

Dear Editor,

I am writing in reply to the letter written in last week's SUN by Barry Friesen, a highschool class mate of mine.

For all the talking that the engineers do, Barry's letter sounded a little paranoid. Barry seems convinced that someone in the Student Union is out to get the engineers. Why? Because someone with a little taste chose to edit the View From the Top on occasion? Some things, in very bad taste were printed on this page. Here, I'm referring to the section published in the Jan. 13, 1983 issue of the SUN: "Grace Kelly: Bring 'em Back Alive" Kelly School of Driving-Leave the Dying to us." Barry says in his letter that the engineers page contained amuzing jokes. This instance of so-called humour is in very bad taste, not very humourous at all. This seems to be the humour of some very sick minds. To my mind, that blub should have been edited.

In the Nov. 25 issue of the SUN, Cranston Snord's ending paragraph of The View From the Top says it all:

"View From the Top is a weekly publication of the UPEI Engineering Society and is consistently sexist prurient, in bad taste, and sloppily produced without visible concern for professional standards."

Barry states that the SUN, as it presently is, is "very boring and out of touch." The SUN, as a university paper, provides information relevant to UPEI campus life, as well as articles on other universities and their happenings. In doing so, the SUN helps to keep UPEI students in touch with life on other university campuses.

Why the attack on "a few whimpish artsies and professors as well as over-protective outsiders." Because they chose to voice their opinions? Because the editors chose to edit a paper so that it will

appeal and interest its readers. A page in the SUN is a privilege, not a right as Barry seems to think it is. An editors job is precisely that, to edit a paper so that it will appeal and interest its readers, not offend and degrade them. Barry says that some View From the Top articles are edited because "someone is afraid of someone or something." Then he says "well, all I say is either grow up or go home wimp(s)." Barry seems to be saying that people should not voice or express their opinions and should leave the engineers alone. (Very paranoid thinking to me.) Why shouldn't someone express their opinions on what is tasteful, informative, and humourous or not?

I agree with Barry when he says that reading the SUN is a welcome change from reading text books, but when articles become offensive and in bad taste, I, for one, would much rather read a textbook.

In the final paragraph of Barry's letter, he wants anyone who has an opinion on the contents of View From the Top not to voice it. Engineers are not above reproach. I'm surprised that more students have not written to the editor about the sometimes offensive, rude, and exploitive nature of View From the Top. I think Barry should reevaluate his reasons for attending UPEI. If he's doing so to merely "read our newspapers" then why is he here at UPEI.

As to his final comment on "what better way than through our newspapers for us to prove to you that Engineers rule the world." How do they do this? By immature, offensive, and ignorant articles in our SUN? By erecting offensive snow sculptures on the roof of our library? Not in my books.

The engineers' constant attack on Arts students are taken in good stride, whereas attacks on engineers by others

are taken, by the engineers, as persecutory attempts to knock them off of their self-erected pedestal. Some engineers should realize that there is more to education and knowledge than surveying geology, statics and dynamics. What about history, psychology and English? Education and knowledge is education and knowledge. No one subject is above any of the others, but many engineers fail to see this fact.

In conclusion, having a page in the SUN is a privilege not to be abused, as the Engineering Society has done with its offensive and immature articles. I'm not saying View From the Top is totally not worth printing, merely that some articles that have appeared in the SUN should never have been printed.

Finally, I invite Barry, or any engineer, to clarify a few things for me:

1. What is a wimpish artsie?
2. How and Why do engineers rule the world?

Mark Jewell
3rd year Psychology.

FEDERAL TRANSFERS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada welcome the announcement made by the Hon. Marc Lalonde, Minister of Finance, that the federal government will continue to support the core funding of postsecondary education in Canada for the next two years.

The Association is very concerned, however, that the increase in the per capita federal contributions to postsecondary education will be limited to 6% in 1983-84 and to 5% in 1984-85.

The need for restraint is recognized by the universities and they are prepared to do their share. In fact, they have been subjected to severe financial constraints over the past ten years at a time when student dem-

and for university education has continued to grow. Over 20,000 additional students came into the system in 1982-83 and still further increases are clearly indicated by current applications for 1983-84.

The Association urges the Government of Canada to spend in the university sector the amount which would have been intended for post-secondary education had the restraint program not been applied to the EPF transfers. There is an obvious recognition on the part of students, parents and a concerned Canadian public that the vigour of our competitive capability in the emerging new world is directly dependent upon the honing of young minds within our Canadian university system. Many areas in our universities are in dire need of support to permit them to meet this challenge. Physical plants are in disrepair. Library acquisitions are not being maintained. Scientific equipment needs to be updated or replaced.

The two-year extension of the EPF arrangements should be used by the federal and provincial governments to assess the needs of the university system and to devise a formula that will insure that these needs are met. This opportunity must not be lost. A mechanism must be developed that will allow the university community to participate actively in discussions pertaining to these matters.

The well-being of our society is inextricably tied to the health of its institutions of higher education. It is essential that the universities be provided with the financial resources that will enable them to meet their obligations to Canadian Society.

For further information contact Mr. Robert Patry, Director, Governments Relations, at the AUCC in Ottawa (613) 563-1236.