

NEWS BRIEFS

Dal invited to conference on World Hunger

Dalhousie has been invited to send a delegation to the New England Student Conference, "U.S. Policy and World Hunger". The conference is to be held April 9-12 at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

A fee of \$45.00 must be paid upon application. A number of workshops are offered related to the broad issue of "World Hunger." Potential delegates are encouraged to visit Student Council offices for further information. Due to the late arrival of the invitation, if Dalhousie is to be represented at the conference, interested parties should act without delay.

Dal Medical Research presents awards

Major awards were presented to world class researchers by the Dalhousie University Medical Research Foundation.

Dr. Henrich Bitter-Suermann won the Bruce and Dorothy Rossetti Scholarship for Cancer Research. Bitter-Suermann specializes in transplant operations and does research into rejection problems.

The Foundation Associateship annual award was won by Dr. Max Cyander who investigates the problems of strabismus (squint) and ambliopia (lazy eye).

Both awards are for a five-year period valued at \$35,000 a year plus \$10,000 towards equipment and supplies for laboratory work.

Dalhousie second-year medical students raised a record \$6,641 at their annual auction for charity. Almost two-thirds of the amount was given for the Isie Madame Mental Retardation Association Training Centre for Retarded People.

\$2500 was presented to Dr. Jeffery C. Kirby, chairperson of the Halifax Cardiac Rehabilitation Committee to go towards purchase of a defibrillator monitor used for people recovering from heart attack.

Book campaign to aid students in Uganda

A book campaign will be held for Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda. Under the government of Idi Amin, the university's library was virtually unable to buy any new books or journals.

Since the students rely on the library for textbooks, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada is sponsoring a nationwide campaign to collect textbooks and back issues of journals to help restock the library. Collecting boxes will be in the Killam, MacDonald, Law, Kellogg and Social Work libraries. Multiple copies will be welcomed.

French-first hiring policy in Public Service

The federal government has implemented a "French-First" policy in hiring for some positions in public service.

Federal Science agencies are paying full public service salaries to Master's holders who are francophones. Those students are paid to qualify them for government research positions in preference to anglophones who are more qualified.

These accusations are made by Michael Samborn, an anglophone doctoral student in biology at McMaster University in Hamilton. "The government is hiring master's holders and paying them twice what the best doctorate students in the country can receive to go to school. Even if they don't get their PhD's, people in this program are guaranteed a biologist job."

Michelin kit in elementary schools?

Terry Donahoe, Minister of Education, has denied intentions of introducing the Michelin Corporation education kit into the elementary school systems.

The Michelin kit has an honourable goal of educating school children in safety. "This program fits well into the framework of goals and traditions our company has fostered over the years," said Bruno Deckel, vice-president and general manager of the commercial division for Michelin Tires (Canada) Ltd.

The kit has been criticized as nothing more than a promotional gimmick for Michelin. James "Buddy" McEachern noted his objections to the kit were the ulterior motives with which it was designed, and the obvious impact it would have on young adults. "At school, values are shaped", McEachern said. He remarked that removal of the Michelin logo from various parts of the package could be a suitable alternative. "Since schools would be charged over \$100.00 for each kit in any case, this would be a reasonable solution. Then, children may be educated to safety without being brainwashed to Michelin," he said.

Holy Shit! Election '81

by Umesh Jain

Though it may be hard to believe, it has been just over two weeks since you heard the words of sweet quintessential victory. "Holy shit!" The team of Logan and Logan had just entered the world of student politics and for a moment you thought there must be a God! Now the miracle is two weeks old and you've come to accept reality. Election '81 and the triumph of the new winners are only hazy glimpses into fantasy now. In an unprecedented show of electoral ethics, I, the Chief Electoral Officer, will try to replay the past events of the election to you (all comments or quotes from this article associated with the aforementioned shall be promptly denied).

Although I may be a 'little' biased, the election was really a true work of genius with unquestionable excellence by those in charge of its planning (I'm getting ready to spring Council for more money). However, after a week of total suffocation in posters, signs and dowdy junior politicians showing their pictures up your nostrils, it's hard not to realize that there was an election. Don't be surprised. In some years, students were often unaware of its very existence. If you voted this time, you may have just participated in an event which some hail is similar to democracy.

You will also be glad to know that 34% of the student's, like yourself, voted, which is almost double over last year. As well, poll by poll results show an increase in voter turnout at every poll. But, this was not a year dominated by the residences. Genuine surprises were at the Burbridge Bldg., Tupper, S.U.B. and the Dalplex.

