

## Opportunities For Youth shouldn't be phased out

Dear Editor:

Of the federal spending cuts announced December 18, one is of particular interest to our organization; this is the cancellation of the Opportunities For Youth program. The government claims that cancellation of OFY will save \$36 million.

What is our interest in Opportunities For Youth? First, we're young people and so are naturally concerned about young people. Second, we ourselves have benefited from OFY projects; during the past two summers we have been employed by HORIZON magazine and Project Growright, both sponsored by OFY. HORIZON magazine was a weekly collection of literature and news concerning the Miramichi region of northern New Brunswick; it appeared in the summers of 1974 and 1975. Project Growright produced vegetables, which were then distributed free of charge to needy families in the same area; it operated last summer. Between these two projects, fourteen local young people were employed, allowing most of them to continue their university educations. We could go on to point out further benefits of these projects, but it should be enough to mention that HORIZON was actively supported (financially and otherwise) by over five hundred persons. Growright's value is obvious. Note that these were not the only worthwhile projects in our area last summer; residents can think of many others. We might also mention that neither HORIZON nor Growright would

have been continued next summer, even if OFY had survived. Our concern in writing this letter is with the benefits of the program generally rather than the loss of our employment with OFY.

Next summer, OFY will not appear on the Miramichi, or anywhere else in Canada for that matter. All because the federal government wants to save 36 million dollars.

Thirty-six million dollars. This would be the saving, but what is the cost?

Besides the money involved, other things must be considered. The community will lose a means of funnelling the talents and energies of young people into positive and constructive social activities. The imagination and initiative associated with OFY projects will be strangled.

The result of this will be increased unemployment among young people in this area and across the country. It's stupid to cut off an employment program in these times of high joblessness. Students, in particular, will find it harder to get a job next summer, which may make it more difficult to continue their educations. This will also increase the number of applications for Student Loans, the interest on which is paid by the taxpayer while the student attends a university.

Does it make sense to remove money spent on OFY and use it to pay interest rates on Student Loans?

While you're considering that question, remember that young people are going to be the only ones

hurt in this particular cut. The bureaucrats in charge of OFY will still receive their salaries, though in other government positions. They aren't going to lose their jobs.

We realize that the OFY program has occasionally been wasteful. Money has been thrown away. However, we suspect that a vast majority of this waste has been caused by government bungling rather than by individual projects.

On the subject of government bundling, you might be interested in knowing about the half million dollars spent on the opening celebrations for Mirabel airport, north of Montreal, including 20 thousand for the liquor bill, 50 thousand for food and 12 thousand for the weekend's hotel bills. Or you might like to know about the \$79,000 spent on monitoring the amount of time the average man and woman spend at urinals at Ottawa public buildings. (It's 75 seconds for a woman and only 41 for a man, so they say.) But we'll know for sure when the remaining 60 percent of the survey is made and the final \$120,000 is spent. We can hardly wait.)

Or, if you're still not satisfied, the post office employs 85 people, at a cost of two million dollars a year, to act as a public relations group. The one television commercial they have come up with was cancelled by the postal strike. (This commercial cost \$436,000 to produce.)

The examples quoted above are from an article by Marci McDonald and Paul Nowack called "The Money-wasters" appearing in the December 15th issue of Macleans magazine. The waste told of in that article would pay for the entire OFY program five times over. The readership of your newspaper could think of many more examples of this waste.

(In the midst of this waste, consider that HORIZON cost \$11,000, Growright approximately \$6,000.)

As we've noted, some waste has occurred in OFY itself. But this waste has taken place mainly at the administrative level. We point to the conference held two years ago at the Algonquin Hotel in the resort town of St. Andrews, N.B. - a costly conference where little or nothing was accomplished. Also, the use of project officers and administrative personnel was inefficient. The three project officers assigned to the Miramichi last summer covered only a small number of projects. Project officers visited our projects only two or three times last summer, for perhaps a half-hour per visit. These visits accomplished little or nothing, simply because they had no purpose.

Does this waste justify the cutting of OFY?

No. Consider that when these spending cuts were made, they were described as "cosmetic", designed to make the government look decisive and motivated, and at the same time to get rid of programs which in the past have been embarrassing to the federal government.

If the government is truly serious about cutting waste, why does it allow the tax-free allowances of MP's and Senators to be increased? Why doesn't the government take seriously the annual reports of the Auditor-General, who is paid to expose

waste? Why is Olympic financing allowed to be so irresponsible? And why on earth are examples of waste like those we have mentioned above tolerated at all?

We realize that not all young people will be directly affected by the end of OFY. However, there will be more competition for the jobs that exist. Next summer this problem will be obvious to the people of the Miramichi, as to the people of the rest of Canada.

