

soundoff

Paton case lacked justice

Dear Editor:

Has authoritarianism become the way of dealing with all and any problems on the campus. It would appear so judging from the recent events on campus. Aside from the problems encountered by the SUB Board we now see how the administration deals with the "littleman". I am referring to the case of Blake Paton who was very forcefully removed from the "Rough Trade" concert. Mr. Paton was attempting to watch the concert, along with 500 other people including myself, when the crowd was told to sit down. The events which occurred after were witnessed by myself and many other people.

Mr. Paton, and approximately 20 other people, stood up to avoid the uncomfortableness of the floor. A CP started yelling at the crowd to sit down, and when he was ignored, forced his way over to Mr.

Paton, who was standing in the front row. They proceeded to have an animated concert argument, and although I didn't hear what was said, Mr. Paton pointed to the other 20 people repeatedly. The C.P. then left and returned with another who, after talking for a few seconds, grabbed Mr. Paton and tried to haul him out. Mr. Paton broke free and once again turned his attention to the stage. The C.P.'s left and returned with a third. They approached Mr. Paton, two C.P.'s pinning his arms and the third applying a choke hold. They carried him out as he struggled and, although I didn't see what happened next, it is reported Mr. Paton passed out from being choked and when he awoke he saw a C.P.'s fist poised over his face with the C.P. sitting on his chest. Unfortunately, it is impossible to get the C.P.'s side of this as they refuse to talk to any mere students about the incident.

The C.P.'s then returned to the concert and proceeded to do absolutely nothing to the other 20 people who remained standing. In fact, at no time did they do anything to these people. The rest of the events, the complaint and the trail, have been reported in the *Brunswickian*.

There are many questions which remain unanswered in this case. Why did the C.P.'s single out Mr. Paton from the approximately 20 people standing? Perhaps it was to set an example and intimidate the others into sitting down. If so, why did

they not take some other action against the remaining standees? Maybe they had already had their fun. Now we get to the trial and the real example of a cover up. Mr. Paton lodged a complaint against the C.P.'s and was quickly charged with the obstruction of a C.P.. The C.P.'s quickly asked the Board of Deans to hear the case, denying the defendant of his basic right to tried before his peers. The Board of Deans then proceeded to hear the C.P.'s testimony and refused to hear testimony from Mr. Paton's witnesses. They

then proceeded to find Mr. Paton guilty, hard not to do when you have only heard one side of the story.

The total lack of justice in this case sets a dangerous precedent for future cases. Whenever the C.P.'s get involved in a questionable case they can just refuse comment and ask that the Board of Deans take up the case. The trial is completed silently and with no embarrassment to the administration or the C.P.'s. Meanwhile, the defendant is stripped of his civil rights and denied a fair trial.

David Leblanc

Paton judgement fair

Dear Editor:

RE: March 23 Bruns, pg. 3.
News: Proper Force.....

Over the past few months, I have heard many comments on Mr. Paton's removal from the "Rough Trade" concert. I would like to comment on these events as I feel this whole affair has gotten out of hand.

Like many others, I agree this concert was not held in an ideal location; floor

space was limited and viewability was negligible. This last problem was hurdled by getting those in front of the stage to sit down, myself among them. There were a few "rowdies" in the crowd, including Mr. Paton. Several people stood up but were told by the C.P.'s to sit down. Most complied but Mr. Paton refused. This led to the events covered in your article.

I feel Mr. Paton got all he deserved, as this type of ir-

responsible immaturity infringes upon others' enjoyment of this type of event. I believe the C.P.'s involved were acting in the public's best interest and not on some power trip. It sounds as if Mr. Paton caused them plenty of trouble when they tried to do their job.

Mr. Paton should have reviewed his own actions of that evening before getting on his high horse.

Bill Hamilton

How is blanket license different

Dear Editor:

I wish you would give me space in your column, so I can present arguments, not just against the proposed 10% administration fee hike, but also against the existence of the administration fee at all.

After almost one academic year in operation, I must ask does the present Blanket License system differ from the previous system used in the residence system? To answer this question I must look first at the two areas with the most changes, acquisition of liquor and control of the sale of liquor to underage patrons. The change is acquisition of liquor was from a system using "beer reps" or personal cars to acquire a "controlled" amount of liquor (that issued in a special occasion permit) to a system where an unlimited amount of liquor is brought to us. The new system is simply an in-

ventory system that does neither control amount of liquor sold or to whom it is sold to. The control of sale of liquor (that is preventing underage drinking) is done by licensed bartenders who are kept in check by the C.P.'s and the occasional random check by a staff member from Sub Holdings Inc. Therefore I wonder why we must pay for an inventory system that just simply increases the unit cost of liquor. Wouldn't it be far simpler to let us get the liquor ourselves and have the C.P.'s responsible for making sure the beer is sold only to patrons 19 years of age and over, since we already have to hire a minimum of 5 C.P.'s to supervise our residence socials anyway, or hire a part time SUB Staff member to make random checks of all bars in residence having socials.

Kirby B. Gesner, BBA V
Bridges House

Dear Editor:

In response to John Bosnitch's letter in last week's *Brunswickian*, in which he stated that my letter of March 16 was "misleading", I would like to make clear a few points:

FACT: Nowhere in the letter did I make reference to a "powerful" group of people who represented a small percentage of UNB Students. In no way do I think this group of people is powerful.

FACT: SUB Holdings Inc. incurred losses of \$2366.00 over a six month period. It was recommended that the 8 per cent administrative charge be raised to 18 per cent in an attempt to prevent further losses, which is

the legal duty of the corporation.

FACT: Never in the discussion previous to the liquor price increase did I speak with UNB Vice-President J. F. O'Sullivan. It was totally a decision of the Board of Directors of SUB Holdings Inc.

FACT: At the time of the preparation of the new catering tender for food service at UNB, there was no proposal from any group proposing the the contract be divided among more than one contractor. That has now been changed and the tenderers have been asked to submit a bid with this in mind.

FACT: When confronted with the 73 percent YES vote

for a student-owned store I did respond that it was nonsense because with 13 percent of the total student population voting, 73 percent of that amounts to approximately 520 people, less than 10 percent of the total student population.

In response to Mr. Bosnitch's comment pertaining to my service on the SUB Board of Directors, I consider that to be just one man's opinion.

Sincerely,
Brent H. Bartley
Former SUB Board Chairman

Soundoff
continued
page 9