

# Larry Hansen explains...

By DAVID SEABROOK

The following is an interview with Larry Hansen, president of the UNB Student Union. In recent editorials in the Brunswickan, student council and Mr. Hansen in particular have been accused of muzzling former comptroller, Tony Tracy, and bowing to administration pressure with respect to the establishment of the Foundation. Most of Mr. Hansen's answers were taken directly from sworn affidavits.

## QUESTION: IS THE STUDENT UNION TRYING TO MUZZLE TONY TRACY'S DISSENTION?

Answer: It is not a question of dissent. By representing this issue as one of dissent is to cloud the issue. The real issue is whether Mr. Tracy has been acting in the best interests of the Student Union or if he is trying to undermine student government.

## QUESTION: HOW HAS MR. TRACY NOT ACTED IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STUDENT UNION?

Answer: There are essentially two areas here. Firstly, has to do with the audit and how Mr. Tracy could have facilitated his seating earlier.

After the audit, which came out after the election, it was learned that Mr. Tracy had received some student funds. There was no documentation to prove the expenditure had been authorized.

Council was faced with the problem of whether or not to seat him. We knew we, as the student government of UNB, had a credibility problem. We needed to show the community we were embarking on a fiscally responsible course.

We offered to seat Mr. Tracy when the matter was cleared up. He just had to meet with us and explain.

Instead of cooperating, he sues us. He begins proceedings for a court injunction that would shut us down the Union. That is an attempt to undermine the Student Union. All he had to do was meet with us.

*"Now things are stable and we're... reworking the role of the employed staff."*

Secondly, was the issue of the CHSR board of directors. The Student Union, our Union, appointed two people to the CHSR board. At a meeting on Nov. 29, 1986, Mr. Tracy improperly allowed two false appointees to assume those seats on the board.

This seating, with Mr. Tracy's full knowledge that these people were improper, was not in the best interests of the Student Union.

There was also a second CHSR board of directors meeting on December 15. Mr. Tracy voted not to recognize the student government to which he'd been elected in October. This was a recorded vote.

At a subsequent meeting, Mr. Tracy was in possession of the minutes and did not object to anything in them when they were presented.

This is how he has attempted to undermine the Student Union.

## QUESTION: WHY WAS MR. TRACY KEPT FROM OFFICE BY COUNCIL OVER \$98?

Answer: Council said they would seat him when the unauthorized funds were explained. He was asked publicly to

meet with the Student Union administrative director to clear the issue up.

If he had met with us the next day, he would have been seated.

At a meeting on Nov. 24, 1986, Mr.

Tracy's case, all specifics to the charges were brought out at Monday's inquiry and have also been borne out in this interview.



*"...money must go to the Foundation to be disbursed as students see fit. That's never happened before."*

photo by Jamie Aitken

Tracy was asked if he had seen the administrative director. He replied that he did not feel it was necessary.

There was a meeting set but Mr. Tracy did not show up. Although Mr. Tracy feels differently, he was adequately informed of that meeting.

On Dec. 3, I received a hand-delivered letter from Mr. Tracy's solicitor. He threatened legal action. Instead of cooperating and meeting with us, we get a notice of being sued.

Eventually, when he did meet with us, he was seated at the subsequent council meeting.

## QUESTION: WHY WERE THERE NO SPECIFIC CHARGES AGAINST MR. ANDRE FAUST OR MR. TRACY?

Answer: In both cases, council would have been in a libelous position had we produced specifications on the charges.

We're not demanding testimony under oath. According to Robert's Rules of Order, the body "has no right to go beyond what is necessary for self-protection and publish the charges against a member... The moral conviction of the truth of the charge is all that is necessary, in an ecclesiastical or other deliberate body, to find the accused guilty of the charges."

Also, in Mr. Faust's case, the charges were "gross incompetence" and "actions unbecoming to the station director" on recommendation of the CHSR executive's recommendation.

He was advised that the issue would be fully discussed at the council meeting of January 12, 1987. He was told he could present all evidence on his behalf. He did not appear.

Council again said they were willing to meet and set a date two weeks later to which Mr. Faust agreed to be pre-

sent and respond in writing.

He did not come and instead Mr. Tracy read a profane letter on his behalf which only made accusations and did not respond to the charges.

Council decided to sustain the charges of the CHSR executive. In Mr.

## QUESTION: DOES THE FOUNDATION FOR STUDENTS REPRESENT CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS BY THE ADMINISTRATION?