We believe that there are many people who would support the continuation of OFY. But they are unable to organize themselves into

unified protest, perhaps because they do not feel like going against the so-called "national interest". We all must make sacrifices, we realized, but let's not sacrifice, common sense.

Thanking you for your time, we remain,

-for the Canadian Young Writers' Association,

Bob Stranach  
John McGuire  
Lawrence F. Jardine  
Dan Babineau

## The library need not be a hassle any longer

Dear Editor:

Has the longest day of your life been spent endlessly searching through library stacks for material that just was not there? Have you ever wasted time doing the 40-mile dash up and down stairs from the card catalogue to the stacks? Have you had to settle for inadequate material for your project because you couldn't get your hands on the right books? If so, library loser, you have my sympathy. However, there are two ways of solving your library problems: one is to purchase your own library, the other is to call upon the Reference Department for help. The first solution would be time-consuming and costly, therefore I suggest you give the second a try.

It's time to cheer up and save time, marks, and frustration by taking a few minutes to learn how to use the library. It's never too late. The people at the Reference Department (ground floor, orange rug) are enthusiastic about helping you find the material you need for any course you may be taking at

this university. They will even give you a tour or show you slides on the use of the library, if you let them. They'll tell you everything you ever wanted to know, but were afraid to ask, about the library.

The library loser does not know that the Reference Department is the key information centre for the library and that it contains many resources for gainful searching. For example, you can find most Canadian periodical articles written on women's liberation in a few minutes. You can use Psychological Abstracts and rediscover yourself by skimming down the many articles listed under 'Personality Assessment'. Use these sources for your academic work - they are easy to use.

So do yourself a favor. Come in and let the Reference staff refresh your memory on how to use the library. Open up and ask how you can find specific information for one of your courses. Or, just drop in to see where they are located.

Former Library Loser

## Newspaper covers up pollution

Dear Editor:

Remember this judgment on the IRVING newspaper monopoly case that "the owners have never cast over their columns any editorial shadow whatsoever"?

Well there is more than just a "shadow" in this year's first editorial (January 2) in the Fredericton Daily Gleaner. On the topic of the budworm spraying program, the editor wrote: "we must keep spraying. Not with the 'dishwater' which K.C. Irving says has been used foolishly in the immediate past, but with solutions potent enough to do a proper job". The editor dismissed the arguments about the environmental damages increased spraying would produce as "fashionable". Implicit within the whole editorial was the ubiquitous idea that "What's good for K.C. Irving is good for New Brunswick!"

The editor was visibly more concerned with the profit margin of the Irving interests than with the welfare of the population. It is no secret that some of the highly poisonous substance used in the large scale spraying of New Brunswick's forests will find its way into the water table and drinking water of some New Brunswickers not to mention the fish life of our streams and rivers. Conveniently omitted by the editor, was the fact that the wholesale destruction of large tracts of forest lands is carried out every year in the name of efficiency and profit by the large concerns (Irving included). Sure, there has been some token efforts at reforestation, but it should be

pointed out that the planting of trees of the same kind and size only accentuates the severity of the budworm infestation. I do not wish to discredit the reforestation program here, but only point out that much of the responsibility for the present problem must lie with New Brunswick's environmental unconscious and profit-motivated capitalists.

Furthermore, should our taxes be used to clean up the lands wholly owned by the Irving interests or the Noranda Group? Who can most afford it, Irving or our nearly bankrupt provincial government? The Irving interests have the money, let them clean up their own yard. Let's stop this pressure by the media in New Brunswick, to get the taxpayers to foot the bill.

It is a well-known fact that the Irving interests control to a large extent, the economy of New Brunswick. These same private capitalists also own or control the main sources of information (press, radio, television) thus making it quite difficult if not outright impossible for the individual citizen to come to objective conclusions on any given issue.

The type of self-righteousness displayed by the editor of the Daily Gleaner (in his editorial of December 16, 1975) in response to opposition criticism can no longer be tolerated. Let's be frank Mr. Editor: You have the power to steer public opinion in the interests of the owners of your paper, and you are using it. Sincerely,  
Michel Goudreau  
Fredericton

**RESEARCH PAPERS**  
THOUSANDS ON FILE

Send for your up-to-date, 160-page, mail order catalog of 5,500 topics. Enclose \$1.00 to cover postage and handling.

**COLLEGIATE RESEARCH**  
1720 PONTIUS AVE., SUITE 201  
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90025

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

**Paul Burden Ltd.**

sales service rentals

**275 Queen St. Fredericton N.B. 454-9787**

**Business Machines**  
**Office Furniture**  
**Interior Design**  
**Stationery**