

# REFERENDUMS

## Rally to push vote for divestment

By RACHEL ORR  
Staff Writer

Students may voice their opinions concerning the University's investment policy in South Africa by voting Tuesday on a referendum that calls for complete divestment of UNC funds from companies conducting business in South Africa.

The referendum, sponsored by the UNC Anti-apartheid Support Group, was added to the ballot after the group submitted a petition with 2,346 student signatures to the Elections Board, said Bruce Lillie, Elections Board chairman.

UNC's endowment board has about \$6 million, 8 percent of its total endowment, invested in companies with business interests in South Africa, said Dianne F. Crabill, administrative assistant to the associate vice-chancellor

of finance. All the holdings are in companies that abide by the Sullivan principles, she said.

Student Body President Patricia Wallace, an ex-officio member of the Board of Trustees, said the policy not to divest was a business decision.

Wallace said members of the Endowment Board felt it was their responsibility to make good business deals, not political statements.

Last year, the University liquidated 26,000 shares in companies that were not following the Sullivan principles in South Africa.

The companies the University has invested in do less than 12 percent of their business in South Africa, and divestment would cause endowment funds to be more susceptible to market fluctuations, Crabill said.

J. Clint Newton, chairman of the BOT and the Endowment Board, said some members of the Endowment Board questioned whether the student body as a whole favored divestment.

Newton said if the referendum indicated an overwhelming student mandate for divestment, the Endowment Board might reconsider its decision not to divest.

Ray Wallington, a member of the UNC Anti-apartheid Support Group, said the referendum was very important because it represented the students' voice on the issue of divestment.

Wallington said, "Basically it's a symbolic gesture."

Dale McKinley, a graduate student in political science from Gweru, Zimbabwe, who worked to get the referendum on the ballot, said if the vote

showed strong student support for divestment, it would help in trying to get the University to change its policy.

"The South Africa question is a moral issue for this University," McKinley said. "It's not good for the Board of Trustees to put profit first."

He said if the vote favored divestment the support group would try to get Chancellor Christopher C. Fordham III to go before the BOT on the issue.

McKinley said members of the UNC Anti-apartheid Support Group planned a rally at noon today in the Pit to educate students about the situation in South Africa and to encourage students to vote on the referendum Tuesday.

Wallington said the group had also posted flyers around campus and placed cards on the tables in Lenoir Hall and Chase Cafeteria.

## Shift in dorm funds to appear on ballot

By JOY THOMPSON  
Staff Writer

A referendum on Tuesday's ballot will allow students to voice their opinion on whether the dormitory enhancement fund should be removed from the University Housing department and turned over to the Student Activities Fund Organization.

The enhancement fund was started by students 14 years ago, so they could furnish dorms with extra items, Residence Hall Association President Tim Cobb said in an interview Thursday. In a 1972 referendum, they voluntarily added \$4 per year to their rent.

The Housing department has since added a stipulation that if enhancement funds were not spent by a certain deadline, the funds automatically revert back to Housing. The enhancement fund has reverted back to Housing untouched for the past two years, Cobb said.

"The money isn't being spent, it is reverting back to Housing, and I just don't think that's right," Cobb said. "It appears to me that the department of University Housing sees the \$4 enhancement fee as a surcharge on rent."

"It seems as if students have been manipulated after their first intentions," he said. "They didn't envision . . . (enhancement) as the system is now."

Larry Hicks, business manager for Housing, said the department was not to blame for the delay in using the fund. Two years ago, the state froze all funds for purchasing, making any enhancement expenditures impossible and creating a backlog of enhancement needs.

The fund will be used this year, he said, and housing is setting aside major funds for enhancement and building renovations, that would be ongoing for years to come. But there are many questions about the enhancement policy that have to be addressed, he said.

The enhancement procedure has been complicated by what Hicks described as "a total lack of communication" between the housing department and RHA.

Most of the confusion centers around what is an enhancement item to be purchased by the dorms and what is a standard item to be purchased by Housing, Hicks said.

According to the enhancement policy, \$2.50 of each student's \$4 fee goes to Housing for specific standard purchases, such as social lounge furniture, kitchen appliances, carpeting and televisions. Housing is responsible for the upkeep of basketball and volleyball courts, as well as the maintenance and repair of items purchased for enhancement.

The remaining \$1.50 goes into a general enhancement pool that is overseen by the Enhancement Committee. From that pool, any dorm can petition funds for extra enhance-

ment items such as microwave ovens and videotape recorders.

The Enhancement Committee, which includes RHA members, an area director and a consultant from business and operations, meets three times a year to decide on requests from dorms for enhancement items.

Hicks gave an example of how confusing the policy could be. Microwaves are considered enhancement items to be paid for through the general dorm pool. But repairs and replacements for these items are considered Housing's responsibility.

"Should . . . (repairs) go through a committee for a vote or should it be done automatically . . . (by Housing)?" he asked.

