

Blood and Thunder

To SRC: put away the mud-slinging

Dear Sir:

When I wrote this letter I had just returned from an SRC meeting (Monday, March 4, 1985). The meeting, which is meant to get business done, seems to have become a weekly obligation that some councillors, it appears would rather not have. This is not a reflection on any one individual but rather, an observation of the appearance of the state of the current SRC. I am really glad that CHSR was unable to broadcast the meeting for it was a disgrace, although, in about three and one half hours of non-stop haggling, two or three things did get done. The Malaysian students finally got money, apparently promised to them by the previous administration, for a cultural night. There were several people named to commissions and the two polling stations for the March 13th election were decided on. The rest of the time was spent giving accusations and insults back and forth. We as students have elected the members of the SRC and therefore when the question: "why did the BIG BAD ADMINISTRATION take the SUB away from us?", is asked, a brief look at past SRC meetings gives us a very clear answer.

I have been sitting quietly in the gallery for the past several sessions and I have come to the conclusion that; if the administration ever monitored SRC meetings they would never give the SUB back. It is very evident that we as a Student Union, now, cannot run very smoothly at all. This is the key to getting the SUB back, and if councillors want the SUB back badly, they had better leave the cheap shots, personal dislikes and other trivial differences outside SRC doors.

The administration, true, does not own the SUB but they have the ultimate say in what happens in that building. What is happening in the SRC now certainly cannot be conducive to giving the SUB back to us. There are those people that say "Well, how can we demonstrate that students can run a business?". The answer is obvious: "Run the SRC efficiently and by the rules YOU set." Once we have shown that we can run a governing body smoothly, I am sure the administration will again help us learn to run a little larger entity. The fact remains, and it should be clear from the previous few sentences, that we are students at university to learn. The administration is here to help us learn, and, if

we fail, to come to our rescue as they see best. Think we will not get the SUB back? I do not think so. The administration now has another thing to deal with. Again if a sound and qualified person was to approach the administration and say: "Hi, I'll take care of the SUB's day-to-day affairs for next to nothing." I am sure the administration would be happy to let us have it. It would be silly to spend more when there is no need to.

Okay, so what do I base the observation that SRC cannot run itself on? There are several points, not the least of which is the glaring lack, of leadership from the President. For the past few sessions I have watched him do next to nothing at the meetings but on Monday he did do something. He decided that it was time to play musical offices; however nobody else was informed. This not only disrupted a certain V.P.'s work when the desk he was working at (in his office) was cleared off by the President. But, it was in direct conflict with a standing executive motion. The President's action was a bad breach of ethics and trust which was inexcusable. It cannot have done anything to heighten the affect V.P.'s opinion of him, and WE THE STUDENTS need our V.P.'s and Presidents to get along if anything productive is to be done. I feel that another such blatant disregard for Council motions would be cause to call for the President's resignation. Another point is the apparent lack of communication between V.P.'s. On Monday we had one V.P. ask another why his commission was looking into certain aspects of the university, when perhaps they were outside his scope. The inquiry itself is fine but the querying V.P. was under the impression that these were his responsibility. We do not need duplication of commission responsibilities; we have quite enough to do as it is.

The above are but a few points to illustrate an important point. This is that bad feeling, lack of communication, snide remarks, and the like serve to aggravate people and prolong debate on issues. This is an important idea. Lower down on the meetings agenda has to wait one, two or five weeks for a debate as those tired of being attacked or tired of listening to attacks break quorum. The specific item I am referring to is a referendum on the residence system, mandatory retirement for faculty and fee hikes for students. This was put on the agenda 5 weeks ago. It was brought up for debate 9 days before it was to be included on the ballot in the election. Wonder why students

never get much notice of the referendum questions? Probably not anymore. At any rate, the bare minimum for quorum decided that the questions could be better put to students in a different manner. The decision to do this differently is fine but there is now no time to move on this issue thus the students, you and I, have been robbed of input into the residence system yet again.

So, am I against the SRC concept. No! I am all for a working Student Representative Council and for student rights. I am just saying that if we are to make true progress, then for God's sake put away the mid-slinging and political backstabbing and get the SRC moving. I'm sorry if I stepped on toes but I'll be part of this and I'd like to be able say we made an honest effort.

