

## Student Governor defends deal for President's house

Dear Sir:

As a student representative on the Board of Governors I was most disturbed by your editorial of Feb. 23rd, concerning the recent acquisition of the President's house. I take exception to your contention that the Board 'pulled a fast one on us'. No such thing was done. Members of the Brunswickan, I urge you to pursue a policy of responsible journalism and not to engage in sensationalism and unwarranted innuendoes.

Students have the right to be cognisant of the transaction, hence

I will proceed to describe why this amount of money was spent in acquiring a new home. Sommerville House which was donated to the university through the generosity of Lord Beaverbrook, is no longer suited for occupation as a residence. The reason for this is quite simple, the house was subjected to extensive alterations while it fulfilled the role of a Law School before Ludlow Hall was constructed. Because of these alterations it was estimated that the cost of restoring the home, in a fashion which would be acceptable as a residence, would cost at least

\$30,000 to \$40,000. This amount was far in excess of what the Board was prepared to spend on a home of the age of Sommerville House. Consequently a recommendation was submitted to the Board whereby it was proposed that the University purchase the Bird House for the same amount as could be obtained from the sale of Sommerville House.

At this point I think it relevant to examine the respective market values of the two houses. Both were assessed by independent Real Estate agents. Sommerville House's market value was assessed to

be approximately \$102,000, while the Bird House was assessed to be worth some \$108,000. Hence the Brunswickan's assertion that the value of the Bird House was \$55,169 is very misleading. The latter amount refers to assessed value for taxation purposes not market or true value.

It is my contention that the acquisition of this house is an investment which will be beneficial not detrimental to the university community. Had we not purchased the Bird House, we would have been compelled, like it or not by the actions of other Canadian universities, to provide a substantial living allowance for the President a living allowance which over a period of 10 to 20 years would amount to the same amount expended on the acquisition of the house.

Sommerville House was not being used by the university nor were we obtaining a substantial revenue from the provincial government for its use.

Let us not disregard the original purpose this house was to serve. Lord Beaverbrook in his generosity donated this house to the university for an official residence for the President, are we now to sell this home for \$92,000 and buy a

\$30,000 house and absorb the profit obtained from the sale. This I would suggest would be a most regrettable action to take. Are we to proceed to exploit bequests given to the university by Lord Beaverbrook? As Sommerville House was not feasible to reconvert into a residence, a decision was made to sell it to the government and to use the funds obtained from this sale to buy another home of the same stature. This, gentlemen, was what occurred! It was not some devious plot by the members of the Board to provide the President with a house which exudes luxury.

In conclusion, I do not believe that I have disregarded the interest of the students, as you intimated I had. I have and will continue to support the Board's decision not to spend \$40,000 on the renovation of Sommerville House, but to utilize the funds obtained from its sale, in order to purchase a house of the same value which will fulfill the very purpose for which Lord Beaverbrook initially donated Sommerville House to UNB.

Sincerely,

Mike Richard

## Reader upset over increase

Dear Sir:

After reading the article in The BRUNSWICKAN concerning higher food prices for residences I must admit that I was upset. As a resident student I strongly object to an increase in food prices because:

1. I cannot afford it  
2. I do not feel this increase would be welcomed by the majority of residence students

Mr. Knox made the point that the price of hamburger was up 15 percent from one week to the next. Well, most food prices in general have increased this year. Unfortunately, there seems to be little that we as students can do to control the price of food.

The article also mentioned that "the frills must be taken out of the services in order to avoid an increase in costs". I fail to see what "frills" Saga Foods is offering me at present. The house dinners (perhaps a "frill") do not differ from the daily food prepared by Saga. The only difference is in the atmosphere and NOT in the food! Instead of the usual brightly

lit dining hall, we eat by candle light and are waited on. As far as I'm concerned I would not object to scrapping house dinners completely (with the exception of Christmas dinners.)

Banquets or buffets this year have been minimal and the type of food served has been of a lower quality than previous years. The last buffet, for example, had little choice of meats yet the cost to a non resident student for such a meal was about \$4.00. This is far too high a price for what the student is getting in return for his money!

I am strongly opposed to the suggestion made that athletic teams and nursing students should pay for their after-hour meals from the Athletic Society and Nursing Society Funds. I do not think that athletes and nurses should be penalized in this manner for this inconvenience. I believe this inconvenience serves a worthwhile purpose. However, with the proposed budget cut for the SAA maybe this will not be a problem in the future as far as athletic teams are concerned.

Some suggestions made in the article seem feasible alternatives to an increase in food prices. The 19-meal plan's breakfast on Saturdays and Sundays being omitted is a good idea since the majority of students don't eat this meal anyway. Shortening meal hours will save money because it will reduce staff costs but it will probably place a heavier student load on the staff during meal hours.