Despite the face of nicety I could easily pull over your eyes, I will try to explain some of the problems in the election while I have this chance. Most of the headaches were administrative. Since I did not inform all clerks on procedure, many may have been ignorant of electoral policy. As a result, some voters may have experienced difficulties at some polls. From the absence of certain ballots at the Library, Dalplex, and the Dunn to the meaning of the word 'preferential', a little more administrative planning is obviously in order. For those voters who were a little shaken about the so-called 'stuffed' ballots, I would like to calm your indignation by expressing my firm opinion that this had no effect on the results but it does make good press. These ballots were positively identified and since no candidate expressed an official protest there was no need to plead 'unfairness'. Be sure, however, that steps have been taken to stop this mischief

again (i.e. Warning signs making clear penalty of fraud, enforcement of lock security, and instructions to poll clerks to detect suspicious activity). Besides problems such as the disgrace to the buildings with the posting of so much unsupervised election material, the spelling of Geoff Seymour's name wrong (I deeply apologize), and faults which others choose to place on my shoulders, I believe the candidates have come through with little bitterness and a strong hope about the future. On this note I wish to make some comments on the Logan victory.

The 38 vote win is very misleading. If we look at only first choice results, we see that the Logan's had a 136 vote lead. This is a true sweep. Also, Logan's won 11 of 14 polls on campus giving up the Womens' Residence, Dalplex, and Chemistry. Whatever anyone tells you, the truth is that the Logan's have a superior mandate from the students. Their campaign shows wit and true insight. I think you'll see an executive unafraid to tackle the problems of petty politics, useless Council meetings, and unforgiving bureaucracy. For those that think Dal has now lost its credibility in these times, let me add in passing, "Holy, Shit! it's no wonder you're insecure."

Gazette's new game: DAL LOGARAMA

Dear Loyal Subjects,

In keeping with the predictions of the editor, we have decided that it is now time to start having fun. Refer to Glenn Walton's commentary "It was a bad day for participatory democracy" in the last issue of the Gazette.

Scoring is as follows:
5 points for a blatant lie.

- 4 points for insults to the intelligence of the student body.
- 3 points for unfounded speculation.
- 2 points for words used out of context.
- 1 point for grammatically incorrect sentences.

The student with the most

perceptive reply will receive a twenty dollar prize and have his critique printed in next week's Gazette. Replies must be received by Monday, March 30. They are to be placed in a box marked "Logan and Logan" behind the Enquiry Desk in the SUB.

Serving you sincerely,
John and Jim Logan

It was a bad day for participatory democracy

by Glenn Walton

A funny thing happened last Thursday evening in the Student Union Building, as returns from the Dalhousie Student Council elections began trickling in. The Logan Brothers, who had entertained the campus with the unlikeliest campaign in some time, began respecting the democratic process. As it became apparent that they had a shot at the top executive positions, a seriousness about student issues crept into their previously irreverent statements. As we all now know, the joke candidates had the last laugh, eventually winning what turned out to be a squeaker, by 44 votes over the Graham-Gilkinson team. Any doubts about their not serving were soon dispelled, and a post-election day interview with

CBC reporters was uncharacteristically pious. Words about how they had sensed a mood on campus and were the candidates of protest were flashed across Canada, and must have satisfied sociologists in, say, Whitehorse, or at Maclean's magazine. Those of us who were seriously interested in the campaign and in the issues discussed during it, and have put more effort into political and social change than a cursory poster campaign, can only respond: feathers and dung!

The Logans owe their narrow victory not to cynicism, but to complacency. The former term implies a certain and oftentimes healthy amount of thinking, something I doubt most of the people who marked their ballots for the Logans did much. Why should they have, when the candidates themselves ignored the many forums and question-and-answer sessions held around campus, even when (as on at least one occasion) they were physically present? Ultimately, in an election that was narrowly contested, it was bloc voting — always of questionable merit — that decided the margin. The law school chose to vote overwhelmingly for their favorite sons, and said in effect "to hell with the rest of the campus". A supreme irony, that the system was made laughable by those who are destined to profit the most from the making and interpreting of laws.

The results perhaps would have made more sense if there had been no choice between the serious candidates. The Graham-Gilkinson team in particular was directed specifically to those who feel that the bureaucrats of the SUB have lost sight of the concerns of the 'outside world'. Their campaign included not only concern for the legitimate interests of other students but for national and even international issues (Remember the Good Old Days of campus fervour?) Instead we saw win a pack of promises (like a proposal to move the campus) that made good copy for the entertainment media, but which offered no solutions to the very real problems facing students today. To do them credit, the Logans themselves were apparently as surprised as anyone at their election; indeed it is perhaps relevant to ask whether many of those who voted for them would have done so if they had any expectation of them winning.

A bad day it was for participatory democracy, but the results must be honoured, and the democratic process will now absorb its former delinquents. The Logans, unacquainted with the workings of student government, must now undergo the arduous task of preparing for jobs that were awarded them by a process they mocked. It will be interesting, in a year's time, to see how they have fared. It is an ultimate irony of their non-campaign that the onus is now on them to do the job much better than the present office-holders (or anyone else who ran) might have, for that matter. By not condescending to let the students who will now pay their salaries question them on the issues, it is now up to them to defuse the very real cynicism that their victory has generated.

Walton's Commentary from last issue