



mugwump journal

By GORDON LOANE

The saga of the Kevin Ratcliff case continues. Almost every week there is something new to report. This week the appeal process at the Board of Governor's level has been changed. Legal advice was the main reason for the change in procedure according to administration officials. Anyway the appeal will be heard October 15th - that is unless there is a change in procedure again or someone comes up with a better idea. Surely, some members of the administration and the Board of Governors should be embarrassed about all of this - indecision it is called.

Last week I suggested that our SRC was losing money by not filling the glassed in show cases in the student union building. Traditionally these show cases have been filled with ads from various pubs around town. SRC administrator Dave Campbell told me this week something is being done about it. Hopefully, negotiations can be completed this week to sell this advertising space. Every week the SRC delays costs the students approximately \$100. The delay has been five weeks already.

I obtained a copy of the operating policy of the SUB from Director Cindy Stacey this week. I was most curious about the policy concerning commercial advertising in the building. Lately I have noticed a proliferation of commercial advertising signs. It appears no commercial advertising is permitted in the building with the exception of those who rent space. Exceptions to this rule are apparently at the discretion of the SUB Director. Exceptions are starting to become the rule as more and more signs are appearing. The huge sign for a local banking institution comes to mind quickly. Perhaps the SUB Board should review this situation at the first opportunity.

A controversy is swirling as to whether SRC Chairman David Kay is legitimately in office. Apparently council must decide each year to appoint or re-appoint two chairmen. As of yet no such move has taken place and Chairman Kay remains in office. Apparently another chairman from last year has decided not to reapply for the position and is under the impression that his term expired at the end of August. I hope that you are as confused as I am about this and council will investigate and make a decision. Incidentally, my comments are not a reflection on the persons who have been chairmen in the last year or so.

If you belong to an organization that is funded by the student union, you should be reading the SRC minutes printed in this weeks issue. The financial policy has been amended and it is nearly budget time again. Changes in the policy will affect us all. The changes will be passed at next week's council meeting. If you plan on receiving funds from the student union read them and save yourself considerable trouble.

A search committee for a new dean of students is being formed. Barry Thompson's term is soon to expire. SRC councillor Rick Libbey and SRC Comptroller Steve Howes have been named by the SRC as your student representatives on the search committee. The deliberations of the search committee are important as the dean of students is a vital link to the administration and important for all students on this campus.

Student Union legal advisor and local lawyer Peter Forbes has several comments on the proposed student disciplinary code. His comments were presented to the Ad HOC committee of the SRC studying the proposed code. One sentence in his presentation was particularly striking "It is my opinion that the entire code should be redrafted with a view that the code is an attempt to self discipline by the students and for the students." I say 'right on Peter'. This code is to be administered by and for students. The legalistic code presented needs a lawyer and them some to figure out. LET'S hope the document will be redrafted and made less complicated.

It appears there will be a two way contest for president of the SRC in the upcoming October 22nd election. The candidates are Eugene Chow and Kevin Ratcliff. Page 21 of this week's issue has information on the Brunswickan and CHSR presidential forum to be held Wednesday October 15th in the Blue Lounge of the SUB. Please plan to attend and hear what the candidates have to say. You have an important decision to make election day.

soundoff

The true facts ?

Sir:

As a UNB student I am writing concerning the recently introduced dissatisfied views regarding the president and comptroller of our SRC.

Being in that both comptroller Stephen Howes and rep Mike Hughson are friends of mine, I have been subjected to two strong opposing opinions.

Since I respect them both, I felt it necessary to research the facts before forming my own opinion. I spoke with both Mike Hughson and Stephen Howes, asked some questions of Bruns staff members and spoke to the Administrator Dave Campbell. In addition I attended the Sept. 29 meeting of our SRC.

Based on my findings I must say that rep Mike Hughson, rep Libbey rep Bannister and rep Lawrence presented facts that were actually conclusion drawn upon circumstance and inadequate research.

First of all, in past summers all the SRC presidents and comptrollers accepted jobs with the Physical Plant or otherwise. Be it known that in the past a provision was made such that it was assumed that the SRC Presidents and Comptrollers would receive the offer of a full time job at the Physical Plant.

In fact, the stated responsibility of the SRC President to his position during the four summer months is only to drop by the SRC office for a couple of hours a day to act as a signing officer, as only he or the Comptroller can sign cheques paid out by the SRC. The stated responsibilities of the Comptroller is nil. NOTHING. During the four summer months the comptroller is only expected to attend scheduled SRC meetings.

