

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007

ASUM Student Government

---

11-12-1975

### Documents from the November 12, 1975 meeting of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM)

University of Montana--Missoula. Associated Students

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum>

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

University of Montana--Missoula. Associated Students, "Documents from the November 12, 1975 meeting of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM)" (1975). *ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007*. 755.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum/755>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the ASUM Student Government at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

consisting of 2 students from each of the student bodies of EMU, UQM and MSU, if each chooses to participate equally on a financial basis

#### PROPOSAL

I. An ad hoc committee be formed, ~~having one student member from each college and university, wishing to participate.~~ Each member will be appointed by the student body president of that unit.

The ultimate goal of this committee would be to make available to the student governments at each college and university the purchase of a liquor license and beer permit. The procedure the committee will follow is:

- 1) retain a qualified lawyer to a) compile all existing data, concerning the liquor on campus issue that has been done over the past five years at each campus, and b) assess the problems that are "blocking the road" to the purchase of beer and liquor licenses (the theory here being that the problems are similar in nature to all the campuses in the University system.), c) come up with solutions to overcome the problems blocking the road, d) to report to the committee on what action should be taken to attain the goal.
- 2) split the cost of retaining a lawyer equally among the colleges and universities participating on the committee.
- 3) inform the respective student governments of the results of the committee. Committee members may have as many assistants as necessary to handle the administrative details.
- 4) choose a chairman from among the members of the committee. The chairman's school will be the headquarters of this committee.

PRESENTED BY: Dan Cobb, Student Union Board Chairman

DATE: November 12, 1975

ACTION TAKEN:



Date: November 5, 1975

To: Pam Ward, Legal Services Committee Chairperson

From: John T. Nockleby

Re: Legal assistance for ASUM

As we've discussed previously, ASUM needs primarily two types of legal assistance. The first is of the sort expressed by former ASUM President, Garry South to Mike Wisocki, who was doing legal research for ASUM. The second involves legal assistance to individual members of the association.

To add to South's memo (attached herewith), I suggest two more areas of recent need for legal assistance. Since ASUM, Central Board, the Montana Kaimin, and Publications Board together with a former editor are currently defendants in a \$102,000 lawsuit, we obviously have retained expensive legal assistance. Before the matter is settled, I expect ASUM to be liable for \$15,000 legal fees, plus whatever, if any, damages are assessed, plus any further action on the part of the former editor to recover her costs. Possibly as a part of your legal services research you might wish to pursue ways we might limit or exempt certain officials from liability in certain actions representing the entire association. You could check into liability insurance for the Kaimin staff plus Central Board members, or for the entire association and anyone acting in behalf of it. You may wish to examine incorporation of ASUM, and separate incorporation of Publications Board, in order to prevent ASUM the liability involved in the current libel suit. An examination of various agency relationships (e.g. Student Action Center, Publications Board, the Montana Kaimin, and Program Council) to ASUM and Central Board might be in order as well.

Each of the above agencies needs and avails itself of legal assistance. Undocumented in South's memo, the SAC could utilize legal help on a daily basis on various issues ranging from pollution problems to FAIR (rate structure proposed changes.) Student government is rapidly becoming more complex. The Montana Student Lobby consulted at least two attorneys in drawing up HB657 dealing with the student's role in collective bargaining. And now that we have the law, if collective bargaining ever does come to UM, most certainly ASUM will need legal advice on how best to include clauses that protect student rights. If we have a beef with enforcement of such a contract, having an attorney to plead our case would certainly benefit us.

Hardly a week goes by that I don't think of some new or revised legal question that we need expert counsel on. If Central Board approves a resolution tomorrow asking the Federal Communications Commission to review our complaint on KYLT's coverage of the Intercollegiate Football debate, possibly legal counsel will have to be obtained to argue our case later.



If we had access to legal help now, before even bringing the issue to the Board, I would have asked our counsel to advise us on the merits of our complaint.

What if the Regents decide to impose a mandatory earmarked athletic fee on UM students? I believe most students would vehemently oppose such an action, and we ought to have legal counsel help us determine which of a list of alternatives we should choose. Should we call a general faculty-student strike? Should we sue the Regents? Should we try to persuade President Bowers not to collect the fee, though he may have permission to do so? Should we go to the legislature to attempt to overturn the decision? Should we boycott all athletic contests? Only an expert could possibly advise us which course would be most advantageous.

