

MUGWUMP JOURNAL

# UNB's student services budget will lose \$40,000

By EDISON STEWART

Recently procured financial statements from the university indicate that while monies for student services and awards rose to over \$553,000 in 1973 (from \$484,000 in 1972) they will drop again next year, at least by \$40,000. Savings of about \$15,000 in athletics, adding to savings that have been planned for sometime will allow for the saving. And make no mistake: that \$40,000 will be spent elsewhere, and will not likely be reallocated within student services.

It may well mean that students will still get many of the services they already have. (In fact, service at the health centre should get better as soon as our full-time doctor gets there.) But the university is able to lower these expenditures by shifting the responsibility to other agencies, notably the federal and provincial governments. The province will be looking after much of the money at the health centre, and the federal boys will be

looking after Manpower.

But the percentage of university funds spent on student services (in relation to all other expenditures) will be lowered. Our student representatives (and perhaps even some of our so-called adult representatives) should do their best to make sure this extra \$40,000 doesn't go floating off into somebody's building fund. Instead of throwing it away, I say we should keep it. There's no end to the ways it could be used to better student life at UNB.

Just looking at the auditor's statement provides a wealth of information. It's entirely possible (and indeed plausible) that if UNBSJ didn't exist, vice-president Pacey (then acting president) wouldn't have had any reason to cry "deficit" last year when he did. UNB Fredericton had a balance of over \$2 million as of June 30, this year. But when that's coupled with a deficit of \$1.5 million at UNBSJ, our balance comes down to less than half a million. Since 1971, that Saint John deficit has

almost doubled, when it was \$844,000. And so, it seems, UNBSJ is another source of our financial problems.

You might also be interested to know that students provide the university with about one-seventh of its income, and on top of all that, the university has just over \$51 million worth of property plant and equipment. (Which means that's how much it would cost just to buy the place.)

As of June 30, we students owed \$510,000 on the SUB. We kicked in another \$69,000 just recently (from our SRC fees) and by my calculations, we now owe \$431,000. So there are still several years to go before we get out of hock on this place.

Maintenance for UNB costs some \$1.7 million annually, and that keeps rising. Here's an interesting note: In 1971, the university spent \$424 on the president's house; in 1972 it spent \$159, and in 1973, it spent \$6,209. It spend \$65,000 on the resident artists and \$25,000 on convocation (which was \$33,000 in 1972). And the

university spent close to \$100,000 in maintenance on the SUB (at no charge, incidentally).

That's all for this week (from the auditor's report anyway.

You're lucky you know, that you got a paper last week. Lately we've been awfully close to our deadline (which is exactly 5:15 p.m. Thursday) and last week we missed by seconds. Seconds.

Do you know the frustration of stopping your car in the middle of a traffic jam, and running three blocks to catch the bus only to find (that for the first time in 50 years) the bus left on time?

To make a long story short, I drove it to our printer in Woodstock (after the appropriate cursing) and made it with minutes to spare. (Like I said, it's been pretty touch and go lately.) So this section of the column is devoted entirely to the "co-operative" staff at SMT.

God'll get you for that.

POLITICS

# Provincial electoral reform - the bagman must go

By CYCLOPS

On February 21, 1918 the New Brunswick government was presented with the findings of a Royal Commission Inquiry into political fund raising activities at the time. It was yet another sordid tale of political corruption involving politicians, contractors and bagmen. Their names are no longer important. Commissioner John M. Stephen's final recommendation on page 44 reads as follows:

"I would recommend ... the publication in the future of all election funds and expenses, together with the name of the subscribers and the amount subscribed by each ..."

That was 55 years ago.

The New Brunswick government's Committee on Electoral Reform and the U.S. Watergate Investigations have brought the perennial question of political campaign financing to the forefront once again. Should the government assume the responsibility for financing political campaigns?

As it stands now election campaigns in New Brunswick (and elsewhere) are financed largely by private corporations and affluent business and professional

men. Each political party has a provincial "bagman" who may also be, but not necessarily, the official Treasurer of the party.

The bagman usually with a small group of assistants will collect somewhere between \$200,000 and \$400,000 in preparation for a provincial election. Contributions are usually \$500 or more with many ranging between 5,000 and \$10,000 — some even higher. If the bagman is a true professional he will never discuss party finances with his political leaders except in a very general way.

He will personally collect from large corporations and will have the only complete list of donors. He must be the soul of loyalty, discretion and competence if his party is to avoid the dangers of political scandal.

