

THE NEW BRUNSWICKAN

SPECIAL ELECTION ISSUE

free
leaflet

Nov. 13/81

REFERENDUM VOTE

Today is the culmination of a six week campaign over the renovation proposals of the Student Union SUB Board. The STU campus voted on the issue weeks ago and it is now up to UNB to make its decision. The students are being asked to vote YES or NO to the question: "I agree to the continuation of the present annual \$15 Student Union Building allocation of my student fees to be used for the presently proposed alterations and renovations to the SUB."

The proposal is being supported by the SUB Board (which manages the building). The Board and its representatives have spent over \$6000 of student money to prepare and publicize their plans in the referendum campaign. Of that money \$1000 was spent on postcards sent to every UNB student telling us to vote YES. Recently, the SUB Board has designed a "fact" sheet for distribution. The sheet shows the facts in the way the Board interprets them and has been called a "deliberate twisting of the truth" by the opposition.

On the other side of the fence is the student group named CAUSE (Committee Against Unnecessary Student Expenditures), which claims support from all faculties on the campus. This "NO" group spent under three hundred dollars on their campaign, almost entirely out of student donations. CAUSE has mounted a poster and button campaign, and has taken the trouble to canvas some parts of the campus from door to door. The goal of the group is TO BRING ABOUT THE BEST POSSIBLE RENOVATIONS TO THE SUB. To do

this, they call on all students to oppose the present plan because it doesn't meet the needs of the student body. Many times during the campaign it has been made clear that the lounge areas will almost totally disappear, the dancing area in the ballroom will decrease in size, and the SUB will become more of a place for seminars and academic meetings than a true students' building if the present plan is approved by a YES vote.

After very careful study it has been made clear that the students were grossly misinformed by the SUB Board, and by representatives of the SRC executive and administration. There has been full-scale harassment of CAUSE leaders ranging from planned impeachments to attempted election fraud.

The only people who seem to be willing to even talk about the facts of the proposal are those in the NO committee. (The chairman of the SUB Board refused to take part in a public debate on the referendum last Friday). Even in past issues of the Brunswickan lies have been told suggesting an imminent takeover of the SUB by UNB.

Therefore, to right the wrongs, we ask you to honestly think about the options before voting today. If you are opposed to a decrease in lounges, if you don't want to vote on a plan that isn't final, if you feel that the students really haven't had any say in the renovation plans then please vote NO so a better proposal can be brought forth.

KAY AND TOZER INVESTIGATED ?

The referendum vote of October 21, 1981 was annulled and declared void by the SRC at an emergency meeting held the next day. The reason for the cancellation of the results was that the wording of the question on the ballots had been unconstitutionally changed from that specific wording passed by the STU and UNB student councils. It was accepted at the emergency meeting that the actual change had not occurred at the SRC office but at the office of the Secretary of UNB, Dr. James Woodfield.

The Computer Science representative on the SRC, Steven Osborne made the first complaint about unfair and improper voting procedure to Dr. Woodfield who declared that the ballots would be counted anyway and that the SRC could then cancel the results if they wished. The SRC executive in turn overruled the Secretary by not even permitting the ballots to be counted.

At the emergency meeting, David Kay, chairman of the SUB Board stated that he felt the illegal change "didn't really

matter". On the other side, John Bosnitch, Engineering representative on council, called for a full inquiry into the events leading up to the "absolutely unacceptable" wording change. Furthermore, he called for the improper vote to be non-binding but that the results be released to the public.

Since then, the controversy has erupted into claims that Kay had overstepped his authority by suggesting the illegal wording to Woodfield, and that the chief electoral officer, SRC Vice President Tozer had totally failed to ensure that the election had been run in a proper manner. Even Dr. Woodfield has made it clear in a recent letter to the Brunswickan that David Kay was the person who gave him the false wording on behalf of the SUB Board. If an SRC investigation finds Kay or Tozer guilty of tampering in the election or not ensuring that proper procedure was followed, both of them could be subject to immediate removal from office.