

# Ellen MacDonald on the SDUSU

The Monday March 9th edition of The CADRE has given notable coverage to the SDUSU inc. decision to donate its assets to the University Athletic Department; fair enough, but I feel that some of the implications of the article reflect untruths.

Initially, I wish to clarify the derivation of the committee that made the controversial decision. The members of the Executive were given the power to make all decisions necessarily involved in the process of winding up the Union at a meeting of April 19, 1969. As a consequence, the decision could have been made by only four people. I did feel, that such a concentration of power on such a major issue, was, at best, dangerous and undesirable. Hence, the Executive agreed that we would ask the elected representatives from the respective classes to enter into the decision. They were Julie Mitchell, Joan Sutherland and Pat Donahue. Additionally, it was felt that because of the Coffee Shoppe Board of Governors had been deeply involved in the business of the shoppe, they, too should make the decision. I really think that the term, "select" cannot be applied to this group any more than it can be applied to any other body of elected or appointed representatives. I will agree that you may charge that the individuals to whom I had written personally were "select"; in that instance selection of some sort or another had to take place, in the same manner as it does in all other surveys.

The statement that nobody knew about the decision surprises me to a great extent. I recall very distinctly, placing a statement in an early edition of this paper, and saying therein, that the SDUSU did, in fact, have an asset of \$32,000 and that this money would be given to some body in the future. Specifically, one of my comments in that article was "Personally I would like to see the money go to the UPEISU as a capital building fund". And yet the cry was that no one was aware. Furthermore, on countless occasions students approached me to express opinions on the matter; still others did not seem to care where the money went.

As I expected, some people felt that the issue should have gone to referendum. This possibility was discussed and it was felt that the idea of calling the former SDU students together would, in effect be in bad taste, particularly in view of the editorial that appeared in one of the local papers, in middle September, which implied that each group of students was trying diligently to maintain that which had been legislated away. Irrespective of what is said now that the decision is made, I feel that the issues were complicated; there were many angles which demanded serious consideration and I am certain that the average student could never be given the facts as they were effectively. I know also that the group making the decision did so only after two and one half months of deliberation. The fact, also remains, that the were elected and appointed representatives, and in this capacity, the issue was discussed and handled.

Following my initial statement in The CADRE, I received letters from the Athletic Department and the Library saying that they would like to be considered as recipients of the asset. We also received letters from Mr. Baker, on behalf of the Board of Governors of the University, stating that they would be willing to match us with \$32,000. In my letter to the Board asking for confirmation of this match, which had been rumor to this point, I mentioned that there were three possibilities re the destination of the asset, the Library, the Athletic Department, and the Student Union. Each of these groups was asked to outline specifically what they had in mind. We heard from the Library and the Athletic Department. To this point we had no specific proposals from the Student Union.

Finally on February 19th the blueprints were given to Ron Jackson, who, in turn, brought them to a meeting where they were discussed. We received Mr. John Keaveny, who answered questions about the plans for the student union building. To the accusation that Mr. Keaveny was too aggressive and that there was a personality clash involved, I have this to say. It certainly did not come from me, and the implication that this may have been the basis for the decision is so out of context that it does not even merit comment. The decision not to give the money to the Student Union was not a personal one;

remember that I did not vote on the matter, and on the basis of that alone, the decision could not be personal.

The students making the decision were happy to be offered an opportunity to perpetuate the values of the two former institutions, in Athletics. The money is not being wasted and there is no question that the present rink is in dire need of repair. With respect to the Student Union Building, it was that this building must be carefully planned out and that within two or three years it could easily be financed by cost planning in much the same manner that the SDU students did five years ago.

In conclusion, to the people who commented in the last edition of The CADRE, I would like to say that I appreciate constructive criticism and I think that you are quite justified in expressing what you think to be right. However, I must admit that I did find the second of the six, rather unprofessional in that the attack was on the people not the issue.

I am pleased that The CADRE attacked the decision, not the persons. I appreciate that approach and I thank the editor for doing so.

—Ellen MacDonald  
President, SDUSU Inc.

## Education and social change seminar

This August five Maritime university students will attend a seminar sponsored by World University Service of Canada, on education and social change. It will be held at the Centro Intercultural de Documentacion in CIDOC, Mexico. Will you be one of the five?

CIDOC is, "not a university, but a meeting place of men whose concern is the effect of social change and ideological change on the minds and hearts of men. It is a setting for understanding the implications of social revolution . . . an environment for learning, not a headquarters for activist planning. It is especially interested in contemporary Latin America, but for the sake of education and not training." CIDOC was founded eight years ago by Ivan Illich . . . and is a kind of anti-school . . . a center for free and often radical discussions among intellectuals from all continents.

The themes of study this year will be:

1. Latin America
  - a) Reform vs. revolution, Brazil, Mexico, cuba.
  - b) Theology and Revolution in Latin America.
2. Political and Economic Systems

- a) Power and Pressure groups in Mexico since Cordeas.
  - b) The labor movement in modern Mexico.
  - c) Economic systems and economic facts.
  - d) The political system of Haiti.
3. Aspects of Education
    - a) Workshop on alternatives in education.
    - b) Man the learner.
    - c) Education in Cuba.
    - d) Education in Mexico.
    - e) Education and Socio-Cultural Development in Latin America and the United States.

The seminars are conducted by guest lecturers who are invited in for periods of one to three months.

Participants must be willing to work hard, as only those who are adequately prepared beforehand will be able to contribute to and gain from the on-going dialogue.

If you are interested and would like more information write to:

WUSC field representative  
Nora Baker,  
Box 347,  
Sackville, N.B.

J  
U  
L  
E  
S  
  
F  
E  
I  
F  
F  
E  
R

