

# SUB Board & SUB Holdings explained

Editor:

As is typical of the Brunswickan's regard for facts, you printed Downey's PAID advertisement in pages normally reserved for news stories, giving the impression that the statements were approved by the Bruns (no disclaimer was printed on the page). On an issue as important to the students as this, the Brunswickan has a responsibility to look into the statements made by Downey and to print the facts. This is an open letter to the students of U.N.B. and S.T.U. in an effort to help the Bruns along....

First, there was nothing to stabilize, and Downey had no authority to dismiss the SUB Board of Directors or the SUB Holdings Board of Directors in order to 'correct the situation'. Let us look at the past relationship between the University administration and the students. The SUB Board was established in 1962 by an agreement between the students of UNB, the students

of STU and the UNB Board of Governors. There were eight Directors, four from UNB, two from STU and two from Teacher's College - no administrators. Then we allowed administrators as observers, followed by administrators sitting on the Board, to administrators voting on the Board, and now administrators controlling the SUB.

Last March there was a difficulty with the commercial leases in the SUB. An appraisal done on the rents charged showed that they were far too low. The SUB Board also believed the commercial spaces should go to tender - as is the practice in the 'real world'. Leases must certainly be longer than one year, but tenders should be accepted to assure the SUB and the students that we are getting the best service and the best prices. The Board of Governors approved both the rent increases and the one year leases to allow for tenders.

There is no conflict between

the SUB Board and Campus Services Board. Both must have the same interests...those of the students. At other universities, students have proven that they are capable not only of running a student union but that they can also operate buildings, businesses and even shopping malls. The first paragraph in both the constitution of the Student Union (Campus Services) and SUB Board states that "the educational advancement of its members" is a prime objective. There is no better way to emphasize the theory taught at university than by actually having students as managers and staff of buildings and businesses.

There was a Director of the SUB when Downey 'dismissed' the SUB Board. Further, it is impossible for Downey to have sent a letter by five directors, since there were only nine directors on the Board with the five from UNB opposing the takeover. Downey is not

automatically empowered to act on behalf of the Board of Governors. There must be a motion made at a regularly constituted meeting of the Board of Governors that specifically allows Downey to interfere and appoint Trustees. No such authority was granted to Downey before he seized our building.

Downey froze the accounts of SUB Board and SUB Holdings Inc. The Bank of Montreal complied since Downey made reference to a motion made by the Board of Governors authorizing such an action. Again, there was no such motion. Further, SUB Holdings INCORPORATED is a legal entity which is only answerable to its shareholders and not to Downey or to the Board of Governors. Neither the signing officers nor the shareholders of the corporation have allowed the funds to be frozen.

The Board of Trustees is to be an interim body - until the summer, when all the students are gone (as is usual practice of the administration)? The Trustees include only totally pro-administration students, in fact one of them is on record believing that students "do not have the right to be heard".

The Trustee's meetings are closed and no minutes are available - part of SUB Board 'disarray' were no minutes? The new paint job (yet to be extended) is being ruined because there are no bulletin boards - the past director has confirmed that they are ready. The SUB Holdings van was needed only for liquor runs, but we are still paying for the van. There is no SUB business that requires a full-time van and the van is not even allowed to be used by student groups. Free phones were proposed by the SUB Board, but only pay phones are presently available.

The audit done by the University auditors revealed the following: 1. cash lying in the Director's office - this is the responsibility of the Director, not the Board, 2. unprepared billings for bar services - the Assistant Director, after having his keys taken away, was not allowed into the office to prepare said billings, 3. loans to the Federation of Youth - these loans were routine cash advances which were payable on terms announced to the whole Board, 4. bookkeeping practices which demonstrated an ignorance of accounting principles - the books have been regularly audited by a chartered accountant who has never informed the Board regarding any problems with the books.

The University is terribly worried about the business tenants at the SUB. Where is the concern for students, who

face increasing prices and decreasing services (the Smoke Shoppe has limited hours and prices that are above the national average for convenience stores)? The student-run store in the SUB is a most important step forward. Not only does the Exchange provide long hours, low prices and train students in business practices, but all extra funds go directly back to the students.

The sale of food items does not contravene Beaver Foods contract with the University. Beaver is given the right of first refusal - would they operate a store from 8 a.m. to 2 a.m. with such a low mark-up? The relevant clause goes on to state, "...the University's sole and absolute discretion over the initiation and cancellation of food services not presently covered by the existing contract." Campus Services has offered to negotiate with the SUB Trustees, and with Beaver Foods and Boyd's Vending.

Finally, Downey terminated the liquor services contract with SUB Holdings by firing the SUB Holdings Bar Services Manager, and then stating the SUB Director automatically became the Bar Services Manager. The official reasons for the dismissal of the manager were complaints about service and staffing problems. In fact, SUB Holdings Board received only letters of commendation regarding the service provided and was informed of only minor complaints by the Bar Service Manager - not enough cups at one event, for example. The staffing requirements were completed for the Queen's visit in advance of the time specified by the RCMP (for security checks). The Bar Services manager performed his duties well, considering he had been on the job for three months with no training from the preceding manager.

The time has come for students to be treated fairly and with respect. We call for the re-establishment of an all student SUB Board and SUB Holdings Board, the release of our assets, along with open meetings and minutes, and active participation by the students.

Members, SUB Board of Directors  
Members, SUB Holdings Board of Directors.

## Impeachment is a serious matter

Dear Editor,

RE: The impeachment trial of John Bosnitch

I attended the SRC - Council meeting on Tuesday that failed to impeach John Bosnitch. I sat through the whole six hour session, listened to both sides of the argument and reached the conclusions, that the majority of the councillors are both unaware of the constitutional provisions as well as their responsibilities as Councillors. Over and over the President was accused of not raising agenda for meetings here, clearly the councillors indicated their ignorance of simple meeting procedures. Raising an agenda is the total responsibility of the council.

Bring up an impeachment proceeding is a serious matter

and requires serious preparation by the councillors raising it. Clear violations of the constitution have to be stated and supported by documentary proof not a rumble of likes and dislikes. Norris, himself, a law student, failed to educate the supporters of the motion on how to take a prosecution case effectively! The only person in the group who attempted to bring some semblance of logic in the attack was Laaper. However, why had he not raised them in their previous meeting and then despite all his logical questions being answered effectively, he illogically voted for the motion. I was most disappointed by the out-going comptroller, Kirkpatrick, who was cynical, impatient, and rude. I

noted two absences by him during the proceeding which lasted about an hour each. His swipe at foreign students was unnecessary and silly. Does he think for one moment, that the foreign students are a bunch of nit wits who could be swayed in any direction by John Bosnitch? I say this to him, the majority of us are intelligent, responsible adults who can see through issues clearly and logically. I didn't need Kirkpatrick's rantings to be convinced. In the end, what started out as an attempt to discredit the president turned out to be a blessing for his re-election. The councillors looked like they were saying, "you have earned too much credit, your only fault is not sharing it with the rest of us, so we shall impeach you."

In conclusion, I would like to say that, let the events of last Tuesday be a lesson to future councillors. You are elected to the council to participate fully in its affairs, by proposing motions, agenda items and standing up for student rights. It's Bosnitch who has risked expulsion by standing up for students' rights, but instead of supporting him and asking the rest of the student membership to support him, you turn around and bring an impeachment motion. Who then derelict of duty? I say it is the present councillors and they are the ones who should have been facing an impeachment motion, not John Bosnitch.

Ahmed Ferej

