



mugwump journal

By SUSAN REED

Well, UNB students have decided. They don't want to be, as one student put it, "railroaded" into accepting the proposed renovations along with their \$15 SUB maintenance fee. It's too bad the SUB board and the SRC didn't realize this beforehand. Fifteen dollars is not such a great sacrifice in return for use of our own building after all. The referendum should have been held to determine whether students were willing to pay that fee, not to finance renovations. Perhaps the board felt that putting the two together would be a time-saving step. If so, it has evidently backfired.

I really can't resist. And why should I? After all something like *The New Brunswickian* begs for comment. Not to mention abuse. Any why? Beyond the title which is both of doubtful legality and doubtless tackiness, there is the subject matter. The CAUSE executive has repeatedly accused the *Brunswickian* of bias and untruth. Yet what does their leaflet provide but these very things? Their lead article tells us "... in past issues of the *Brunswickian* lies have been told suggesting an imminent takeover of the SUB by UNB." This is nothing less than a blatant fabrication. The only thing in the *Brunswickian* which remotely resembles it is the suggestion in the November 6 editorial that should the building fall into disrepair, it would probably then be taken over by the university. This, should it happen, would obviously take a number of years to come about. All the editorial is doing is attempting to caution students concerning the cost of the SUB upkeep, especially in view of a) the list of priorities of the MPHEC and b) budget cutting everywhere.

Further the leaflet (its name really sticks in my throat) charges that the *Brunswickian* never gave the "No" side a chance to air its views. Ridiculous. CAUSE had a two-page feature spread on its objections to the proposed renovations, the same space which was allotted to the SUB board. Not to mention innumerable, and I mean that literally, letters to the editor on the subject.

Another interesting little item: the "No" side claims on its editorial page that it spent \$35 on its referendum campaign. This would pay for buttons, etc. "No" presidential candidate Steve Kitching in our election edition claimed he was running his campaign without spending any SRC money on "designing and printing tacky "Vote for me" posters and buttons." Why then did Mr. Kitching claim election expenses from the SRC, one item of which were buttons? How curious.

Engineering rep John Bosnitch brought up several convincing constitutional arguments at Wednesday's SRC meeting which resulted in the motions seeking the annulment of former SRC President Perry Thorbourne's supposed loan being called out of order. Council may now review that subject again at any time. This is something with which I couldn't agree more. Thorbourne never had the right to pay himself that money and I cannot fathom why anyone would want to give it to him, whether in the form of an annulled loan or a salary.

soundoff

Bosnitch defended

Sir:

Sometimes I wonder whether human beings are not encouraged by bureaucratic systems to keep their mouths shut regardless of how important what they intend to say is. When one considers why some councillors want to impeach Bosnitch the only reasonable answer one comes up with is that whenever Bosnitch wants to argue a point he goes beyond himself to collect evidence about the case. Taking example of the Thorbourne case, Bosnitch came to council with all sorts of evidence to the effect that Thorbourne was never employed by the SRC to keep its office open. In fact, according to the SRC minutes of May 19, 1980, motion number 2 which Bosnitch supplied to every councillor, the then councillors voted 10 to 7 to show that Thorbourne did not even put in the required hours required of an SRC President, let alone working extra hours for pay. This and other evidence collected by Bosnitch made the SRC administration and the executive agree that it is in fact true that Thorbourne was never formally employed by the SRC to keep the office open. The person who was employed and paid by SRC to do that was Mr. Howes, the Comptroller. SRC decided to pay him for humanitarian reasons. Don't ask me what the reasons are. I voted No.

When it came to the SUB renovations it was because of Bosnitch opposition to the proposed renovations which promoted a motion to have the

final plans approved by both UNB and STU - SRC's before being implemented. Bosnitch did not introduce the motion but he had the documents to show that those plans were in fact, the actual intended alterations and not "a fantasy" as some supporters of the changes called them. He in fact brought to council the whole bundle of documents and plans of the intended alterations.

This kind of preparedness to support his argument with written evidence may cost Bosnitch his seat in SRC. One feels that some one or some people somewhere don't feel comfortable to deal with this kind of efficiency so they want Bosnitch out of council so as to have the kind of council they can control. This is a gut feeling of mine so do not bother to ask me who the person or persons might be.

Those who intend to impeach Bosnitch claim that he does not keep quiet in council. As a councillor I feel that as long as the chair recognizes you and gives you the floor, even if you talk 35 times you are legally working within the SRC constitution and any complaint as to why you talked 35 times should be directed to the chair and not to you. In this respect Bosnitch has always talked with permission from the chair and cannot be said to be 'out of order'.

As to the question of 'dereliction of duties' I wonder how a councillor can be accused of dereliction of duties after just three meetings after his election. Unless a special trained group had been set up

to study Bosnitch in advance, I do not see how his weakness, as compared to weaknesses of other councillors, could have been so identified in such a short time as to introduce a motion to impeach him. I agree with those who claim that Bosnitch personally might be irritating to some people but while a girl who intends to marry him might consider such minor details, a person who meets him at the council and parts with him there has no reason to consider Bosnitch personality or what he perceives it to be. All that is necessary is weigh his ideas about the particular topic at hand and oppose or support those particular ideas. It is cowardice to defeat someone's ideas by making sure that he does not get a chance to air them, in fear that those ideas may receive support from those councillors who listen to fact regardless of whose facts they are. If the idea is to have councillors who are willing to say "yes sir" and then keep quiet until the chairman says, 'those in favour, those opposed', motion carried, go home, then I agree that Bosnitch will not be one of them but then what will not be the use of a council? I hope this kind of idea dies before it becomes contagious. I look forward to having an active dedicated and patient council, for most of the houses that fall are the ones built in haste.

Yours fellow student,

Isaac M. Kithyo.
Education Rep.

University removing privileges

Dear Editor:

I would like to comment on a matter that affects all of us directly, particularly those of us living within the residence system. This is the way in which our privileges and freedom of choice are gradually being taken away and being replaced by rules and regulations. It started with the abolition of open pubs a couple of years ago followed by rules about house bars and initiation practices and now some houses have instituted quiet hours all year around. Who knows what freedoms we take for granted now may be gone a year or two down the road.

I am sure that these policies were made with all the best in-

tentions and there are probably good arguments to back them up but I think the University is taking the easy way out and that taking away the students freedom of choice in these matters may have disastrous consequences.

The purpose of a University is to prepare people for life in the real world, not just to train them for some particular occupation. For most of us, this is the first time we are on our own, without parents and teachers looking over our shoulders telling us what is best for us. It is here that we make some of our most important decisions about morals, drinking and drug habits, etc., and to a very great extent, this affects our behavior for the

rest of our lives. It is important that we learn to make responsible decisions now about the way we should act and the way that society in general should behave, because it is the people who are in university today who will be tomorrow's politicians, judges, corporate heads and, in general, the people who make most of the important decisions about the direction in which humanity is headed.

The only way we are going to make responsible decisions is if we are given the freedom to decide on our actions now. We will not learn much if we live in a perfectly ordered society with rules and regula-

(Continued on p. 8)