Student Union Referendum
as passed by CB 21 February 1963

Proposed that:

A new student union building be constructed and such construction be financed by a bond issue of an amount which can be retired by a Student Union Fee not to exceed $9.00 per student per quarter.

This student union fee will include planning of the student union building, construction and furnishing of the student union building, acquisition of land for the student union building, and operational costs of the Student union.

It is understood that if students approve this proposal, Central Board will appoint an advisory committee to assist the Student Union Planning Committee and to report to Central Board during Spring Quarter, 1963, and as feasible during planning and construction of the new facility.

It is also understood in this proposal that an opinion ballot will be submitted to the students during Spring Quarter, 1963, in order for them to express preferences on the facilities of the new building.

☐ For ☐ Against
Joint Meeting
Central Board and Student Union Executive Council
February 21, 1963


ASMSU President Ed Whitelaw called the meeting to order at 4 p.m. in the Silver Bow Room.

With the referendum proposal stated as passed at the Special Session of Central Board February 16, Mr. Dugan proposed a paragraph to take care of what he felt to be the general misphrasings in the original statement. As he proposed, it would read "It is understood that if the students approve this proposal, Central Board will appoint an advisory committee to assist the Planning committee and to report to Central Board early in April and as feasible during planning and construction of the new facilities." Johnson asked what the advantage of having another committee over the additions previously suggested. Dugan answered that the Planning Board had been appointed by the President on recommendation of Central Board and students, and that the general consensus was that it wasn't thought to be feasible for Central Board to appoint another. Pantzer said that he couldn't see that adding to the committee would do much more than add a few more votes to it. Cole suggested that it would be more realistic to have the Student Union committee to propose plans and possibly have open meetings for interested students to air their feelings. Bartlett suggested that it might be better to have an advisory committee than to have one associated with the SU committee. Dugan said that an advisory committee could find out by conversations the feelings of a broader group and then counsel the regular committee, as to where adjustments might be needed.

When questioned as to how many people would be added if the committee were only enlarged, Bertelson said probably 4 or 5, but if a new advisory group were formed, about 10 to 15. Dennis asked whether there seemed to be objection to the present third paragraph about "another election". Dugan answered that it might be unsound to have a third ballot and also that another objection was that it was bad to suggest that "4000 students who have never seen an elephant should be asked to describe it." Whitelaw said that the planning committee could assume that certain things were required in the building but that the other possible facilities might be put in a list and the students allowed to check a "yes" or "no".

Shannon stated at this point that every student had been heard that had wanted to be heard. He said that he felt at some point trust must be placed in the competence of the committee since every member has been at some time approved by Central Board.

FULLER MOVED THAT WE ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL AS AMENDED BY DUGAN.
SECONDED BY WOODS. Robinson said that he agreed the competence of the committee could be depended upon but felt that the referendum shouldn't be rushed since he didn't feel it would ever pass in a referendum held in one or two weeks. Van Sickel asked whether it was true that if the results of a referendum weren't submitted within two weeks we'd have to wait for a year to submit them to the Board of Regents. Mr. Pantzer said that the President had shown willingness to try submitting it later as a special case but
with full knowledge that it might be turned down. Vinour noted that if we go too fast and the proposal is defeated it will be a full four years before we could ever bring it up again; if we wait and get it okayed "at least we will have it." Shannon stated that we should all be aware that beginning July 1 the students won't have the use of the Silver Bow Room the Cascade Room and some of the others. DENNIS MOVED THAT THE 3RD PARAGRAPH CONCERNING THE 2ND BALLOT BE PUT BACK IN THE PROPOSAL. SECONDED BY JOHNSON. Robinson expressed disapproval at this since it would set an arbitrary date and he didn't feel it would be wise to work under a deadline. Shannon said he was opposed since he felt it would be deceiving the students to let them assume that they would have a final approval or disapproval of the plans since every adjustment would cost money and was therefore unfeasible. Shannon stated that certain things were inherent in a Student Union and that if it is the big things that the students want to ok or not, they should be inserted in the first proposal. Robinson said that according to the amendment suggested by Dennis the second ballot would be April 17, which would mean the first must be before this and it was setting a deadline which he was opposed to doing. MOTION TO AMEND DEFEATED UNANIMOUSLY. SWANKE MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION BY DELETING "EARLY IN APRIL" AND ADDING "DURING 1963," SECONDED BY BERTELSON. MacDonald asked whether this spring would be soon enough to let the administration know whether or not we will be building a new SU building so that they can adjust their plans for the food service. Pantzer said that this would be soon enough but that the problem is that we ought to establish fees soon to build up reserves since we can't be sure how much the operational costs will be. Dugan added that every year we don't sell this it costs us another §15000. MOTION CARRIED WITH BOWLER ABSTAINING. BERTELSON MOVED TO AMEND THE PROPOSITION BY ADDING "IT IS ALSO UNDERSTOOD IN THIS PROPOSAL THAT AN OPINION BALLOT WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE STUDENTS DURING SPRING QUARTER IN ORDER FOR THEM TO EXPRESS THEIR PREFERENCE ON THE FACILITIES OF THE NEW BUILDING." SECONDED BY JOHNSON. MOTION CARRIED (13-0) ENTIRE MOTION CARRIED (13-1). 1TH STONE OPPOSED. ROBINSON MOVED THAT WE HAVE ANOTHER JOINT MEETING TO ESTABLISH THE DATE OF THE REFERENDUM. SECONDED BY MACDONALD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne M. Hassing,
ASMSU Secretary