

EDITORIAL

It is a sad commentary on the state of Student Union affairs when full time students are forced to take valuable time out of their studies and other university duties to engage in organizing and producing an alternative forum so as to enable the presentation of views held by the majority of university students on a student-related issue.

The students involved in this publication have risen to the challenge of former SRC Administrator Dave Campbell and SRC President Kevin Katcliff who have expressed concern that UNB-STU Students are not getting the full story on the proposed Student Union Building renovations. They are both of the opinion that all the facts have not been clearly presented to the students. This paper springs up thanks to all of those who have expressed similar concern.

The campaign over renovations has generally been labelled "one-sided". I think that most of us agree on this. We all know that the SUB Board has spent a vast sum of money on a post-card campaign urging a YES vote, without so much as giving a hint of what a YES vote would mean. The Board has asked for and obtained support from various sources, the Brunswickan and the SRC President are just two examples. Furthermore, "YES" has unlimited SUB funds, resources, paid personnel, and unlimited use of display cases for posters in the SUB at their disposal.

The NO side (CAUSE) spent exactly \$35 on its entire NO campaign prior to the referendum. This publication comes to you as a result of donations by interested students who feel they cannot in good conscience accept elitist attempts at steam-rolling the students.

Mr. Campbell and Mr. Katcliff both seem to feel that all the facts have not been presented to the students. Those who have attempted to obtain copies of the SUB Renovation Proposals -- Concept Plans know how hard it is to find out what the truth to the concepts is. The students are asked to fork out a supplementary \$3.50 just to

obtain copies of the proposed alternatives to their own SUB. One is asked to contribute \$15 for the alterations to one's building and furthermore another \$3.50 just to find out what those alternatives will be. And this comes to you courtesy of the same people who complain that students aren't getting the facts!!

Those students who attended the UNB Debating Society-sponsored challenge to debate the renovations agree that the YES side was soundly thrashed in the debate. Their arguments were effectively challenged and proven deficient and contradictory. The audience clearly showed its support for the NO side.

I would now like to draw your attention to a few goodies. When challenged publically at the SRC meeting of Nov. 4, David Kay, chairman of the SUB Board, himself declared the

forementioned plans as a broad "fantasy" and "blotches of colour splashed on plans". This, then, is what you are asked to contribute \$15 for. If you look at the actual proposals, you'll notice that the new lounge will be limited to a few feet in front of the windows. The pocket lounges which "YES" stresses so much are going to be tiny cubicles of a few square feet in the corners of the stairways. Ridiculously, the SUB Board argues that the students shall gain from the added office space for the SRC and SUB administration. I fail to see how added space in which to create bureaucratic inefficiency can be to the students benefit. This in light of the brilliant planning strategy which brought about renovations of the SUB and specifically to the Blue Lounge last year. It sure is comforting to see that some people have enough money to waste. Maybe they could spare a few extra dollars on a few copies of the Renovations Proposal. Or maybe there are reasons why they do not wish to! Finally, I am pleased to see the students paying for better convention and reception facilities, for that ought to be the prime goal of the SUB; (the Board seems to believe it is). I am convinced that the students of STU and UNB are delighted to pay an extra \$15 so that the Ladies Auxilliary can have a nicer place to hold their next annual meeting.

In conclusion, I suggest that any interested student go to his/her SRC representative, and then to members of the SUB Board and to other spokespersons for the YES side and accumulate as much contradictory information as they can. This will convince anyone to vote NO. A NO vote only means that the present proposals are completely unclear and that the students question giving their \$15 for someone's "fantasy".

Ed.