A few months ago a graduate student came to Central Board to ask for financial assistance to forestall what he termed an IRS "test case" for taxing graduate students income derived from teaching assistantships. Although Central Board approved the allocation, if the knowledge had gotten out that we were assisting individuals in such a manner, we may have been besotted with such requests. As it were, the fellow apparently won his case so everything turned out OK. But questions remain: Should ASUM have helped this solitary fellow with his tax problems? Was the case in fact a "test case" for all graduate T.A.'s? Could we have been sued by a disgruntled underclassman by spending "student" (or "state") money on behalf of a private individual? By helping this fellow, were we obligating ourselves to help all in similar circumstances, e.g., an individual evicted under Missoula's City Council interpretation of the single family zoning ordinance claiming "test case"? The legal questions are endless.

Recently at the National Conference on Student Legal Rights I was discussing student services with a former student body president of one of the CUNY units, who was serving as workshop leader. During his term, his student government set up numerous student services in their SUB including a health food coop, a bank, a student travel service, and I believe a pub, among others. He continually emphasized that if they had not set up a legal services at the beginning of his term, they would have been unable to set up any of the other services. So you now may understand part of my enthusiasm for access to legal assistance. The benefits could be enormous and the costs, if done right, could be minimal.

The second type of legal services I would like you to explore involves individual members of ASUM. I can document only personal needs, or those of my friends, so rather than give a list of the various sorts of legal problems a student might encounter, let me reluctantly generalize that the greatest need individual students have is not for representation in legal actions, but rather for



occasional counsel on personal problems ranging from "Do I have a case?" to tax law to "Can I beat this drug rap?" to simply finding out about a technical point in the law. In short, advice on whether to pursue a legal matter, or how to pursue it, or whether one should hire an attorney is needed.

Though the benefits of a full-scale legal services program may be enormous, over a four-year period students are simply unable to avail themselves of the full benefits such a program could provide. Thus at a relatively low cost we ought to be able to provide great service to many students in terms of initial legal counsel. I urge you to explore both the need and the feasibility of such a program.

Finally, I urge you with all due dispatch to utilize the talent of the Law School. Not many institutions are fortunate to have such a broad range of expertise "just sitting there". I wouldn't expect the Law School to leap to our aid, but in light of the recent legislation allowing law students under certain circumstances to counsel clients, I believe we should advantage ourselves of the proximity of such latent talent. A project of mutual benefit could be worked out in at least two fashions:

1. In their legal writing course, several students have complained that the questions they deal with are either moot or have little practical relevance. ASUM and the various agencies involved therewith might be able to strike an agreement whereby we'd regularly provide legal questions we'd like some research on. Obviously, such responses as we'd get should be used for preliminary groundwork, but I believe 90% of our legal questions would thereby require no further legal aid.
2. In counseling individual students, many prospective lawyers attending law school have indicated interest in gaining practical experience. In light of the new law you might be very successful in obtaining responses from various groups within the law school. If you approach them, I urge you to be very well prepared on how such programs would benefit them individually as well as the entire school.

Though I suspect I've given you more than you wanted, I hope you're able to pursue all the problems I've delineated. Your efforts are very important and must be completed as shortly as possible. If we move quickly with the Law School idea, we could have legal services as early as Winter Quarter. So I urge you to move with dispatch.



Finally, as you probably were not aware until now how important your committee is in deciding future direction of ASUM student government, I suggest that you personally draw up an omnibus course for yourself in Political Science, Interpersonal Communication or Sociology so I won't feel so guilty about exhorting you to move with such haste! It's a big job but the major work, if completed in a month or two, I'm convinced will prove to be one of the lasting and real contributions to improving student welfare this year. Best of luck.

Encls.

cc: Central Board members  
Mike McGinley, ASUM Accountant  
Legal Services Committee Members



TO: Mike Wisocki, Legal Services Researcher

FROM: Garry South, ASUM President

RE: ASUM legal problems

DATE: 14 March 1974

As per our conversation of last week, I herewith submit to you a listing of the many legal areas in which ASUM, or one of its units, has obtained or could utilize professional legal services.

First of all, the legality of ASUM itself and therefore any of its actions is constantly under question. Many questions have arisen in the past with respect to ASUM's legal liability for its actions, or for the actions of groups which receive ASUM funding. We have frequently consulted an attorney relative to such matters.

