Senate. I was only repeating 'common ignorance'. My article

stressed the fact that the SRC had a communications problem and most of my recommendations were aimed at improving communications between the SRC and the Engineering students. One phone call won't do the trick.

Time after time in Steve's letter he proves how carelessly he read my article. I'm misquoted all over the place. My writing style is not that bad I'm sure, but his letter does make me wonder. For example: he accuses me of advocating virtual censorship of the Bruns. I did not do this at all but rather I wrote that the SRC should use the Bruns as a medium for informing the students of SRC activities and successes. Censorship? Sheesh.

The NUS question brought forth another heavy response from Steve Berube. He was quick to point out that the majority of ballots at Head Hall favoured NUS membership. That has nothing to do with my argument. I myself am for the principle of the NUS but I cannot see where the present NUS (of the AFS, for that matter) has done anything for us. Most Engineers feel the same way: as a matter of fact, most UNB students seem to feel the same way as witnessed by our lacklustre performance on National Students Day. The use of election results can cut both ways, Steve, the low election percentage turnout is just another proof that SRC has to clean up its image. Thirty-two percent is a poor turnout no matter which way you cut it.

Finally, I must say that where Steve Berube's letter really disappointed me was in his lack of analysis of the recommendations. I'll be the first to admit that they are elementary, maybe even naive but at least they are constructive. That crack about the SUB did not impress me at all - I know that the SRC owns the SUB. That is one of the main reasons why the SRC should get out of there once in a while. One token

effort at the Dunn, 10 months ago, is not what I mean. There are some great meeting rooms outside of the SUB and the SRC should be using them. The whole campus is their constituency, not just the SUB. Want their locations? Give me a call!

I do not doubt that Steve Berube meant well - his appeal for student help and input proved that. It's just that he saw red when he should have read.

Jim Smith's criticisms were of a different sort. The president did explain some of the activities of the SRC but he fell short in his explanation, omitting to answer several of the questions raised in the article, such as: What good is the NUS or the AFS doing? What can the SRC do for us? What are they going to do about student apathy?

Smith did make an attempt to break through the communications barrier by writing a column which announced a general SRC meeting at Tilley 102 on Wednesday, November 17, at 3:30 p.m. It was an attempt, but a rather strange one considering that the article was entitled 'No this is not a regular feature' - why not Jim? - and that the time of the announced meeting fell on one of the heaviest class days of the week. Most Engineers were in labs and classes as were many foresters, nurses, and science students. It's no wonder we're afraid of failing if we participate, Jim, no wonder at all.

The big question that came to my mind after reading the two letters was this: Who is serving whom here? Is it the student's job to cut classes to attend SRC meetings and to make phone calls to find out what the SRC does for them? or is it the SRC's job to make sure most students can attend general meetings and that all students know what their council can do for them?

When apathy strikes as deep at a university as it's supposed to have struck at UNB then the council and the councillors have to try harder to get support.

Try harder, group.  
Yours truly,  
Andrew L. Steeves  
Room 306, Head Hall

Evil apathy explained

Dear Editor:

I must comment on the article "Apathy here to stay" in the Brunswickan of Nov. 12 which labelled students who did not support the stand against the government as apathetic. It should be noted that people who did not support those demands (or any others) are not necessarily apathetic. They, like me, just might oppose them.

Ginny Banerjee  
Computer Science

more pg 9

Dossier info requested

Dear Editor:

The term of appointment of Professor Barry Thompson as Dean of Students expires on June 30, 1977, and he is eligible for reappointment. In view of the broad responsibilities of the Dean of Students to the University community, the Search Committee wishes to receive written comments on the possible reappointment of Professor Thompson from students, members of faculty or staff in the University. I should appreciate it if you would publish this letter as a means of inviting comments from any member of the University community who might wish to express an opinion. According to regulations adopted by the Board of Governors and Senate, it is my stated responsibility as Chairman of the Search

Committee to invite written comments which will be treated in strict confidence except as explicitly provided in the regulations, viz:

The information obtained (by the Chairman) will be summarized by the Chairman of the Search Committee and the summary will be disclosed to the incumbent prior to determining if the incumbent wishes to reoffer for the post.

Written, signed comments must be received by this office no later than December 6, 1976. The Search Committee will advise the constituency of its deliberations in due course.

Sincerely yours,  
Mervyn Franklin  
Vice-President (Academic)  
and  
Chairman, Search Committee