



mugwump journal

By Bob Macmillan

I cannot resist comment at least once this term on the seal hunt which grabs so many headlines at this time of year. I do not claim to know more than any average "citizen" about the actualities of the case but nonetheless having read and researched various areas of this controversial subject, I do have an opinion. Now whether or not it's nice to kill those little seal pups cannot be decided by relying on the looks of the little devils. Has anyone seen a baby calf or lamb lately? They're sort of cute too, BUT... do you see anyone screaming save the sheep, or as the Newfoundland protesters put it so well last year when they demonstrated here on campus, what about saving the pigs?

However what offends me most about the whole issue is the people who oppose it so much. They include Greenpeace, the International Fund for Animal Welfare and the Fund for animals. These people have in the past few years done a variety of things to stop the hunt. They include 1) physically trying to stop the hunt, 2) pouring out huge volumes of material depicting our cute little pups and our cruel methods of torturing them by killing, 3) set out to kill Canada's tourist industry by sending out millions of kits urging Americans not to travel in Canada (this done by the U.S. based Fund for Animals).

They have also had a certain degree of success. For instance while they have never actually managed to stop the hunt itself they have managed to make problems for the Newfoundlanders by creating chaos on the ice flows. In addition, I have it from a good source that Great Britain and Europe proper are inundated with anti hunt propaganda and I guess the Europeans really don't think too much of us over here. Finally, more than 75,000 postcards supporting the boycott have been received by Canada's embassy in Washington. Not too nice, eh?

I think what bothers me the most is the fact that it's Americans and Europeans who are waging the biggest war, and last time I looked Canada still belonged to the Canadians.

As a Canadian I highly resent being told how to run my country by a bunch of Americans. I don't feel they are overly capable of running their own country and while there's great talk nowadays about the future of Canada, I think enough people feel the way I do - which is that Canada will be around for a long time. It's a trend which Americans began oh so many years ago and one which I think should be arrested. Almost every area of our country is being interfered with by Americans and I for one am sick of it, especially when it comes to the anti-hunt turkeys.

I am sure that if our friends looked into the matter they would discover some facts. For one thing much as I like animals I admit to caring a bit more about people and Newfoundlanders have it hard enough without having one of their major sources of income cut off.

In addition, the hunt, contrary to propaganda is carefully controlled and while the method of killing may seem a bit messy - one has to keep in mind that these people are professionals and know what they are doing. One Newfoundlander pointed out to me last year that it would be extremely hard to skin a wiggling creature who had only been "stunned" by a blow on the head.

Incidentally, don't the Americans have a seal hunt? Who knows? No one ever protests that.

A few tidbits about the University of New Brunswick presidential race. It seems that the three candidates left are indeed from "outside" and according to a source they hail from the University of Toronto, McGill and Acadia. Only time will tell, I for one am looking forward to meeting these gentlemen.

THE BRUNSWICKAN-7

Out-of-Province

differential fees next?

My dearest Editrice:

I'd just like to get a thought or two in concerning the article about differential fees which appeared in the last issue.

Ontario was the first province to introduce this tuition surcharge to foreign students, a few years ago. As a student there at the time, I was exposed to some of the arguments both for and against such a move.

It seems to me that the only reason then and now for such a fee increase (an extra \$759 was proposed for UNB) would be to help generate a few extra hundred thousand dollars for this ailing university. This amount of money only does represent a splash in the bucket when it comes to the total operating expenses of this university.

If the reason to push this differential fee increase is to alleviate local taxpayers of the burden of educating foreigners,

then take note that maybe we should charge foreigners around \$5,000. If they are to completely pay for their education.

How far would this extra revenue go? The increase that about 85 foreign students would cough up would just about pay Dr. Anderson's leave pay. We presently have about 300 foreign students at UNB.

As a Canadian student my stand is against a proposed policy of differential fees. Most of our foreign students are from countries that can use the benefits of Canadian aid. Such aid comes in two forms: material goods and knowledge. The best aid we can give to third-world countries is the education their representatives here can take back home to spread around themselves. The least we here can do is offer outsiders an education for the same fee that we ourselves have to put up, as is the treatment

Canadians get when they study in most other countries.

Canadians benefit directly from having foreign students in their universities. They bring with them their culture and values, which are of great benefit to our people. Also, universities should strive for the open flow of knowledge between people. Differential fees would interrupt this flow.

An extreme example we shouldn't follow is that of the American state universities. A differential fee (roughly double tuition) is not only charged to non-American students, but to out-of-state students as well. An equivalent step in Canada would be for a New Brunswick student to pay double-tuition when studying in another province, whether or not his or her programme of study were even offered in the home province.)

Marc Lulham
Forestry 4

Foreign student's view

Dear Editor:

I noticed an article in the Brunswickan last week concerning differential fees for foreign students. This would mean that foreign students who enter a program for the first time would have to pay a maximum of 80 percent extra of the usual tuition fees. I am a foreign student, but as I am presently enrolled in a program here I shouldn't be affected. However, I just thought I'd throw in my 10 cents worth.

As was pointed out in the article in last week's Brunswickan, differential fees are charged in Alberta, Quebec and Ontario. I think that the people who thought up the idea of differential fees for foreign students were a little short-sighted. If a foreign student would be charged more cash for studying in Canada he/she will go elsewhere or stay at home. If he/she does not study in Canada the Canadians

with whom he/she would have interacted will have lost an opportunity to communicate with someone who has a different way of thinking from themselves. If this idea of differential fees spreads further, the end-result is a block in

one of the pathways for exchanging ideas between countries. I think that a University should try to increase the flow of knowledge - not block it.

Robin

Sadat up for treason

Dear Editor:

The following is from a note (March 12, '79) to the Egyptian Embassy, Ottawa, where I've been known several years.

"Some time ago I wrote you - re signing a peace treaty with Israel - that if President Sadat ignored the Palestinians' just demands, he'd be charged with treason and punished.

Today news came from Iran that he has indeed been charged with treason.

I must now give another warning: If President Sadat signs - under reported conditions - the entire Middle East will erupt, and the Russians will reap a golden harvest."

Sincerely,
Maurice Spire

P.S. Certain readers may not be surprised to learn, Dear Editor, that I sent a copy of the note to the Russian Embassy, Ottawa. M.S.

No P.R. move - Worrell

Dear Editor:

I am writing in order to clarify some misunderstandings in the paper of February 16, as well as to make some comments.

First, the intended purpose of the reduction in student fees was not a "P.R. MOVE"; rather a reflection of the funds needed to operate the Student Union.

As far as the CHSR issue, concerning its possibility of going off campus, the feasibility study has not been completed, so we cannot logically say things like "when CHSR goes off-campus...". If the students want CHSR to go off-campus, the bureaucratic process will take time, probably one or two years.

The statement concerning the extensive amount of expenditure

during the summer is an interesting one. Most of the expenditure was made because we (SRC President, Comptroller, Administrator, Vice President External) knew that the SRC would have a huge surplus by the end of the fiscal year. We felt that it was in everyone's best interests to purchase needed capital equipment in order to reduce the surplus.

Sheenagh, you have not seen any SRC sponsored movies or pubs for two reasons. First, we tried both first-rate movies and pubs. They were losing money due to a lack of participation, so we stopped them. Secondly, the SRC did not feel that it was in the best interests of the students to shaft clubs by invading their movie market.

I don't feel that your comments about our SRC President, Dave Bartlett, were warranted. He's new at the job, give him time. He's the only one who had the guts to run. If you don't like his style by now (1 month in office), by all means, tell us.

Respectfully submitted,
Geoff Worrell
Former SRC Comptroller