He said he understood students' frustrations with the policy.

"Students got together with a list of priorities . . . (for enhancement), and at some time it got bogged down in committee," he said. Students were not seeing the results of their efforts.

"What we're doing is we're going to address this need . . ." Hicks said. "We're going to sit down and look at each of the items, one by one."

Cobb agreed that there should be a clearer distinction between enhancement items and standard items.

"(University Housing Director Wayne Kuncel) . . . set up standards that he wanted to bring the dorms up to, and I think that's fine, fantastic," Cobb said, "but I don't feel it is the student's responsibility to help fund those standards with the extra \$2 per semester."

Hicks said the department was wide open to the suggestion of having enhancement turned over to SAFO. But he said Housing officials wanted to concentrate on clarifying the policy first.

"The overall objective of the department is to serve the students," Hicks said. "This is not a power play."

Even if students do vote to transfer the enhancement fund to SAFO, Hicks said, the transfer would have to be approved by the state.

The enhancement fee differs from the more flexible social fee, in that it is an integral part of the rent, Hicks said, and it is therefore regulated by state guidelines.

Regardless of where the enhancement fund is, the Housing department has to have some input as to how the money is spent, Hicks said. He added that he thought Housing was more qualified than students at budgeting dorm enhancement expenditures.

"One thing we should do is see how . . . (the present enhancement policy) works," he said. "It's never been tested before. It's gone to the point of committee, and then there was the breakdown in communication on both sides. It needs to be ironed out."

## Council members differ on whether student fees should go for lobbying

By RANDY FARMER  
Staff Writer

Campus Governing Council members remain divided over a referendum that would allow student fees to be used for political lobbying.

Last December, the CGC approved putting the referendum on Tuesday's general elections ballot by a 10 to 5 vote. If approved, student groups could petition the CGC to allocate funds for lobbying on issues that "directly affect students" at the local, state and national levels.

The CGC would have to approve the expense by a two-thirds majority.

The Student Constitution prohibits the allocation of student funds for activities, services or events of a political or religious nature. If passed, the referendum would amend the constitution.

The bill is intended to give students a greater voice on issues that directly affect them by giving them lobbying power through student fees, said Student Body President Patricia Wallace, one of the bill's authors. The raising of the drinking age was an issue she had in mind when writing the bill, she said.

Wallace said student governments at other universities, such as N.C. State, had the right to lobby for or against legislation using student fees.

Charles Bryan, (Dist. 15) who voted against the bill,

said the money could be misused. Student funds could be used to support political lobbying that did not affect students, he said.

"Spending other people's money who do not feel that way should not be done," Bryan said. ". . . (Student groups who wish to lobby) should use their own money."

Todd Patton, (Dist. 17), voted for the referendum. "I think there are adequate safeguards (against misuse)," Patton said. He said there were issues outside the campus that affected the students.

Jane Gordon, one of the bill's authors and chairwoman of the executive branch's student affairs committee, said it was unlikely that the amendment could be misused.

"A two-thirds majority is quite a mandate," Gordon said. "It is highly unlikely that some radical group will have fees appropriated."

Lisa Jacobs (Dist. 8) voted against the bill. "I personally feel that the CGC has no business trying to represent student views on national issues," Jacobs said. "I certainly wouldn't want most of CGC members representing me on a national level."

"If I were upset about something like tuition hikes, I wouldn't trust my CGC representative to represent me," she said. "I would write my congressman."

Jay Goldring, (Dist. 7) who voted for the referendum, said students should have the opportunity to lobby collectively for issues. "If Student Government can't decide, who can?" he said. "We need a lobbying structure for students. I think Student Government is appropriate."

Bill Peaslee, (Dist. 9), who voted against the referendum, said: "Basically, what's going on is there are some people that want Student Government to act on international issues. Student Government should concentrate on issues here on campus. It's a matter of getting the best return on where you're spending your time."

Wallace disagreed. "The Student Government is looked to as the voice of the students," she said. "If Student Government is held back from lobbying, then who will do it for the students?"

The bill does not say the CGC will fund the College Republicans or the Young Democrats, she said.

Peaslee said students could use other avenues to lobby for or against legislation. He cited organizations such as the N.C. Student Legislature, the Young Democrats and the College Republicans.

"I think it's wasting the Student Government's time," he said. "It's opening a box that you don't know what's in it."

## ARA, meal plan: a take it or leave it issue

By DENISE MOULTRIE  
Staff Writer

Referendums concerning the renewal of ARA's food service contract and the mandatory meal plan will appear on Tuesday's general elections ballot.

The mandatory meal plan referendum will be like one passed last semester, in which students voiced opposition to the meal plan. The other referendum allows students to vote on whether they want the University to renew ARA's contract, which expires in March.

"Most students feel that ARA is too expensive for the quality of food they

get," said Jaye Sitton, chairwoman of the Campus Governing Council Rules and Judiciary Committee. "The only student input comes through the Food Services Advisory Committee. There are very few students on that committee."

