



## Removal motions defeated

# Thorbourne still president - barely

By SUSAN REED  
Assistant News Editor

A motion to impeach SRC president Perry Thorbourne was narrowly defeated at Monday night's regular SRC meeting. Ten councillors voted for the motion and seven against. A two-thirds majority was required.

A second motion to impeach Comptroller Steve Howes was also defeated. The voting went six for, 11 against.

At the start of the meeting it was proposed by Chairman David Kay that all other items on the agenda be tabled in favour of the notices of motion introduced by Councillors Mike Hughson and David Laurence. Kay said this was to allow sufficient time for a discussion of the issue at hand.

The discussion opened with Thorbourne requesting that the mover of the motion or accuser speak first.

Science Rep Hughson replied that he did not wish to act as a prosecuting attorney. Hughson also objected strenuously to the tabling of the other items as he said he felt they were too important to be put off. Following the vote on the motions, council decided to continue to discuss some of the tabled items.

When Thorbourne again asked the reasons for his impeachment, Hughson said he had informed the President of these at an August 11 meeting at which Thorbourne had reaffirmed his intention to resign. Hughson then read a telex addressed to the UNB SRC from former Graduate Student Rep Don Andrew:

*Regrettably resign from council. Outraged by Perry's resignation refusal. This should not repeat not go unopposed. Please end this scandal. Elect new executive now.*  
Don Andrew

Engineering rep Laurence told Thorbourne the reason for the motion had been clearly stated in the motion itself - a violation of bylaw 14, section 6, this is, dereliction of duty.

Councillors Laurence and Hughson had formulated a set of questions to ask Thorbourne concerning the charge of dereliction of duty. Laurence said the issue was being brought out in council in order that it be brought out in the open.

Thorbourne demanded the withdrawal of the impeachment motions saying that nothing was being accomplished. Referring to the councillor's list of questions he said, "having questions unanswered is not an offence."

Much of the debate centered around whether Thorbourne and Howes had indeed kept the promised regular business hours. Physical Education rep Margaret Bannister first raised the question, saying, "it's pretty poor when we have to police our own executive." Councillors presented different views of the question, some stating the hours were kept and other asserting they were not.

Howes said he had put in a minimum of 40 hours per week, often working until very late.

Bannister said the hours kept were supposed to be regular ones. If he came in at night, she said, that was his own decision.

Howes said they had kept office hours as often as possible but there were meetings to be attended and investments to take care of.

Thorbourne said there were times when he wasn't in the office. He said he had meetings and other times he hadn't come in. He said he had tried.

Howes spoke in Thorbourne's defence, saying the president was repaying the salary he had claimed during the summer and therefore was responsible for only the "2 to 3 hours per week" past presidents had put in during the summer.

Engineering rep David Laurence noted that during the summer, Thorbourne did not intend to pay back his salary and should have followed the job functions.

Howes reiterated that they had put in the hours and deserved every penny they got. "I had a damn hard summer," he said.

Forestry Rep Andrew Wort said the council was forgetting the absence of an administrator this summer and said Thorbourne and Howes did a commendable job and had done nothing wrong under the circumstances.

Bannister questioned the president again, asking why he had taken a salary after accepting his honorarium. Thorbourne said what he had done was not wrong, but "incorrect," and added he still felt entitled to the salary. He claimed that in taking a salary he

had broken union law but not criminal law.

Bannister also wanted to know why no one had been informed there was a problem with the office. She suggested a student could have been hired to stay in the office to ensure it was kept open and running.

Rep-at-large, Ross Libbey asked why another bookkeeper was not hired when Doris Wu, the former bookkeeper left.

Howes replied he hadn't known how long one would be required and didn't know the job requirements. Howes asked Libbey if he would have preferred hiring someone "off the streets" and giving them access to union funds.

Libbey also raised the point that Howes had paid himself more than Wu, a near-qualified CGA.

Laurence asked Thorbourne why he hadn't attended the Alumni Council meeting that decided to put Counselling Services in the STUD. He said this constituted the loss of a major possible source of funding for SUB renovations. Former Vice-President Chris Earl agreed: "One hundred thousand dollars has been chopped out beneath our feet," he said. He said it was unlikely the SRC would ever find itself as high on the list of priorities of the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Council again.

Thorbourne said he had known what was going on and his presence would not have made any difference. He said he did not receive notice of the meeting until the day of the meeting itself.

Laurence said two notices of meeting had been sent to his office. Thorbourne claimed he did not receive them. For the past five years the Alumni Council has invited the SRC president to its meetings to gain student input. Laurence asked Thorbourne if he did not see attending the meeting as one of his duties, that it must have been a matter of conscience.

Thorbourne replied, "Conscience and duty are not the same thing."

The president was also questioned about the entertainment conference he attended in Toronto. He said he and Howes attended the conference to meet other student unions. At the conference it had been agreed to hold an Atlantic Student Union's meeting, he said. This later fell through due to lack of interest.

Campus Services Ltd. funds were used for the trip without its board approval.

Howes said an executive meeting had been held about the trip. Earl said he had known of no such meeting. He said council would have to determine who was lying, Howes or himself.

The president said union activities suffered during the summer because of his attitude. He had intended to resign, he said, and as a result had less "capacity and enthusiasm."

"I've made mistakes. I'm human. But I'm learning," said Thorbourne.

Mike Hughson wanted to know why, at a meeting to acquaint students with new Vice-President Academic Burridge, no students showed up. He blamed Thorbourne. "It's no wonder the university is beginning to make decisions without us. They think we don't care," he said.

Hughson said Thorbourne had treated councillors "contemptuously" during the summer. He said Thorbourne had replied to various questions he had posed at the August 11 meeting, saying "I don't give a damn."

Hughson reminded Thorbourne he had said during his election campaign he would not take a summer job. He mentioned the "fair bit of fallacious information concerning the SUB" which he credited to Thorbourne during the referendum campaign. He said council was not kept informed. Thorbourne had presented the Student Disciplinary Code to the Board of Governors for approval, he said, and it was only through sheer luck that time had prohibited the board from examining it, thus giving council a chance to look at the code.

Hughson said he had spoken to Dean of Students Barry Thompson concerning this and Thompson had said he was under the impression the code had SRC approval.

"I can no longer believe this executive," said Hughson, "My trust has been lost."

Business Rep Doug Moore said the motions to impeach the president and the comptroller had not been properly researched and considered. He said the action has hurt the credibility of the union

Continued on page 3