

ion Main issues of CHSR-residences dispute explained

By CHRIS FISHER
SRC Comptroller

The question of residence sub-
sidization of CHSR service is once
again being blown up. To explain
the whole issue arose it
seems that we should start from
the initiation of the Carrier Cur-

rent system on campus.

Last March 15, 1972 the Ad-
ministrative Board, which handles
all financial matters of the SRC,
passed the Carrier Current Budget
which amounted to over \$10,000.
Suffice it to say here that it was a
capital expenditure and we would

receive the return on our invest-
ment within four years. At the
time the motion was passed I
asked CHSR Station Director Bill
Akerley personally to go to all
the house presidents of the resi-
dences and to explain the new
system while negotiating a rate at
which the SRC could charge the
residences.

This rate has been paid by the
residences since 1961 and every
year the residences have been
budgeting \$1.00/head for CHSR
service; the funds being taken
out of the General House fund.
The main reason why the SRC
instituted these rates was that off-
campus students were complaining
about having to subsidize a ser-
vice that they were not receiving,
by paying their \$35.00 SRC fees.
This problem has not changed. To
offset this imbalance the SRC
asked the residences to help out
in this matter by paying a rate
for the service they do receive.
The final outcome was that every
residence agreed. The same thing
happened when Mr. Akerley
talked to the House Presidents
last March. To my knowledge,
every house agreed to pay \$1.00/
head. This is how the whole
problem arose. The outgoing
House Presidents, (elections are
every March), did not tell the new
House Presidents about these rates
and I took it for granted this
year that these rates would re-
main as negotiated last March.
When Peter Ashton, (SRC Finance
Chairman), myself and Roy Neale,
(SRC President), met with the
RRC (Residence Council) four
weeks ago, the majority of the
new House Presidents knew
nothing of this rate.

It seems that old house presi-
dents failed to inform them. How-
ever, there were a couple of resi-
dences that did budget for it.
The outcome at that meeting was
that each president would meet
with their respective committees
and inform them of these rates.
The following day, (Friday), the
Director of CHSR came to me
and informed me of his intentions
to shut the radio station down if
the SRC did not pass CHSR's
budget the following Monday.
The problem that now faced us
was that CHSR's budget had al-
ready been passed by the AB
with the \$1,667 from the resi-
dences included. It was awaiting
final approval by council on the
following Monday. Without the
definite approval of the \$1,667
from the residences, I could not
attempt to pass this budget in
council. Peter Ashton and I called
a meeting with the RRC on Sun-
day night to get the approval
from the residences. As only four
(4) House Presidents showed up,
nothing was accomplished and
Peter and I went on CHSR to
explain the situation to the stu-

dents. The SRC Executive finally
decided on Monday, before the
SRC meeting, to pass CHSR's
budget with the expected revenue
from residences included. As this
rate had been paid for the last 11
years, we foresaw no problems in
collecting it again. CHSR's budget
passed through council Monday
night which avoided CHSR from
going off the air.

To bring this long involved
hassle to a climax, the SRC execu-
tive met with various houses to
discuss and explain the issue.
Lady Dunn and Tibbitts agreed
to maintain the rate, as did Har-
rison House. Other houses agreed
to negotiate. Some houses didn't
see any reason for paying. Fin-
ally, the RRC met Monday night
(October 16th) and voted that
it would be up to the individual
houses to pay this rate. Most
houses have many fallacies as to
what the situation actually is:

- 1) Some houses seem to think that
the advertising revenue will
offset most or all of the oper-
ating costs of CHSR. The facts
on this are as follows:
Total Operating Costs:
\$7,232.91.
Revenues (excluding residences)
Maggie Jean & Murray House
(still on speakers): \$40.00.
Co-op: \$600.00
STU Residences: \$1,379.34.
Teachers College: \$90.00.
Forestry Lounge: \$36.00.
Law Lounge: \$25.00.
Smoke Shop: \$25.00.
Advertising Revenue (approx.):
\$2,500.00.
TOTAL REVENUE \$4,695.34.
Budget Request from SRC:
\$2,637.57

We can see by this that advertis-
ing helps considerably but in no
way does it offset operating ex-
penditures. Advertising is fairly
high this year because of the
election. Close to \$1000 has al-
ready been sold to Political
Parties which will not be the case
next year.

- 2) Some people in residence say
that seeing as how the resi-
dences are the audience for
advertising that in fact they
are giving the radio station a
service. This is true, but the
radio station in turn is giving
the students a service, and a

very useful one.