Board of Trustees Chairman J. Clint Newton disagreed, saying students had excellent representation in Student Body President Patricia Wallace.

"Patricia Wallace is a forceful, articulate speaker," he said.

The CGC voted at its last meeting to present the meal plan referendum on each general elections ballot until 1990.

The referendum asks students whether they support the \$100 meal plan, possible \$25 increases in the plan and the possibility that the plan could develop into a full room and board plan.

Sitton said students would, through referendum, ask the Board to reconsider the mandatory meal plan. "I hope the Board of Trustees will recognize that students are dissatisfied with the mandatory meal plan and ARA Food Services," she said. "If they don't, I will be disappointed."

The results of last semester's poll which indicated students disfavor of the meal plan were sent to the administra-

tion, Sitton said. But the BOT did not act on the referendum, saying the 10 percent of the student body that voted did not represent student opinion as a whole.

Newton said the BOT judged student referenda based on the size of the vote and the turnout. "We don't run the Board of Trustees by referendum, but we will use it as an indicator. We've never turned down a student group that makes its case."

Sitton said last year's turnout was as high as turnout in the national elections. "Our biggest grievance is that there has been very little student input," she said.

"It would be great if the administration would abolish the meal plan and not raise it by \$25 per semester if Chase Hall doesn't generate enough money," she said.

**First Time These Items Ever Offered At This Price**

**All Remaining Winter Slacks**

**1/2 Price Menswear Sale**

**Group Of Outerwear**

**Group Of Long Sleeve Sport Shirts and Dress Shirts**

**Group Of Designer Vests and Shoes**

**Group Of Hats and Caps**

**Group Of Year-Round Suits and Sportcoats**

**THE HUB LTD**

CRABTREE VALLEY MALL, RALEIGH 782-0637 103 E. FRANKLIN ST., CHAPEL HILL 929-0343

## Vote to tell if CGC is CGC by any other name

By LIZ SAYLOR  
Staff Writer

Students will vote Tuesday on whether to change the name of the Campus Governing Council, delete an obsolete clause in the Student Constitution and give the CGC speaker an annual stipend.

Former CGC Speaker Wyatt Closs brainstormed two of the referendums, CGC Secretary Suzy Street said.

"The letters 'CGC' don't seem to mean a lot to students," Street said. "It wasn't clear that CGC meant Campus Governing Council. Wyatt thought 'Student Congress' was clearer."

The CGC approved putting the referendum on the ballot by consent last semester.

John Hairr (Dist. 22) said he favored the name change because many students didn't know what CGC stood for. "I'm tired of people asking, 'What's CGC, the Carolina Gay Council?'" he said.

Lisa Jacobs (Dist. 8) said she didn't think the name change would have much impact on student attitudes toward the CGC. "Most people aren't very interested in the governing council," she said. "It has a pretty low profile. . . . Most students are pretty apathetic about it."

Closs also authored the referendum for the speaker's annual stipend, which the CGC approved 10-1 for Tuesday's ballot. The student body president, student body treasurer

and student attorney general all receive stipends.

Street said one reason for a stipend was to compensate the speaker for the job's heavy workload. Another incentive was to lessen the need for the speaker to hold another job, as Closs did at Est, Est, Est. Street said an extra job took time away from CGC business and made life hard for the speaker.

Street said the new CGC vote on the amount of the annual stipend during April's budget hearings, providing the majority of students voted for the referendum Tuesday.

Charles Bryan (Dist. 15) voted against the stipend. "I wanted to make it so no one on this past council who runs again could get it," he said.

"More than likely, the people on the council now will be eligible for it as speaker for next term. . . . I felt like maybe someone would aspire to be speaker for the money. . . . I tried to get them to push up the date for enactment of the stipend, and they wouldn't hear of it."

Hairr said Closs put a lot of time and work into the CGC this past year and deserved some compensation.

The other referendum would delete a clause in the constitution that says no more than 55 percent of Elections Board members can belong to one campus party. The CGC approved the referendum because campus parties no longer exist, Street said.

"We used to have two political parties on campus," Street said. "One was conservative. One was liberal. They were abolished a long time ago."

"Personally I don't see any point in it," Street said. "Students have about eight referenda to vote on. I doubt they'll even care."

The CGC voted 7-3 with two abstentions at its last meeting to put the referendum to delete the clause on Tuesday's ballot. She said the members weren't concerned about reinstating it if campus parties started again.

Hairr said he didn't like the idea of the original clause, which he said undermined the honor of the Elections Board.

"I really felt that whole phrase was an insult to the Elections Board," Hairr said. "I don't think it was necessary to have that clause in it in the first place. I think the possibility of their party affiliations affecting the elections is minimal."

Remember family or friends with Special Occasion, Get Well or Memorial cards.

WERE FIGHTING FOR YOUR LIFE

American Heart Association