

Shocked at his rep's actions during meeting

Editor:

I decided to write this letter, after having attended the open SRC meeting on Wednesday, Nov. 20, which is the first SRC meeting I have attended this year.

I was very happy to see that so many students have enough interest in the affairs of this campus to attend such an important meeting.

I think the first letter sent by the SRC to president Mackay and the board of deans was demanding rather than requesting, and hence the second one, which was approved at the open meeting, should be acceptable.

I want to make it very clear that I do not condone the past actions of the SDS on this campus, but I also cannot go along with the actions of the administration or those of certain irresponsible, violent students who visited Liberation 130 during its occupation. I think this fall term has been a series of 'wrongs' on both sides of every question, and no one has advocated any 'rights' until now.

Our students representative council has decided to ask the board of deans to meet with the students at an open meeting of the SRC; any other type of meeting of the SRC would be unconstitutional, as has been pointed out. If the board of deans does not arrange for a meeting, action in the form of a strike is to be taken.

I think it is time we put aside our selfish personal ambitions and take an interest in other people by supporting our SRC in its endeavours to solve the problems of student unrest on the UNB campus. The SRC is our only hope; the SDS and the administration have been given their chance and look what happened! So, let's get behind our SRC and fight for the rights of our students and faculty.

I was utterly shocked at the actions of Robin Bunner, my science representative on the SRC, who violently opposed

every suggestion made by council and proposed no alternatives as solutions to our present problems. As I have previously stated, this is the first SRC meeting that I have attended and hence, knew nothing of this misrepresentation that I have obviously been receiving.

After the meeting, I asked Bunner how he decided that he was representing our faculty and his reply was, "Oh, I know the physics students and the biology and geology clubs are behind me." He also mentioned that the physics club, of which I am a member, was supporting his views.

At this point, I want to make clear two things. First that

these groups represent a small portion of the science faculty, almost entirely excluding first and second year students, and secondly, that this topic and no other related topic were ever discussed at a meeting of the physics club.

All the science students who spoke at the SRC meeting were opposed to Bunner and I must only conclude that he is representing the apathetic students, who were not there and who hardly need to be represented, as their position is evident.

Perhaps in the future, our representatives can consult members of the science faculty, other than the executives of clubs, and truly represent us.
Donald Moore
science 4

Students want to leave here soon

On November 20, 1968, I attended the open meeting of the administration (who did not attend), the SRC and the student body. I went with the idea that I would have the opportunity to hear for myself (up until this time I had to accept the biased opinion of the Brunswickan) what the students want from the administration and to hear the answers from the administration. As mentioned above the administration did not attend.

Upon arrival I found a full house and gladly took a seat on the steps. The SRC and a few students; for example Tom Murphy, were engaged in a discussion of why the administration did not show and what steps should be taken concerning their absence. I sat for an hour and within this time there was no deviation from this topic. Mr. Alastair Robertson put forth a resolution and the SRC president, Jeffery (sic) Green, who in my estimation did not take the time nor make the effort to think about Mr. Robertson's resolution (which I am sure Alastair took great pains to devise) called it 'chickenshit.' The use of this menial terminology (sic) shows little concern on the part of the SRC president. Needless to

say, the reaction of the student body to Mr. Robertson's resolution and Mr. Green's terminology was quite in contrast.

I tried to see in the faces of the student body what their reactions were to the things being said. A few sat with polite attentiveness. They did not clap when subtle remarks were made against the administration nor did they show much enthusiasm when Alex Jablanczy, a graduate student in English, came forth with his radical DEMANDS. Some students showed their reactions by 'hissing' or 'clapping'; however, this did not necessarily mean their support or their opposition. It appeared that these students were looking for an evening's entertainment (which did not cost them anything, except their time) which at around 10 o'clock seemed to suddenly bore them.

My impression was that the majority of the students who were at the meeting were not truly concerned with the proceedings of the SRC. I wonder what good could come from a meeting with the administration and the student body (if such a meeting can be established). I tend to think that if such a meeting occurs, the students who will speak will be the ones

(see page 10)

MORE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Small group controls council

Editor:

While attending the last SRC meeting I was dismayed by the student council presumed the opinion of the whole student body and attempted, with the support of a very small group, to steam-roll and involve all of us in a factional dispute. I am referring to the Strax and Room 130 affairs. Since the action taken by the individuals involved has been on their own and without us being consulted beforehand, I do not feel responsible for the consequences of their acts, nor bound to support them.

While the people of Room 130 and Dr. Strax raised some important questions about the purposes and role of the University and its administration, I do not believe that such hasty action as theirs was in the best interests of the student body as a whole or in developing unprejudiced and free discussions with the hierarchy of the University. I feel that the student council now is also taking hasty and hard line stand.

If anything, name-calling and taking hard positions only forces the two parties involved into extreme positions from which it is impossible for either to come to compromise. What we as students really are interested in are the immediate problems concerning the students during our academic years and, in a wider sense, the shaping or reshaping, if necessary, of society and its institutions, and not in a couple of unfortunate occurrences.

An undertaking such as the shaping of society cannot be achieved in a few weeks or months. It certainly cannot be undertaken in an atmosphere of tension and recriminations, threats and counter-threats and, above all, emotionalism.

If anything, the Strax and

room 130 affairs have demonstrated that channels of communication between the administration and the student body are badly needed. Some meaningful dialogues should be started soon, but not on the basis of the student council's present hard line position. At this point there is no sense putting the blame for the lack of communication on either side. It seems clear that the administration has failed in the past to voluntarily open such channels. But it is also clear that the student council has not worked too hard either to bring about meaningful talks except in periods of crisis, which are not the most conducive times to ask for such talks.

But for such a remonstrance to be successful, it has to be backed by a large number of students. I know that most students have no time for idle and lengthy discussions. This is why I have decided to post in the entrance hall of each faculty some sheets of paper and a pen, where students who support this position can sign their names without disrupting their schedules. The signature of your name does not involve you in more than what this letter says: a remonstrance to the student council and the expression of the will of the students. It is most important that you come out with your opinion.

A small group of activists are using the student council as a tool for their own ends by pressuring it into radical action. It is true, however, that the fault lies with us and not with the activists. By remaining silent we have in effect given up our franchise.

It is time for us to remind everyone that while not taking part in most discussions, we have to be taken into consideration, and that if pushed too far, we too can take action.

Stephen deAuer
grad philosophy

VIEWPOINT

do you think athletic scholarships should be awarded at unb?

by ben hona and ian ferguson



barb biggs
phys ed 3

"Yes, but I don't know why".



barb mcgraw
phys ed 2

"Yes, a healthy body makes a healthy mind".



celine goodine
arts 2

"Yes, it would increase the spirit of the student body with respect to sports".



john robinson
arts 2

"No. Hey, you took my picture. I should confiscate your film".

jim lindsay
phys ed 3

"Most 100% definitely, yes, they should be"



ruth carroll
arts 1

"First of all, have we any athletes?"



ted givan
arts 2

"No, I think that's a semi-trick".



john grant
grad history

"If it wouldn't lower the academic standing".