Just recently, as you know, the legality of an ASUM allocation (to the student Committee to Un-elect the President), was questioned by the University administration, and was subsequently ruled illegal by the Attorney General. Without the assistance of student legal services, we have been forced in this matter to rely upon other agencies for legal assistance, namely the Board of Regents, the office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, and several attorneys who are close enough to the ASUM operation to give us speedy bits of free advice. In 1969, you will recall, ASUM's contribution to the Project 19 fund was questioned and was also ruled illegal by the Attorney General.

The problem involved in any legal matter which strikes so basically at the heart of the whole ASUM operation is two-fold. First, when we engage an attorney or firm on a specific legal problem, such attorney or firm is usually not familiar enough with ASUM's unique legal standing to be able to give the kind of knowledgeable, competent legal assistance that they can furnish to a client of long standing. Second, we cannot afford to put an attorney or firm on retainer using ASUM general fund monies in view of our present funding commitments to student groups. Many times when official problems arise we do not have adequate money left in our special allocations fund to finance the kind of legal work that we need.



Thus, I firmly believe that ASUM has a demonstrated need for an on-going student legal services with a full-time attorney and a good research staff. The primary need is to adequately protect our very existence and the legitimacy of our actions, and to be able to cope adequately with the legal agencies (i.e., the Attorney General's office, the County Attorney's office, and law firms) retained by individuals and agencies in conflict with ASUM. Our needs become ever more acute as we move into more and more political activities--such as lobbying, etc.--to protect the interests of our constituency.

In addition, there are many special projects that ASUM undertakes for which we have retained counsel in the past, or for which we would make use of legal services if they were available. These include such wide-ranging activities as negotiating the contract for the lobbyist for the Montana Student Lobby, to the comprehensive legal brief that was done for us on the effect of the sale of liquor and beer in the University Center. In the past, legal counsel has been obtained on such matters as determining the legality of certain actions by the ASUM officers, determining the legal advantages and disadvantages of incorporating ASUM, and challenging certain actions or policies of the ASUM administration. In this last category, we recently challenged the UM administration's policy on withholding student documents for the non-payment of parking fines, and were recently upheld in our position by a bill passed by the state Legislature.

Also, on a day-to-day basis, the ASUM president and business manager have frequent need for access to legal counsel on small matters ranging from determining what sections of the Revised Codes of Montana might apply to a certain question, to whether or not a certain written statement might be considered libelous in the opinion of the attorney.

The director of Program Council also informs me that the Council makes many uses of legal advice in their operation, which handles hundreds of thousands of dollars over the course of the year. They frequently consult with legal counsel in the area of contract negotiations, which are carried on almost constantly between the Council, promoters, and agents, throughout the year. Generally, they retain one attorney on an hourly basis for these purposes, so that he becomes familiar with the contract needs of Program Council.

In addition, Program Council has in the past retained counsel for such matters as determining liability for any riots or disturbances at concerts, injuries caused by thrown or broken objects, and the legality of searches for alcoholic beverages at Program Council events. Just recently, legal counsel was retained to determine the liability of the director as signer of contracts in light of the abolition of sovereign immunity in the new state constitution.



As I think you can appreciate, ASUM--counting all of its subsidiary activities and agencies--is nearly a million dollar operation. Our legal needs would seem to demand professional legal services just as a matter of good business practice. The ad hoc, haphazard manner in which legal counsel has been retained in the past--jumping from firm to firm, from attorney to attorney-- has proved to be neither acceptable nor very fruitful. Obviously, we do not have the desired continuity in this type of situation. And it has been rather expensive considering the quality and force of action that ASUM's relatively minor legal problems usually received from overloaded "prestige" law firms.

So given the rather fragile legal status of ASUM itself, and the constant need for legal counsel on one matter or another in the regular operation of the organization, I think that it is obvious that we need ready access to professional legal services. Perhaps such services could be funded by a special student fee, much like the current Student Health Service fee.

As an additional note, I would point out that the University of Montana student body is, in actuality a diverse community of over 8,200 persons. Yet, we have no legal counsel to represent us or to work on our specific needs. This has many times meant that ASUM has provided funds for legal advice to individual members of the student body on matters which were personal, and did not relate to the operation of ASUM. This situation could be corrected and the need adequately met by the institution of a full-time student legal services much like the Student Health Service now caters to the health needs of the individual student.

I hope that this information will prove helpful to you and look forward to receiving your draft proposal.