The bagman, often at his sole discretion, will allocate most of this fund to the various constituency organizations in amounts between \$5,000 and \$25,000. In making this allocation he must weigh such considerations as; the chances of winning the riding; the strength and competence of the local organization; the commitment to the candidate and, above all, tradition. Highly competitive and crucial ridings

like Moncton and Charlotte are heavily supported; whereas Kent and Albert are given substantially less.

The bagman must also use the campaign fund to pay ad agency fees, media costs, staff and other expenses incurred in conducting a provincial election.

Additionally, of course, the local constituency organizations solicit financial support from individuals to supplement their provincial allotment.

There is no question that the vast majority of contributions are made with the expectation that the government will therefore be more sympathetic when making decisions on appointments, purchases, contracts and policies. At the very least the donor contributes to be "on the good side" of the government.

It is obvious that the public interest must always be in jeopardy when political parties are completely dependent on a small number of "vested interests" to finance their election campaigns.

In a typical election each party spends between \$10,000 and \$35,000 in each constituency. More than half of this money is spent on election day; poll workers, scrutineers, cars and drivers, liquor, chocolates etc.

The provincial government could virtually eliminate legitimate election day expenses for parties by assuming the responsibility for scrutinizing polls and by providing transportation for voters requiring it. Each political party could be given a grant for media and other election expenses based on the number of candidates and perhaps their degree of popular support. Such a reform would cost the New Brunswick taxpayers less than \$1,000,000 every four years or so — a bargain at twice the price as they say. New Brunswick would then be in the forefront of the electoral reform movement that will hopefully sweep North America in the wake of Watergate. No doubt the practice of businesses and individuals contributing to political parties would still continue.

But such contributions, if they exceed, let's say, \$100, should be disclosed to a proper government agency. The public would then be aware of any possible conflict of interest.

And to minimize such contributions they should not be tax-deductible. Support of political parties should not be considered "charity" nor should it be considered a legitimate business expense.

"For gifts blind the eyes of the wise and change the words of the just" — verse 19; 16th chapter; Deuteronomy.

ALONG THE TRACKS

# Welcome to the League of Visionary Underminers

By STANLEY JUDD

(Stanley Judd is the pen-name of a Canadian freelance writer who for reasons of political affiliation prefers to remain anonymous.)

I belong to the League of Visionary English Underminers. As I mentioned in an earlier column, I attended the first annual policy-making convention of the League, held in Vancouver this past summer. As yet, there is no written policy. As a matter of fact, policy was never discussed at the convention. As another matter of fact, the first motion of the convention was that the convention be adjourned until the winter or at least until, as Agent Schaefer cleverly put it, "we get it together". The motion was passed unanimously. Everyone agreed that: "the strength of the League lies in the minds of

its members and since no two minds are alike and since the road from thought in mind to thought on paper is lengthy and arduous, formulation of written policy, at this point in time, is impossible."

Agent Neville spoke those words. He surprised us all. His usual contribution to League meetings consisted of girls, giggles and dope. He was most generous with these, but no one had ever heard him talk before. His father used to be a used politician who demanded only attentive ears from his children. No doubt this was why Agent Neville never spoke, but always giggled. I might add that he hasn't been seen or heard from since the adjourning of the convention. One of his girlfriends (he had many) mentioned that he was planning a trip to Asia. His purpose, she said, was to disrupt the visits of various world leaders to that newest (and oldest)

of tourist attractions, Red China. What a brilliant vision! The strength of the League does lie in the mind of the beholder! Once word is received of his successes (perhaps Prime Minister Trudeau already has word), I'm sure Agent Neville will be elected to the Underminer Hall of Infamy without a moment's hesitation.

The League of Visionary English Underminers was founded in Regina, Saskatchewan in the early 1900's by a disenchanted group of transplanted United Empire Loyalists. Or so I've been told. As far as I know, their objectives were never clearly defined. At least, no record was kept of either their objectives or their accomplishments. In fact, not even their existence is on record. I spent endless hours in both the Regina Public Library and the library of the University of

Saskatchewan trying to find some mention of their name, but there was none. However, I, for one, do not dispute their existence. Hector has assured me that they did and still do exist.

Who is Hector? Hector is in command of the League. Hector is wise. Hector is mysterious. For these reasons he is a good leader. All agents respect his wisdom. All agents fear his mysterious presence. Respect and fear. Traits of a good leader. 'Tis better to be feared than loved. 'Tis better to be alive than dead. Hector is both feared and alive.

Yet, I've never seen Hector. I've heard his voice many times. I've received many written communications from him. But I've never seen him.

I and three others (who later became

Continued to page 12