

## Hamilton explains non-resignation

By CINDY CAMERON  
Staff Writer

Professor Angus Hamilton is the only original member remaining on the Presidential Search Committee, mainly because, he said, "the job wasn't finished". Since a president has not as yet been elected to the position, he feels his role on the committee has not been completed to his satisfaction.

Professor Hamilton said the other members of the committee resigned because of a "personal opinion", and therefore he could not state if they were right or wrong in doing so. Although he would not offer any comment as to why the others did resign, he did feel the original procedure had nothing wrong with it. Therefore, he said, the committee hasn't planned any new approaches. Hamilton certainly didn't think the

previous Committee was a failure, on the contrary he said it was a good Committee, and that it's nobody's fault that we don't have

a president as yet. Professor Hamilton said it's a difficult task to find a president and they're not finished yet.

"People expect some ideal person, like Superman, and this person just doesn't exist."



ANNE KILFOIL Photo

### The Bruns congratulates PJ on his record-breaking, 14-mile crawl

One of Philadelphia's cultural landmarks has just re-opened - it's the old Bellevue Stratford hotel,

where 29 American Legion members were killed by a mysterious disease three years ago.

The building was bought last year by the Fairmont Hotel Company, and is now called the Philadelphia Fairmont.

Company officials say they're not really concerned that the hotel's bad reputation might scare off potential customers. Over 300

groups have already made reservations, and since some of them are medical organizations, executives say that will help dispel any fears. Besides, says Fairman president Richard Swig, "Our biggest problem is selling Philadelphia, not the Fairmont." (NEWSSCRIPT)

## Disease Hotel reopens

## Personalities clash

(Continued from page 3)

bank. After deduction of bills, this indicated a \$63,000 residual.

Bartlett said the figure at the end of April does not indicate a final expenditure. Whoever had written the editorial, Bartlett said, could obviously not read a balance sheet.

He then accused the media of depicting Cronshaw as some sort of "autocratic demagogue."

Varty's letter, Bartlett said, was unfounded as well as untrue. He said he regarded it as an illustration of what he termed "CHSR's never ending demands." Bartlett said he had tried to tell the various clubs the SRC's side in meetings on Thursday but he had not been believed and blamed the media for the interpretation given about the SRC.

He said because of the letter, Cronshaw had been made to feel as if the eyes of the students were upon him, wondering if they were being given a fair chance.

Bartlett then said it was not clear how Varty perceived his job.

At this point in the meeting, a general consensus was reached by the council to go in-camera. Varty questioned this decision, asking if the council was afraid people would hear something they would disagree with.

Once the microphones had been shut off, Bartlett returned to the subject of Varty's letter, saying he found it distasteful.

Varty said it was a private letter, to which Bartlett replied it wasn't private in his book. He then read it aloud.

Varty said he had written the letter because of student fears that their organizations budgets were being reduced because of CHSR's FM expansion and cited the example of the Anthropology Society's Jennifer Bishop's letter of Oct. 12 to the Brunswickan. She had written that she had been told by Cronshaw "that nearly all budgets are being drastically cut this year" naming CHSR as the

cause and adding "almost as an afterthought" the decline in student enrollment at UNB."

In response to this, Cronshaw said one letter from "one very upset girl" hardly justified Varty's remarks. He stated that the Administrative Board had never used CHSR as a reason for cutting back on club budgets.

He then asked Varty, in reference to the letter, how it was possible for him to enhance his reputation in this manner at UNB. He said if he had had no regard for the students he wouldn't be on the SRC, calling it a "thankless job."

Cronshaw accused the media of trying to ruin the union, adding that it was doing "a damn good job" at it. He said the media was "making a mockery of the whole thing", using CHSR's broadcast coverage as an example.

Cronshaw suggested it criticize things when they happen and not before.

A motion was then made to force Varty to retract his statements made in the letter and apologize for them.

Arts Rep Georges Whalen interjected at this point with the question as to whether such a motion would be in order. He said he saw the letter as a personal opinion.

Bartlett said Varty was responsible to the council, his position as CHSR's station director being ratified by a 2/3 vote. The letter had been written on CHSR stationery and signed as CHSR's director. Bartlett said if Varty refused, "that leads to something else."

Lawyer Forbes was recognized by the chairman at this point. He said everyone present "was running the whole thing incorrectly". Such a motion was probably out of order, he said, and would not get anyone anywhere, demanding an apology.

He said Varty should have been

given notice of the motion to give him both time to consider it and seek counsel.

The motion was then retracted.

Forbes censured those present for "setting a lot of electric tension" between the SRC and the media, saying this tension was artificial and not making the situation easier for anybody. He added it may have been the case that Varty was mistaken in the means he chose for expressing his views but to go about solving the problem in this manner was a waste of time.

These comments by Forbes seemed to clear the air somewhat, Cronshaw asking Varty point blank what it was he was after. Varty replied he wanted what was best for the station, which was going FM without a lot of red tape, stating again he was upset with CHSR being named as the cause of budget cutbacks.

Cronshaw denied ever saying that, because of the flak he knew he would receive should he say something like that, and also because it just wasn't true. There would be budget cuts, he said, but promised small organizations would not suffer because of CHSR.

Arts Rep. Whalen said "the clubs don't think they are suffering, otherwise they would be here."

Bartlett then said that declining student enrollment was a fact and CHSR's costs would not drop so gradually they will pick up a bigger share of the budget. CHSR cannot operate independently, he said, adding "you are putting your head in the sand if you believe anything else."

Observer Chris Earl, a member of CHSR, said he had attended Administration Board meetings and received the definite impression that the blame was CHSR's. He said he felt it must be publicly stated it was otherwise.

Cronshaw replied that the SRC is creating a surplus for CHSR but CHSR must do its own part. He

spoke of his letter to the editor that appeared in the October 19 issue of the Brunswickan in which he had stated this publicly. He said the letter should not have been relegated to the back page of the paper.

Editor Kathy Wakeling answered that letters to the editor are put in the paper in the order they are received. The letter from Cronshaw had been the last submitted. Wakeling denied practicing any bias. Cronshaw then apologized for his remarks concerning the layout of the letter, saying he had been unaware of the methods used in putting the paper together.

Wakeling also said it had been intimated to her by a member of the Administrative Board that the Brunswickan should realize in its budget that CHSR had top priority.

Business Rep. David Farnham brought up the October 12 editorial in the Brunswickan which said "groups presenting budgets (to the board) were given the shabbiest treatment possible." He said the Brunswickan and CHSR had not been given "shabby" treatment.

Varty said CHSR had not received all they needed. Cronshaw said in that case CHSR should make an appeal to the SRC.

Earl said he felt the Administrative Board showed a lack of understanding of why clubs needed certain things and the majority of board members did not try to understand.

Computer Science Rep. Karen Hubbard suggested the meeting go on the air again as it was supposed discussion of Varty's letter was finished. Accordingly, the CHSR broadcast was resumed.

Cronshaw said the fact remained that he had been publicly attacked and asked Varty if he would retract his statements and apologize for them. Varty replied, "No thank-you".