

Meeting consensus-

Immediate action on co-ed plan

By TWEED

A decision on whether Victoria House will be a co-educational residence in January is expected by the end of the week. It was decided at a general meeting Monday night to present the proposal to the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors immediately.

A consensus was reached on three points at the meeting. First, it was agreed that co-educational residences are desirable at UNB. Secondly, Victoria House was determined the appropriate situation to initiate the concept. Thirdly, it was decided that

immediate action would be undertaken to get approval for the proposal and make the idea a fact in January.

Dean of Students, Barry Thompson, will take the matter to the Joint Board-Senate Committee on Residences. Other principles in the decision, Dean of Women, Mrs. J.P. Kidd, and Dean of Men's Residences, Dr. W.W. Chernoff, are strongly in favour of the project.

Turnout at the meeting, held to determine what interest there is in co-educational residences, was small. Only five female students attended the meeting, but many

more have expressed interest since the idea was first put forward last week. Representatives of Victoria House were positive in their presentation of the plan.

Discussion covered many areas of the situation. Victoria House was suggested to be of particular interest to female students presently living in less than ideal accommodations off campus.

Persons with previous experience living in co-educational residences recommended it highly in lieu of the "nunnery-monastery" existence imposed by segregated residences.



If all goes according to plan, Victoria House may be the first co-ed residence at UNB. However, only five female students turned out to a meeting last Monday to discuss the matter.



New Brunswick Premier Richard Hatfield rejected separatism for Quebec at a panel discussion last Wednesday night, but four UNB political scientists said Canada may have no choice in the matter.

Photo by Sheenagh Murphy

Future of Confederation doubtful

By DERWIN GOWAN

Although they all expressed hope that Quebec would not separate from Canada, panelists were generally pessimistic about the future of Canada as a united union last Wednesday night in Tilley Hall.

The Political Science Students' Association hosted the panel which included Premier Richard Hatfield of New Brunswick UNB political scientists J.G. Allen, S.D. Bosnitch, C.R. Grondin, and S.I. Pobihschy.

Hatfield, who accused Quebec premier Rene Levesque of sentimentality on election night, doubted that Quebec could do "great things" as an independent country.

The premier described a nation,

using the definition of Canadian historian Donald Creighton, as a group of people which "Did great

things in the past" and hoped to do "great things in the future."

See Panelists, page 20

Two students killed

By TOM EVANS

Two Forestry students, Francis Lo from Toronto and Jean Fortin from Trois Riviere were returning from a Forestry 1000 class at the UNB woodlot about 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, Nov. 25, when they were struck by a car on the Trans-Canada Highway opposite the College Hill Road.

Francis Lo was pronounced dead on arrival and Jean Fortin died two hours later at the Everett Chalmers Hospital.

A fellow forester who was

returning to the campus at the time stated that the visibility was good and the approaching car had its headlights on. The two victims apparently did not realize that the car was approaching at the speed it was going.

The chief coroner of the province has not decided if an inquest will be held until the RCMP have submitted the final report.

The forestry dean, J.W. Kerr stated that all students in Forestry 1000 will be transported to and from the UNB woodlot for their last class this term.

Four hundred and eighty thousand dollar question!

STAFF

Since the cover page on last week's issue of The Brunswickan seemed to titillate the interest of more than one reader, a full explanation of the cover cut-line is in order.

As the accompanying report from Dr. Anderson to the Alumni shows, the amount necessary to pay off present creditors is about \$480,000.

If all goes well, according to Dr. Anderson, only some \$280,000 will be required to pay off the building.

There is no doubt that the Aitken Centre was intended to serve the needs of the student body. There is considerable doubt whether or not the finished product actually can serve the needs of students.

As CSL and others have proved, it is very possible to lose in a lot of money on concerts in just the first 6 months of operation.

The facts appear to be that the building is only suitable for ice events. It seems to be too big to attract sufficient numbers of promoters to have concerts there.

This is an extremely unfortunate state of affairs. The only things that can save the university from carrying huge interest payments is another gift or possibly active promotion of the building.

From all appearances CSL has spent (or lost) some \$41,000 on the two concerts it put on. It seems very unlikely that council will approve more money to continue this company, at least for the entertainment division in future years.

This means in practical terms that concerts are finished for the next ten years in the Aitken Centre. No 'outside' promoter is going to spend money to develop the market without help from 'inside' organizations such as the SRC.

There is some doubt, at this point in time at least whether students actually care whether the option of entertainment in the Aitken Centre is available or not. Certainly there is considerable doubt whether the surrounding community cares at all about Aitken Centre.

More money could be invested (as it were) in CSL but it should be a decision of the people. It seems inevitable that SRC fees will be raised at least \$5.

Possibly at the next election a referendum should be held to decide whether or not an additional \$5, for a total of ten, be added to existing fees (\$45.00) with the understanding that the \$27,000 or so raised be put into a rational development of concerts/entertainment at the Aitken

Centre.

Students and the university are now forced into a situation where we have to deal with the Aitken Centre. Whereas CSL was created by council to respond to an apparent need, the Aitken Centre is a rather grandiose exhibition of a group of people's (the university) visions of immortality. (although perhaps there are mutual similarities).

Critics of the Aitken Centre have long said that a hockey rink

can be built for \$1.5 million dollars, and that a theatre/auditorium/pub facility can be added to the SUB for about 2.0 million dollars.

There is absolutely no doubt that, in retrospect, this is what should have been done, but as one senior university person put it "the Aitken Centre was a fait accompli by executive authority with negligible input from the university community on the actual idea before anyone knew it".

Armchair retrospective quarter-backing is a national pastime. Aitken Centre is here, like it or not. If the student body wishes to assist by trying to rationally promote concerts for the university community, Dr. Anderson's job will be substantially easier raising that \$280,000. If not, so be it, and being rational about it, students well inevitably pay some of the

See Anderson, page 10



It now seems the Aitken Centre is not as well off financially as it might be. Events held there consistently lose money and the university will have to come up with \$480,000.