the brunswickan

Stephane Comeau _____ Editor - in - Chief

Bill Traer _____ Managing Editor
Advertising Manager

Peter Thompson
John Stillwell_____ News Editors

Steve Griffiths_____ Entertainment Editor

Stephan Comeau
Jeremy Earl _____ Offset Editors

Richard Doucet_____ Photo Editor

Stephen Marks
Eric Drummie_____ Sports Editors

Heather McNaught_____ Features Editor

Robin Daniels_____ Lit. Page Editor

Joe ' Jo-Jo' Gauthier _____ BusinessManager

Staff this week

Stephen Seabrook, Sid Yobbo,Danny Scott, Eddie Studley, Vusma Yauzzan, Peter Bailey, Pam Stillwell, Nancy Maxime, W. G. Hale, Tim Lynch, Mike Robichaud, Ronald W. Carver, Derrick Walsh, Nora Mair, Kim Doyle, Joyce Oullette, Neddy, Tom Stillwell, Karen Mair, Kevin "Studdley" Hollis, Melynda Jarrett, Nujma Yaqzan, Mark Stevens, Stephen Marks

Typesetters Extraordinaire?! ?!

Stephanie ' See you at the Cos ' London, Tina Bakari, Kathy Makela, KateMacKay and Dave Morrison

The *Brunswickan*, in its 122st year, is Canada's oldest official Student Publication. The *Brunswickan's* offices are located in Room 35 of the University of New Brunswick's Student Union Building, P.O. Box 4400,College Hill,Fredericton,N.B.,E3B 5A3

The *Brunswickan* is printed with flair by Henely Printing Ltd. Woodstock,N.B.

Subscriptions are $20.00 per year.National and local advertising rates are available at (506) 453 - 4974. General phone 453 - 4983. News line 453 - 4973.

Opinion is a forum for Brunswickan staff members to present their own viewpoints on various topics. Their opinions are not necessarily those of the Brunswickan's editorial board, its staff, or its publishers

Opinion

An open letter to Student Union President Jane Arnold

Dear Jane,

We saw you asking questions in righteous indignation at the recent candidates forums in the SUB cafeteria. These questions, while interesting, seemed inappropriate coming from you. Doesn't it seem unethical for our Student Union President to ask stilted questions that indicate quite obviously who you're not going to vote for and possibly bias the electorate against those certain candidates?

Especially considering your own track record as President.

Speaking of your track record, let us try and remember exactly what you've accomplished.

You've sold three photocopiers after promising to expand photocopying service. You've continued the practice of using a student information page in the *Brunswickan* as a student advertising page. You've seen a Student Union "investigating" comittee judge a person guilty of sexual harassment without giving due process. You didn't even consider what the issue was between the Board of Governors and Susan Forestell and yet you posthumously pronounce judgement on this issue.

Are you proud of this impressive record?

Certainly you've done some good things-but it is darn hard to find out what they are.

Campus Entertainment is always a visible plus, but the exact reason for its' success is probably not the Student Union, but the hard work and dedication of Tim and Marc, so it would seem difficult for you to take credit for this in any way.

As an example of this dedication, we were witness to Tim Judah and Marc Braithwaite spending long hours in the Bruns offices putting together an exceptional ad campaign for their events. The amount of work by Tim and Marc is what made Campus Entertainment what it was this year-not any supposed changes made by the S.U.-such as a change in name.

We noticed in last weeks that your "biggest beef" as Student Union President has been the *Brunswickans'* lack of responsibility. Just what does this lack of responsibility entail, Jane? Were we sued? Do we have impending civil charges? Did we not print enough propoganda? Were we too negative? Are we not an effective student voice? How did we promote apathy?

Maybe it's just that we don't subscribe to your point of view. Maybe it's because we question your plans and motives? Maybe it's just because *you* don't like what we print.

Maybe that is our purpose: to be the watchdog of the Student Union; to investigate and report the facts, and to print a variety of opinions, be they ours or others.

And in case you haven't noticed, much of the bitching has been about the Bruns itself, the best example of which is the "Bruns investigation". This "investigation" was covered both as news and through the letters to the editors sections, and we could just as easily have covered it up. We have had a policy of printing any viewpoint be it positive or negative, pro-Bruns or anti-Bruns, pro-Student Union or anti-Student Union, or even pro-Red Devils or anti-Red Devils.The issues exist and we are simply a forum for students and others to discuss these issues. It's not our responsibility to pre-judge these issues; it's our responsibility to print them, and we do!!, whether you or anybody else likes it or not.

And yet we can only print issues when we know about them. When we get information about them. But, Jane, you've been of minimal help at best. Which is surprising from a person in your position. Isn't it your responsibility to inform the students of council's activities. Aren't you our president, our voice? You had a whole page to present the issues before council. You didn't. Why not? Was it because there really was nothing going on? Isn't that irresponsible? "Those without sin should cast the first stone."

Perhaps the negative feedback was due to your inaction. Is that our fault?

We think not.

This year, we've been accused of promoting apathy, and yet we've probably been one of the biggest victims of it. Our only major problem has been a lack of staff, and with a bigger staff, we would have watched you much more closely. What a bonus!

Seriously, Jane, if you read the paper over the past few years, you'll see that this year has seen improvement over some of the slanted editorial positions taken previously, to-wit, the John Bosnitch dynasty. To quote one of our former editors, (no longer in the city), immediately after John Bosnitch had won his last election: "Damn, if I had one more issue, I could destroy John Bosnitch"

So, Jane, are we really that awful? Have we really been that irresponsible?

It's easy to criticize, but it's not so easy to consistently produce a 28 page paper that you are hoping will address the issues before the students, and provide entertainment as well.

It's obvious we'll accept criticism; we even use our own paper to present criticism of ourselves.

Is this irresponsibility?

Why does the Bruns need a watchdog? Why does the Bruns need a board of directors to "guard against editorial and advertising copy that is unacceptable to the university community"? We're sure that people like Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Idi Amin, and others of similar expertise would (and did!) say the same thing about their own newspapers.

In short, Jane, What is your purpose?

Signed, your friends,

Alan Robichaud, co-sports editor
Jeremy Earl, co-offset editor
Peter Thompson, co-news editor

P.S. feel free to respond,Jane. Blood and Thunder is open to anyone whether we agree with them or not. Including (Shock Horror!!) the President of the Student Union.