EDITORIAL

Students whose curvilative averages fall below a certain point are having their future determined to a rather significant degree by what is called the Selective Service College Qualification Test. If a student's score on this test is above a certain level, his deferrment will be continued; if his score falls below this level, he may well be drafted.

Since this test is so important to so many people, I andered what type of test this would be, so I got a sample test. The test claims to examine "your ability to read understanding and to solve new problems by using your general knowledge." It goes on to state that "these abilities are necessary for success in fields which require advanced training." And that is precisely what the test does. It tests your knowledge of and application of fundamentals—things which, in my opinion, no nollege course either deals with or will improve your ability in. It is more a test of innate ability than of he wiedge gained in college.

All this test does is provide an "out" for lazy but intellige; students who have low cumulative averages but who will be able to get a continued deferrment because of their performance on the test. Students who are doing practically nothing in college and continue to in practically nothing, while the plodder type student who doesn't cossess a great deal of irrate ability may well be drafted.

The question is, "Why give lazy but intolligent students ar "out". I think the only criterion which should be used in determining who should be given deferrments should be cumulative average—the equivalent to actual performancein college.

STUDENTS OF PEHRETD:

As was announced, the results of the election of April 20, 1986 for SGA carry-over members has been declared invalid.

The reasons for the invalidation of the results are:

1. The polls were closed at 4:30 p.m. on the above date. The ballots were then counted and the results made known. It was believed in the judge of elections that all

classes had been dismissed in 1.80 page

- 2. Following the announcement of the election results, one class, which gior to the time of closing the polls was thought to have been dismissed, let cut. The people attending this class were given permission to vote.
- 3. After the results of the election were made known, another person went to Erie Hall and encouraged those persons who had not voted to go and vote for a person who was losing according to the 4:30 p.m. election results.

As a result of the above reasons, the results of the election shifted from one person's favor to another's. Understandably, the election was contested. The SGA, in a special meeting during Cormon Hour, April 21, 1986, voted to invalidate the results of the election.

Thus, another election for SGA carryover members will be held between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. today, April 22, 1986.

The election of the president of SGA for the 1986-67 academi: year will be held as scheduled, Wednesday, April 27, 1966, in the lobby of the Otto F. Pehrend Science Fullding.

Thomas G. Clonnor President. SGA

Dear Mr. Editor.

I was very appalled at the mover in which the SEA elections were executed. Closing the polls and then respening them because a few people hadn't voted strikes me as being a rather unorganized way to run an election for a post as important to Februard students as membership in the Student Bovernment Association.

Several students have stated that the national elections are run in a similar manner with the votes being counted be one the polls have been closed. Fowever, this is not true; and—if we were to continue along this line of thought—national elections are not stopped at 7:30 so the votes can be counted and then reopened at 7:45 so people who did not have a chance previously can vote and change the results which have already been made known.

To my mind, the SGA is certainly at fault here. Authorization should never have been given to close the polls early. Put since it was, the only people who should have been aware of the results were those who counted

Och et et e