

Bio issue clarified—new policy in offing

For publication in University Perspectives :

RESEARCH EQUIPMENT TRANSFER CORRECTION OF ALLEGED REFUTATION

"On Saturday, October 28, 1978, at the request of the Biology Department, President Anderson and Dean Brewer met with members of the Department to permit clarification of the statements published in the "University Perspectives" issue of October 23, following the controversy about the removal of microbiology equipment and materials to the University of Windsor. All parties agreed that there was no wish to extend or increase the controversy, but that a number of erroneous statements and implications needed clarification or correction.

"The Department of Biology clearly recognizes that the President of the University has the right to make decisions about requests to transfer equipment belonging to the University but purchased from research grants. The President and Dean Brewer have acknowledged that there were indeed teaching and research implications for the Department of Biology, and the consultation with the Chairman and other responsible individuals in the Department would have been appropriate before the final decisions were made.

"The meeting expressed its regret that so much controversy had arisen as a result of this issue, but noted that with respect to the microbiology equipment information the "Brunswickan" editorial of October 13, was factually correct although the remarks 'making a mountain out of a molehill', 'the equipment is not really needed by the University' and 'the equipment belonged to the Franklins' attributed to Dr. Anderson were taken out of context. No criticism of Dr. Franklin or Dr. Maxine Holder Franklin was implied.

"All parties agreed that a University policy concerning transfers of research equipment would be useful to avoid similar problems in the future; to that end, the School of Graduate Studies and Research is to be asked to consider this in the near future.

"This release has the approval of President Anderson, Dean Brewer and the acting Chairman of the Department of Biology."

Editor-in-Chief of The Brunswickan, the person who provided the tip was a student who failed to spell Dr. Franklin's name correctly, and certainly was not a graduate student in any department.

2. "Dr. Anderson said research grants to faculty are held in trust by the individual's university, who may choose to release equipment and materials to ensure that the research continues should the faculty member choose to go to another institution."

According to the NRC, equipment purchased by grants from that body is not held in trust in the conventional sense of that work. Thus, the University did indeed own all of the equipment.

3. Dean Brewer also said the Franklins left behind "Substantial equipment", but that this has not been costed out.

It is incorrect to state that a "substantial" amount of equipment was left behind. According to a list held in the Department of Biology, the value of the equipment left seems to be less than \$5,000. In addition, many items on the list have the notation 'broken' or 'useless' beside them.

4. The Franklins also refute the Brunswickan claim that teaching and research in the biology department will be adversely affected by removal of the equipment in question."

several issues, the following has been determined. From University Perspectives, October 23, 1978:

1. "[we have been informed that the person who delivered the note was a graduate student in biology]"

According to Sheenagh Murphy,

5. "Dr. Lynch has one right now that is perfectly good for undergraduate teaching, should they want one." [a chemostat]

Dr. Lynch does not have a chemostat.

6. Regarding the precedence for moving equipment, President Franklin said "it should be noted that when Dr. Bruce Cumming came to UNB as chairman of biology in 1971, he brought a very large amount of equipment with him from the University of Western Ontario in order to continue his research. The value of the equipment, estimated at the time, was between \$50,000 and \$60,000 and UNB spent between \$2,000 and \$3,000 to cover moving costs. Earlier, Dr. Radforth had also brought equipment from McMaster University in the late sixties."

It should equally be noted that in order to move this equipment, Dr. Cummings had to provide a purchase order for each item of equipment to be moved showing that the equipment had been purchased from a given grant. Dr. Cummings has stated that for other reasons, the transfer of equipment when he came was not entirely comparable to this case. Dr. Radforth owned his own private consulting company, and much of what he brought belonged to that company and was not purchased by research grants. Thus, largely, this situation is totally incomparable.

The Brunswickan claimed the equipment sent to Windsor carried a replacement value between \$40,000 and \$100,000.

As will be seen in the above statement, there are those who disagree with this statement.

President Franklin said neither he, Dr. Holder-Franklin nor Dr. Lynch provided such figures and the equipment was between five and nine years old and had significantly depreciated in value. It was insured for \$70,000 for its removal to Windsor because, says President Franklin, that was their best guess at the time about the equipment's 1978 replacement value."

Clearly, the replacement value of the equipment is the only meaningful measure.

FROM THE STATEMENT:

"...Although the remarks 'making a mountain out of a molehill', 'the equipment is not really needed by the University', and 'the equipment belonged to the Franklins'. Attributed to Dr. Anderson were taken out of context."

It is not clear how these remarks were taken out of context. Notes kept by Editor Murphy of this conversation with Dr. Anderson indicate that these statements were responses given by Dr. Anderson to her questions concerning the issue.

The Brunswickan wishes to thank Drs. Anderson, McKenzie and Brewer for taking the time to correct the impression given in the October 23, 1978 edition of University Perspectives. Equally, it is gratifying to see that formalized procedures for handling a case such as this are being developed by the School of Graduate Studies. Criticism of this issue by The Brunswickan was meant strictly in terms of the handling and procedure or the transfer.

As can be seen by a quick examination of the above document, what was reported on this issue in the Brunswickan has been re-examined by the administration and found to be true. For further clarification an examination of the last sentence in the first paragraph is useful, and on

Vandalism not as prevalent this year

By LINDA HALSEY

Vandalism is apparent on the UNB campus this year but "damage is not better or worse than last year," according to Chief Williamson, head of security and traffic.

Broken windows are the most common form of vandalism found on campus, and the majority of damage occurs during Friday and Saturday nights. "There's always damage after pubs," said Williamson who added, "It's ridiculous for someone to just throw a rock through a window, I can't understand it."

In addition to broken windows, destroying or damaging traffic signs has become a favourite target for vandals. "People aren't

aware of the expense," he said. Last year the University spent \$6,000.00 in repair and replacement of signs.

Williamson feels vandalism stems from a lack of respect for public property. "People don't seem to understand; vandalism increases University operating costs which eventually reflects upon student fees."

"Campus vandalism is not always caused by UNB students," said an employee of the University Physical Plant. "A lot of damage has been caused by High School students which we have to spend time and money repairing."

Last year, the physical plant installed a row of trees in front of the Old Arts Building at a cost of \$20.00 each. After months of grooming, five trees were cut down by vandals. They were never apprehended. The employee asked, "why the heck should we waste University money planting trees when people are just going to tear it down?"

"The beauty of the campus is being destroyed by student negligence," he said. "Too many students create muddy paths by cutting through University grounds when a paved sidewalk is only a few feet away."

He said everyone should become more conscientious. "If




photo by kilfoil

the campus is clean, students will think twice before dirtying it, but if it is constantly dirty, people won't care as much."

SUB director Cindy Stacey said vandalism has maintained a fairly low key within the Student Union Building this year. She attributes this to "excellent student security

and a feeling that "students are becoming aware of the increasing costs of replacing materials ruined by vandalism."

She said an increased amount of vandalism would eventually reflect upon decreased renovations like carpet cleaning, and less purchases of such new items as

furniture.

Meanwhile, vandalism continues to affect students on campus with no apparent solution. Security Chief Williamson encourages students to report any signs of damage caused by vandals and asked students to report any person(s) causing vandalism.

Care for Your Lungs
it's a matter of life & breath