Answer: No. The Foundation's job is to ensure that students get proper accountability of student funds.

## QUESTION: DID THE ADMINISTRATION INITIATE THE IDEA OF THE FOUNDATION?

Answer: No, the idea came from the S.U. The administration said they had concerns but we were not forced into it. The Foundation also protects students and their student government against legal claims. The Foundation protects funds specifically. All S.U. assets remain with the S.U.

## QUESTION: IS CONCERN LEGITIMATE THAT THE FOUNDATION, THROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR BRIAN WALSH, HAD EXERTED CONTROL OVER STUDENT AFFAIRS OUTSIDE THE ACCOUNTING AREA. (I.E. YEARBOOK, THE 1986-87 BUDGETS, AND THE STUDENT DIRECTORY)?

Answer: Mr. Walsh did an exemplary job here. He arrived at a time when the S.U. was in chaos and he did help us get a number of projects started. It was not a matter of too much power.

Now things are stable and we're completing the process of restructuring by reworking the role of the employed staff. What we essentially need are clerks and bookkeepers and the job of administering the S.U. is, and will continue to be, the job of students.

## QUESTION: WHY DOES THE ADMINISTRATION GET TWO REPRESENTATIVES ON THE FOUNDATION?

Answer: The administration is ultimately responsible for those funds, no matter how you look at it. They collect the student fees so they have a trust or banker-type relationship with the students to ensure accountability.

In the past, the administration could at any time say they were not going to turn over the money. Now, the contract stipulates that the money must go to the foundation to be disbursed as

when funds weren't available. We hired a third person as secretary to replace the S.U. secretary now in charge of accounting.

We did this all within the budget guidelines for salaries as approved by council. Council was informed that there would be restructuring of the offices and they have the terms of reference for the new positions.

## QUESTION: WHAT AUTHORITY WILL THESE PEOPLE HAVE?

Answer: They are clerks in accounting, receptionists and secretaries. There is

*"The Foundation also protects students against legal claims."*

students see fit. That's never happened before. The administration has two votes on the Foundation and students are given three.

## QUESTION: WHY DOES THE FOUNDATION GET A VETO OVER SU BUDGETS?

Answer: To prevent what happened last year from happening again: that is, over-expenditure. What it boils down to is that the Foundation has no business as to where the money goes but they have every right to see that the money goes where we say it should go.

It is a trust relationship. The duty of the Foundation is enumerated and is to ensure adequate control of in an accounting sense, to make sure there are adequate records.

We were \$150,000 in debt. The loan creates a safeguard. There has to be a mechanism to account for those funds. If it doesn't work for students, we'll try something else.

## QUESTION: HOW WAS IT THAT TWO NEW STAFF WERE HIRED WITHOUT COUNCIL'S APPROVAL?

Answer: The executive committee of council is charged with the general management of the S.U. and when Mr. Walsh left, we promoted the S.U. secretary to take care of accounting. We then hired a bookkeeper that was originally going to be hired in the fall

no administration outside of that. That is the job of the students. If they are approved budget items, they will be processed. If an interpretation of the budget is necessary, it will be reviewed by the finance committee. If there are any doubts, the finance committee will decide. Nobody else.

## QUESTION: WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO ACCUSATIONS THAT THE COUNCIL USES "MADE-AS-YOU-GO BYLAWS"?

Answer: Firstly, we stated after the election that there would be a method of removal from office in response to Mr. Bosnitch's accusations that we needed a method of removal to be democratic.

Secondly, during our whole term the bylaws are under revision. That removal bylaw was part of a package. It was not in any way a response to Mr. Tracy.

Likewise, the change of the comptroller to a secondary signing officer was recommended by our auditor, John Weatherhead; our administrative director, Brian Walsh; and the constitutional committee before the Oct 22 elections. The change was not directed at Mr. Tracy or any other individual. This has been sworn in affidavits.

There is no attempt to play tricks with Mr. Tracy. We don't spend 24 hours a day thinking up ways to get him. We are trying to get things back on track for the students.

Weekend  
Weather  
with  
Wicked  
Wanda

Bundle up Frederictonians because this cold weather we've been enduring isn't over yet and it's going to be a cold weekend.

The Fredericton weather office is calling for snow today and temperatures that range from -10 to -7. Saturday and Sunday are going to be mostly sunny with colder than normal temperatures. What can be a better excuse to snuggle up to that someone special on Valentine's Day?