I do not agree with the shortened feeding calendar by 10 days (no meals at Thanksgiving, March break and two other days at the beginning and end of the term.) Many students do not or cannot go home at these times.

I agree that Saga is not trying to "screw" the students, but at the same time the position of the students must be considered.

If student population decreases in the future (as is predicted) and university fees will be increasing, an increase in food prices would certainly be unadvisable.

So, with these points in mind I do hope, for the sake of the students and Saga as well that food prices do NOT increase.

Yours truly,

Brenda M. Fraser  
B. Ed. 5  
Tibbits Hall

## 'Immature, tasteless'

Continued from page 7

entire argument on this (you must, you know nothing else from the meeting). This begs the question: where is your sense of proportion? Surely, all but His Excellency Major Lockhart could not have been wrong. I mean, they must have had SOME good reasons!!

Oh, I get it, you see \$92,000. First of all, the money was not spent. No money came out of the University. In terms of value, the University is in the same position as it was before, a fact that was stated in your paper. How can you, or his Excellency, say there was any purchase?

So the only other avenue for you is to have Sommerville House sold and redistribute the \$92,000. Well, in keeping with your ignorance of the relevant facts in this matter, allow me to make a point that you ought to have considered. Sommerville House was given to the University for, inter alia, use as a residence of the President. Morally, if not legally, this was a clear term of the gift. You can't go

"hocking" it whenever you please. So you ask, how come the government now owns it? The answer to this question can be easily dealt with. Because it would cost too much for alterations to Sommerville House, the University traded. The point is this, Mr. Editor, that the university is keeping within the spirit and intentment of the gift while saving money at the same time.

You are like a horse with shutters on: you can only see what is ahead of you and not off to the sides. A university newspaper, by implication, speaks for the students. I would ask you, Mr. Editor, not to embarrass us like this again.

Yours respectfully

D. Peter Forbes  
Law 2

P.S. How are you enjoying your new computerized typesetting equipment costing in the five figures, my friend?

## Poetry good

Dear Sir:

As usual, with scepticism and a certain degree of fear I turned to the poetry page of this week's Brunswickan. I'm never sure if I'll be met with someone's freaked out acid trip, or someone who lost their body while on a walk (which I find highly unusual), or an obscene and disgusting outburst. But, whatever the subject matter of the poems happens to be, they all have one common trait: they are pathetically feeble.

However, in this week's issue, much to my surprise and delight, the poems by Deborahh were of a completely different nature than most of the previous ones. She has obviously put some thought into her writing and the importance of her thoughts comes through

beautifully. Despite her said kind of despair, her feelings are revealed with strength, which is fantastic to see. I suppose the emotional impact of her work is the most appealing, for what is poetry if it doesn't stir you inside? The last stanza of "Mona" is great, as is the whole poem "Don't Eat Non-Union Food". In fact all four poems were really nice to read. Sure hope to see more poetry like this in the Brunswickan - it's far better than the greasy spoon stuff you've printed before.

Julie Lindstrom

More letters on page 10.

## STU standards higher than ours?

Dear Sir:

In the Brunswickan of Feb. 23rd is an assertion which is not only slanderous but unsupported. In "Education Should Make us Think," you rightly warn against the danger of lowering academic standards. You go on to say:

"And yet the rumblings that we hear suggest that something similar may be happening at STU now. Professors must in many cases lower the work - loads in their courses since education is becoming a seller's market and tough courses are notoriously unpopular with students."

Two paragraphs later the author magnanimously admits that this "tendency" is at UNB as well, "although it is better hidden by our size." Apparently UNB is only

slightly affected by the contagion of lowered academic standards which is rampant at STU.

I am in my fourth year at St. Thomas, and I am currently enrolled in courses at both universities. I have taken a total of eight courses at UNB and twelve (in addition to a thesis) at St. Thomas, covering a wide range of arts and science subjects. I have put equal effort into courses at both universities, but the cold statistical fact is that my average for UNB courses is six marks higher than that for STU courses. In the current year, my highest mark is in a UNB course.

In four academic years, I've had four courses I would consider "birds". (They were accidentally picked) Two were at UNB, two at

STU. I have had seven courses with work loads so heavy and marking standards so strict that at the time I didn't know how I would ever get through them. Two were at UNB, five at STU.

Sure, St. Thomas is going to have trouble maintaining standards in the economic-enrolment crunch. But I would like to make two final points:

1. These standards are now and have been as high as UNB's.  
2. They will not fall, if they fall at all, any lower than UNB's. Meritocracy is neither prevented nor concealed by UNB's larger size.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Ryan STU 4

MARCH

What do you providing the president what alter

Mike Rich

...I think it decision residence wise one business University

Holly Mc

...I think see why t with a pla

AP