

Bartlett makes case for 'yes' vote

Dear referendum voters,

It has been several years since I wrote a letter to the Brunswickan but the recent referendum decision has prompted me to write again.

I voted "yes" in the referendum and propose in this letter to make a case for that position.

The Student Union Building (SUB) was built in 1968. Half of the initial construction cost was provided by the students through their contribution of \$15 per year. The mortgage relating to the half of the costs that the students paid has now been retired. With the results of the last referendum, the students have effectively decided that their \$15 per year contribution to the building will cease.

The SUB was built with a financial commitment and partnership between the students and the university. The other half of the initial construction cost, which the students did not pay, was paid by the university. In addition, the university pays for the heat and light consumed as well as all maintenance to the outside of the building. There is no direct charge to the students via either the Student Union or the Student Union Building to off-set these expenses. The university has also from time to time conferred other benefits upon the building

(most recently the new interior paint job and the brown carpeting on the second and third floors). The renovations that have just taken place on the first floor were NOT paid for by the university. A portion of the cost was funded by the SUB but most of the cost was paid by Beaver Foods. This renovation represents one aspect of the consideration given by Beaver in return for an exclusive five year contract at UNB. By now it should be clear that the students are not paying half, or anything close to half of the building's total cost in a direct way. The students should take note that the group which pays the direct cost will be more likely to guide the future of the building. The students' contribution, as of the most recent referendum, will be exclusively indirect.

In 1966 when the students' contribution started, the plans for the building were not finalized. Those students saw fit to contribute to the concept of a SUB. Since its completion, problems of space allocation have arisen. In this period of tight money the problems will not be solved by building more space. The problems will be alleviated (if they are to be alleviated) by making the most of the space presently within the buildings superstructure and this, in a word, means

renovations.

Throughout the renovation debate this fall we have witnessed something that Canada, and perhaps this university in particular, has experienced (all too often). That is our flair for internal bickering. I have not heard the "No" side condemn renovations per se. On the contrary they appear to be in favour of renovations but with a proviso. The proviso is that they (the 'No' side) want the right to give their personal approval to any proposed plans. They have arrived at a different conclusion than that of the SUB Board but without the benefit of the recommendations of architects and financiers.

The sad part of this whole debate is that the real issue was never in fact debated. Surely the issue was: Do we need renovations? If 'No' the question is solved. If 'yes' then we proceed to architectural plans based upon financial considerations in an attempt to find a solution that is affordable. The question that was before us in the referendum was whether or not to continue

to contribute \$15. The SUB Board felt that \$15 per year would provide sufficient funds to renovate the building in a step by step fashion and thus provide a building better able to service the students.

The debate which took place did not dispute whether renovations were required or even desirable. That appeared to have been common ground. The foolish debate presented before us was between 1) supporting renovations based on conceptual plans as offered by the SUB Board and 2) the questionable alternative of wanting to have plans finalized before voting on the need for renovations. The latter would be asking that the cart be placed in front of the horse.

Some of you must wonder how the issue became so confused. Where were the so-called student leaders and why were they not able to communicate the question to you? Frankly, I do not know. The SUB Board did not organize their campaign for support well enough. The UNB Student Union took less than a strong

stance on the whole issue. The media, aside from a small endorsement, failed to make it an issue.

Our present state is that the SUB can fairly be described as being in need of modifications. The university in its present financial crisis will not benevolently offer to correct a problem which the students have rejected. The building will continue to show its growing age and inadequacies.

The decision of the last referendum may well reflect the wishes of the student body but I do not believe that we will know unless we have (I hesitate to suggest it!) a third referendum with the issue, this time, clearly before the students. The issue is: Do we wish to have the building renovated? Or do we want the building to further deteriorate and continue to be dysfunctional?

Sincerely,

David Bartlett
UNB Student Union President
1979.

'Corruption evident'

Dear Sir:

As one of the quieter members of the C.A.U.S.E. executive I would like to speak out on the corruption that is evident throughout the UNB campus. How has this corruption come about, well you should contact your nearest SRC councillor. These people are supposed to represent you but actually how many councillors were rated in.

Here are some prime examples of our corrupt society.

- (1) Vice-President SRC misinterpretation of consitution during election campaign.
- (2) President Elect Finnan and his \$660 dinner. (How about receipts?)

Is he enjoying his affair with the Harrison . . . ? But as he would say "Stop being a child."

- (3) The SRC Chairman, can they really do their job? How many points of order can they handle before they end up working at MacDonald's.

I could go on and on but why bother. Nothing is going to

transpire this term and the corruption will soon end for another term but what are we going to do with these childish politicians?

In January something will be done, and CAUSE has outlined some events that will transpire next term.

- 1) Presidential campaign.
- 2) Will the New Brunswickan come again?
- 3) Will Gerard survive his term in office?
- 4) Will the CAUSE executive be sued?
- 5) Will Dave Kaye survive his night in the Dunn?
- 6) Will Sue Lynch finally appear? (Will her sister disappear?)
- 7) Will John Bosnitch run for President?
- 8) Will Kristie ever give in?
- 9) Will Dr. Woodfield send us a post card?
- 10) Will the McLeod Gigalo finally come out of his shell?
- 11) Will the Brunswickan print this?

Stephen McAlinden
CAUSE Vice-President

Nurses upset

Dear Sir:

We, the nurses were supposed to attend a pub with the engineers, November 13, 1981. However, due to the offensive nature of some posters advertising this pub, we decided not to involve ourselves with a group who hold us in such low

**Sure
cure**

Dear Ed,

There's not a damn thing wrong with SRC meetings that a fragmentation grenade couldn't cure.

Yours in command,

Sgt. Nick Fury
and his Howlin' Commandos

regard. We felt that by attending the pub we would be condoning their degrading attitude conveyed on the posters.

We were told by the Engineering Society President that they understood our position and that we would receive a written apology in the Brunswickan. Two weeks have passed and there has been no apology.

In a December 1 conversation with their president, we were told that the engineers have changed their minds and refused to apologize. He stated that had we attended the pub and been "good sports" about being insulted that they would have been glad to apologize. Because of the inconvenience caused to them in cancellation of the pub

when informed that we would not attend, they feel we do not deserve an apology. Yet, in retrospect, had we not forwarned them of our boycott they would have incurred substantial financial loss instead of just inconvenience.

After the date of the pub, we learned that the posters were the actions of only a few students. Yet we believe that their society is responsible for the actions of the whole group of engineers even the ones who misrepresent the rest. Furthermore, we still feel offended by their blatant sexism and derogatory attitudes towards nurses and are awaiting an apology.

Sincerely yours,

The Nursing Society

A statement of ideals

Many young people of Western societies are cynical of many present day religious, social and economic institutions. They ultimately believe in a free and democratic society but lack faith and trust in existing governments. They realize that human values are debased and corrupted, that humanity and the physical resources of the earth are wantonly exploited to support the selfish, narrow, and parochial concerns of moneyed minorities.

The youth of today should be

interested in finding paths for socio-political development that will make like more noble, just, and humane for all peoples on the planet. New psychological and ideological perspectives are needed to insure the emancipation and healthy development of all peoples. We must become more aware of the needs, interests, and objectives of other peoples. We must support underdeveloped countries towards self-subsistence through educational programs and appropriate technology

transfer without social and economic profiteering. All countries should have appropriate industry based principally upon their internal human and physical resources. These industries should be oriented towards self-reliance and an equitable distribution of incomes.

So that we may strive for these ideals, we must use educational systems to become critical, analytical, logical thinkers so we may

(Continued on p. 16)