

What the Exec. is up[↑] to?!

TUESDAY, September 29, 1981
By Lesley Semple
12:30 p.m.
Location: Robertson
Library

The speaker, Neil MacKenzie, called the meeting to order immediately after a 10% quorum (143 students) of the student enrollment was present. Terry Palmer, president of the Student Union, spoke on: the renovations to the barn over the summer, the background of Federal Funding Cutbacks, the March to Provincial House September 30, 1981 and the future plans to attract students to the Barn.

Patti Bradley,

Vice President External, discussed her responsibilities involving the SUN, CIMN, and the Yearbook. She introduced the people involved under these areas, informed students on what has been done and what plans have been made for the future of these areas. Patti encouraged students to get involved and that they would be more than welcome to participate in these activities.

Sue Parlee, vice President Internal, explained that she was in charge of the C.P.'s, Bartenders, and any activities that involved the Barn. Susan wants to make massive use of

the Barn via movies, pubs, and main events. She also discussed wage increases for C.P.'s and other paid staff at the Barn.

The final report came from the Treasurer, Bruce Hickey. Bruce briefly went over last year's audit. He invited students or anyone interested to go down to the Barn and view the audit. Bruce said he would be happy to answer any questions involving the topic.

The floor was then open to questions.

Jim Revell, a senior Business Student, questioned the union executive on a motion that had been put through

Student Council this fall. The motion involved the bar proceeds going to classes and sub-organizations after a pub or main event. The passed motion as it stands now allows classes and suborganizations to receive 75% of profits from the Bar after all expenses have been taken off. Jim could not see the Student Unions line of thinking on the subject. As a result it was suggested that Jim would go to the next student council meeting and present his argument towards the motion.

The meeting was then adjourned by the speaker.

Model U.N. Conference

By Kathy Greene

This year the Political Science Department is participating in the National Model United Nations Conference. This Conference will be held at the Grand Hyatt Hotel in New York City. The dates for this conference are April 6-11, 1982.

This conference is a political education

experience about the U.N., world affairs and of international politics through five days of simulated U.N. sessions.

The idea of the conference is that each participating university represents a country in the United Nations. Each university delegate will have a chance to meet the U.N. members from the country they represent.

The Grand Hyatt is located above Grand Central Station and is within walking distance of the U.N. and other popular sites in New York City.

This opportunity is open to all students. If you are interested there will be a meeting on Tuesday, October 13, at 6:30 in the Political Science/Philosophy

Faculty Lounge, Main Building, Room 326A. Further details about the conference and possibilities of fund raising to defray the cost will be discussed.

Remember: Tuesday, October 13, 6:30 Political Science/Philosophy Lounge, Main Building, Room 326A

All students are welcome.

Amnesty International

by Gerhard Elston, Executive Director of Amnesty International - USA.
Reprinted from Amnesty International Bulletin

After all, governments are pledged to uphold the minimum standards set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in the various covenants and treaties that translated the vision of the Universal Declaration into international law. If governments lived up to the obligations (and all of them have subscribed), there would be no work for us. And though we look forward to that day with some eagerness, we are not in any immediate hope of being able to go out of existence.

While we may have come of age quite some time ago, an anniversary such as the one that we are observing this year must necessarily be a sobering matter. This brings me to the discussion

that has recently erupted in the United States.

This political discussion is most interesting-- but it is not an AI discussion. It is certainly worth debating at governmental levels; "What weight should be given to human rights considerations when foreign policy decisions are made?" But that obviously is not a problem for a human rights organization.

Governments obviously take many things into consideration - we must have one commitment, namely, that these rights are honored and observed. And when other consideration override these human rights concerns, we will scream and continue to be very noisy. But it is also a very interesting discussion at the governmental level to discuss the relative role of human rights considerations when you're talking about national security matters.

matter of mere common sense, we should have long since learned - not we as AI, but we as citizens - that unless human rights are observed and people are treated with a measure of equitable justice, there isn't going to be peace and stability in the world; therefore, human rights considerations should be ranked very high at any discussion of national security.

But this is not just an AI question, because the AI approach to these matters is more direct and simple. Our challenge to government is not the measure and degree and attention that human rights concerns are to be given in the matter of policy, but very bluntly, "How do you hold governments accountable to the standards that they themselves have set and agreed to? Because we wouldn't

have to exist if they did hold themselves and each other accountable to these standards."

The preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights makes it very clear that the intent of the Declaration was not only to say "never again" to the horrors of Nazi death camps, but also to make it clear that the world community had determined that these violations, if they ever occurred again, would never again be regarded as the internal affairs of any nation, country, or government. The preamble of the Declaration makes it very clear that not only are governments to be held accountable to these standards, but they are also pledged to hold each other accountable to these standards.

continued on page 11