Yours truly,
Allan J. MacDonald

Senator does not want ex-officio status

Dear Editor:

I am a Student Senator, and therefore an ex-officio member of the SRC.

At Monday night's meeting of the S.R.C. there was a motion to repeal the ex-officio status of Student Senators and Student Governors. Although we have no vote, 4 of the 6 student senators supported this motion. This is probably the first time that a motion to remove someone from council has been supported by those members of council being removed.

During the debate, it was suggested that the Student Senators were afraid of the S.R.C. This is not true. The student senators have attended some S.R.C. meetings, and attempted to have some input on Senate matters. But these senators have had very little say on the matter because most councillors are not concerned with Senate matters.

Also, in the debate, I stated that I would never feel accountable to the S.R.C. This was suggested as a slip of the tongue on my part. However, I stand by my statement, because I feel I am accountable to the students. Some of those students I am accountable to, have suggested to me that the S.R.C serves no purpose. I may not agree with this decision, but I have to listen to these students, as I am their representative on Senate. Therefore should I be accountable to S.R.C. or the students who have elected me?

In addition, when I was elected to Senate, there was no requirement that I had to be accountable to the S.R.C. I am

elected to serve the interests of students on Senate. This does not always require me to introduce motions, but that I should vote on the motions as may be best for students.

If the S.R.C. wants to keep in touch with the Senate, then the Academic Commission could always report to S.R.C. on the proceedings of Senate meetings.

Yours truly,
Chris Ward
Student Senator

Arts Rep Candidate: Paul Higgins

Dear Editor:

My name is Paul Higgins, and I am in my second year at UNB. I am running as a candidate for the vacant Arts' seat. I participate in the Arts Undergraduate Society, so I have some background in the problems faced by Arts students and by Arts organizations.

I believe in the communication system whereby the Arts representatives relay messages back and forth between the Student Council and the department clubs. I pushed it the last time I was up for election, and I still think it is a good system. If I get into office, I will try to implement it. I don't possess limitless wisdom, so as Arts representative, I would need your input and criticism. If I should get elected, you, the electorate, should make sure I do what I promise and that I do what is in your best interest.

Paul Higgins

Arts Rep Candidate: Helena Rojas

Dear Sir:

The keys for a good council are cooperation and communication, both of which seem to be lacking in the present council, especially in its executive.

The idea of a more unified student government is prevalent in my mind; when fighting for students and their rights. The main opponent should never be other students - that in itself defeats the purpose of a student government.

Having had the opportunity to not only watch council at work, but also to ask them to do some work, it is indeed clear to me that a strong voice is needed on council. I have been such a voice even while off council, but in order to be more effective, to be able to defend the students' rights to have a Yearbook, to have

cultural, educational, and recreational events, and a stronger voice in the university community, I need your vote for a voice in council.

Helena Rojas
Arts Rep

More from "Just M"

I meant my letter to be taken at face value. There really wasn't a deep meaning behind it like the critic found

The point was, and still is, that I can't understand why women stay with creeps! I really didn't expect anyone to get so upset. Ah hindsight! I'm not going to argue about having the right to hit someone else nor am I going to take any psychology courses. Everyone is so intent on analysing everything and reding between the lines that they miss the forest through the trees.

Thanks to Mr. Colwell who did see and read exactly what I wrote. One smart cookie thee, we know where the crumbs are don't we.

Just M.

Input on Ombudsman wanted

Dear Sir:

A small sub-committee of the Senate Academic Policy and Procedures Committee has been established to examine information, previous reports and recommendations on the proposal for a University ombudsman. We have been asked to consider and report on the need, role to be performed and scope of responsibility of an ombudsman.

We have already met with a number of groups and individuals who have given us advice; however, to ensure as wide an expression of views as possible we would encourage anyone, who may wish, to make a written submission to the secretary, Dr. J. Woodfield. It would be helpful to hear additional views on perceived need, on the role and scope of a University ombudsman and on the nature of actual or potential problems which might require or benefit from the service of an ombudsman on campus.

The sub-committee consists of Ms. Suzanne Currie, Mr. Brian Ingram, Professor A.R.A. Taylor (Chairman) and Professor J. Woodfield (Secretary).

Please respond by March 15, 1985!

Thank you,
A.R.A. Taylor