- 3) Another argument that was
put forward stated that as the
new system works with radios
and not speakers, should the
people without radios pay the
one dollar? CHSR did a survey
of all residences last year and
found that 96 percent of the
people had radios. Also, if the
majority of the people in resi-
dence have radios, then the rest
should pay for the majority.
The money comes out of the
general house fund, not out of
each individual's pocket.

- 4) Also, the rumor was being
circulated that CHSR was serv-
ing the whole of Fredericton.
The fact is that the radio station
does not have a license to serve
Fredericton. It is just on campus
and will stay that way until some-
one comes up with \$100,000 for
new equipment and personnel
needed to serve Fredericton.

In summation, I would like to
point out that by Student Law
a rate is expected from the resi-
dences. If this rate is not paid we
have two alternatives:

- 1) Shut down CHSR. By doing
this we lose all our advertising
revenue from people who would
never deal with the station
again if this happened. Also,
\$100,000 of equipment would
be laying idle and the 50-60
members of CHSR would not
get this valuable experience in
bringing the residences the ser-
vice. We have about the best
university station in Canada and
it is well organized.
- 2) The SRC could subsidize
CHSR to the extent of \$1.00/
head in residence. By doing
this, off-campus students are
paying out even more for some-
thing they didn't receive. Off-
campus students are the ma-
jority at UNB and we have to
respect their views. Also, we
would have to cut down on
other areas of the total budget
to compensate for this loss.
Therefore I appeal to the stu-
dents in residence to abide by
the decisions of the past and to
meet this responsibility. I have
gone as far as I can go by present-
ing the facts to you.

Mugwump Journal

By EDISON
STEWART

Bonjour.

For those of you who didn't know, there are rumours
circulating now that civilization doesn't end at the university
gates. Matter of fact, it (civilization, that is) supposedly goes
clean down to the river.

I kid you not.

And in that land mass just south of the gates, a certain
Lord Mayor and his duly elected councillors have proposed
that we (ie. us) be taxed. Taxed, yet. Lord God will it ever end?

This university and the students in it are two of the reason's
for this hole's existence. The other reason is the provincial
government. (What else?) And as if UNB, STU, and TC already
didn't provide the shopkeepers of Freddie's town with a living,
janitors, clerks, computer operators and professors with a job,
this certain Lord Mayor would have the university be taxed.

Well, it may indeed be true that the fellows downtown
need more money. But we're already faced with a fee increase.
And charging us any more just isn't going to be cricket. If
the government's wise (a misconception definitely not based
on past experience), this Lord Mayor and his crew will be
advised to play it cool. Already, as Pacy says, our "future is
in jeopardy." To jeopardize it any more would be the last
straw.

Where does the workend?

Not at the edge of the world, obviously. At least most of
us think so. And the Drop in the Bucket campaign currently
underway proves just that. But there are some of us who
feel that campaigning for money to aid schools in other
countries is an undertaking of a rather dubious nature.

One student, who was looking at the Drop in the Bucket
poster which solicited his help, walked away in disgust. "Damn,"
he said, as he stomped out of his million dollar student
union building. "When are they going to start helping Canadian
schools?"

With that having left his lips, he marched out into the
night, over to the multi-million dollar library, marched in,
and proceeded to view thousands of dollars of books.

And if that's intelligence, well...

Man of the year award

Nope. It's not General William Westmorland. (He's coming
here in December, you'll recall). And it's not J.O. Dineen,
although there's little question that he deserves the honour.
It's the moron who called the Dunn last week, and said
there was a bomb in the building. This character (who un-
doubtedly is still doing post-grad work in kindergarten) kept
the girls out of the building for no reason at all. But watch
out, Bomber, someone's after your title. Last winter another
person phoned the Dunn at 2 in the morning. You guessed it.
Another bomb scare.

Will people ever learn?

Cake contest

It's been awhile since we've had a contest in the Bruns-
wickan. But it's time that we had another one. To the first
person who finds a stale piece of cake in the Saga cafeteria
in the SUB, we'll try to award the following: You, the winner,
will receive a trip direct to the regional Saga offices (for UNB),
where you'll (hopefully) be greeted, arms outstretched, by the
Saga manager. Then (again, hopefully) he'll replace your dry
piece of cake, and maybe we can arrange for a photo of this
historic event.

So win, win, win. BE the first on your block to catch
Saga with their pants down!

S'all for now. See you next week.

BRUNSWICKAN STAFF MEETING

SUNDAY NIGHT AT 7:00 P.M.

ALL NEW AND OLD STAFF PLEASE ATTEND.