The SRC Presidents in past summers have been paid an honorarium of approx. \$125 weekly for the 2 to 3 hours daily in addition to holding a full time job. The comptroller has never been paid during the summer for their involvement with the University SRC, so obviously they have found it necessary to hold a full time summer job.

This summer, comptroller and President were faced with important decisions to make.

Perry Thorbourne, with only \$125 weekly was faced with supporting himself for four months and trying to save enough money to pay various University fees. An impossibility. So with good reason, Perry had to accept a summer job at the Physical Plant. Stephen Howes as all other comptrollers, accepted a full time summer job as well.

On March 31, the bookkeeper Doris Wu quit her job. Stephen attempted by working very late hours at night to familiarize himself with the job of bookkeeper so the books wouldn't be left unattended until a suitable replacement could be found.

On May 8 the administrator Ted Hudson quit. Stephen and Perry were now faced with two vacan-

cies to fill.

Rep Mike Hughson and rep Libbey at the SRC meeting presented these "facts." The Administrator is a full time position, the bookkeeper is an eight hour a week position. They then asked why Stephen and Perry quit their jobs at the Physical Plant to each replace these positions at full time. Their information about the bookkeeper were wrong. I went to the current administrator to verify Libbey and Hughson's information. The job as bookkeeper is a full time position. The administrator and I checked the payroll reports covering the last four years to prove this. Libbey's statement that the position of bookkeeper was only 8 hours per week was based on one instance. During the summer of 1979 Doris Wu took a 2 month period off approved by council to arrange some family business. During that two month period she came in a minimum of 8 hours a week, and she had an arrangement with the administrator to cover as much of regular office hours as possible. This is the only time the position of bookkeeper was handled on a part time basis.

So Perry and Stephen took over two full time positions at the expense of their physical plant jobs. It is only fair to expect that they be paid fairly for their positions. If the representatives were dissatisfied with the arrangements they should have checked the books more thoroughly. If they had, they would have observed that less money was paid out this summer as opposed to summers past.

It was indicated that "Regular office hours" were not kept by rep. Bannister who said she came up on three separate occasions only to find the office closed. The reason for this is quite valid. Since in the past office hours have been kept up by the administrator and bookkeeper, the president and comptroller were able to go to their various meetings without

closing office. Since neither administrator or bookkeeper were there this summer, Perry and Stephen had to close the office to attend meetings that were part of their responsibility as President and Comptroller. Rep Bannister said she would have been willing to come into the office occasionally to help Steve and Perry attend their meetings without closing office. Well, it's a bit late to say that on Sept. 29 when the summer is over. It's a case of constructive suggestion made much too late.

The new administrator Dave Campbell was hired on Aug. 13 and reported for his first work day on Aug. 18. He only had time to properly familiarize himself with the office before the regular academic year began.

A bookkeeper was hired for one week prior to September to help Stephen prepare the books for the annual audit. Not as some reps would have us believe, to clean up the mess.

The representatives wanting the removal of President Thorbourne and Comptroller Howes had points well taken. But the fact that their research was inadequate and unfairly presented created dissention among the council members and as rep. Doug Moore said, a major loss of credibility of the SRC.

From what research I have done I must say that I believe that Perry Thorbourne and Stephen Howes have done as best they could with an awkward situation. They should be patted on the back, not ripped apart.

Hopefully, the proceedings and opinions voiced will be well documented to help future SRC members.

And to the SRC body currently in office: try to work as a union of people working towards the benefit of the student body rather than individuals concerned only with your own interests.

Grace McGinley
1st year Science.

Not "vermin"

Dear Sir:

I regret that I must object most strenuously to comments made in a letter by Bryce Bowman, printed in your last issue. It saddens me to hear Mr. Bowman describing CHSR as an organization having as "much credibility as the National Enquirer" and the people working there as "vermin." Mr. Bowman in conversations we've had seemed eager to see the campus media used for improved communications between the Student Representative Council and the student body rather than as a deterrent to SRC activities.

Clearly Mr. Bowman has changed his opinion. I do not question the motives for this transformation. That is Mr. Bowman's affair. I

would be unwise to reject his comment completely for I do see some truth in them, extreme as they are. I believe there does exist a malicious undercurrent in the campus media, most frequently unintentional, sometimes not, but it is hardly the "Petty underworld" which Mr. Bowman envisages.

CHSR does not entertain a policy of attack towards the SRC. That is not my policy, nor, I think, is it the policy of the majority of station members. It has always been my policy to work with the SRC as much as possible. This does not mean CHSR will shirk its duty to report on SRC matters. Any reporting CHSR has done in this area, has, to the best of my knowledge,

continued p.9