The Ad Hoc Library Committee has investigated the major areas of student concern pertaining to the Library and makes the following observations and recommendations.

1) THE BUILDING: There exists no possibility that funds will become available for new chairs, lounge furniture for the recreational reading area, and for general completion of the building until the next session of the Legislature in 1977. The only action this committee and the students can take is to begin to put pressure on the Administration, Regents, and legislators to set aside funds for completion of our Library facility. This committee will do so and we urge all students, CB members, and related committees, such as Campus Development, to make known their desire for a completed facility.

2) INTERIOR ATMOSPHERE: More widespread use of artwork, sculpture, wall hangings, and plants has been delayed by the graphics problem. The graphics must be decided upon by this coming June so more visual aesthetics can be expected soon. The leftover plants from the tropical plant sale were given to the Library and will be put out as soon as pots are obtained. Also a wall sculpture will soon be put up on second level. This is a process that can best be left to the Dan and Library staff to move on as they see fit.

3) LIBRARY HOURS: As with the building, funds are not available to extend hours and maintain the same levels of service. The main dilemma will be maintaining present hours. This has been accomplished this quarter through a special allocation from the Administration and by juggling internal accounts. Additional funds will be needed each quarter so continual pressure must be applied.

4) ACADEMIC QUALITY BOOKS: The book fund allocation to the Schools and Colleges is exactly the same as last year's allocation of \$52,489. Average book prices, however, have risen by 10% during the past year. We investigated to see if the Alumni Book Fund Drive could be expanded. We found that the Alumni Association has discontinued this project with other Alumni fund raising projects. The Alumni suggested that the most effective means whereby the students could raise funds would be a mailing to student parents. This was done in 1971-1972 and netted about \$10,000. The committee has decided to pursue this course of action as the only tangible, short run action open to the students.

November 12, 1975

Submitted by: Kevin Strobel, Chairman  
Ed Beaudette  
Ann Steffens  
Paul Nockleby  
Dan Short



The meeting was called to order by President John Nockleby at 7:10 p.m.

The length of the minutes taken at each meeting was discussed. Nockleby felt that it would be good to have lengthy, informative minutes so that future Central Boards will be able to refer to past minutes in their decision making. However, this process is more expensive, but it was suggested that only ten copies per week be run off rather than one for each CB member. The copies would be available to read and discuss in the office. This might also give CB members a chance to become more acquainted with the office. Elliott suggested the possibility of also keeping tapes of the meetings so that people can refer to what was actually said. Hahn pointed out that keeping long minutes may become too time consuming for the secretary. She is in favor of giving this idea a couple weeks time period. Murray suggested shortening the meetings. The majority of the CB members wanted to try long minutes for a couple weeks. Hahn felt that if the secretary spends more time with minutes, CB should spend more time in the office. Nockleby urged those CB members who have not signed up to help in the office, even for an hour, to do so; it would be good for the CB member as well as student government.

#### PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Conferences and Workshops -- President Nockleby announced several conferences that should be of interest to someone on CB. One is the Academic Affairs Workshop in Logan, Utah. Anyone interested in academic advances on campus should consider attending. Nockleby mentioned that the bulletin board in the ASUM offices contains a list of the conference topics. On December 5, 6, and 7 in Denver the research project on Students in Collective Bargaining is holding a conference. The main topic will be third party pressures on a two party process. Several people from Montana will be speaking. This conference will also be held in February in Anarber and in March in Washington, D.C. Nockleby advised representation at this conference because he feels that since there will very likely be an election Winter Quarter at which time the Faculty will choose one of three agents, no agent, or form a coalition; it is very possible that we might be into collective bargaining as early as next Spring. Another conference, the National Conference on Financing of Higher Education in New York, will deal with lowering tuition through additional federal grants for higher education. This conference will be held on December 12, 13 and 14.

Summer Activities Fee -- Nockleby pointed out that CB is going to have to budget the Summer Activities Fee within the next two weeks. The applications are due Friday, November 14 and the final decision must be made by November 21. Hahn asked why the budget session had been moved up as well as the application due date. Nockleby answered that President Bowers expressed to him concern with groups who have been budgeted in the past and who would not be getting sufficient funds to operate their programs in the summer. They want to know by



November 21 whether or not they are going to get enough money so that they can plan on what to put in the summer catalogue. CB will have to start budgeting sessions next Wednesday. A total of \$14,000 can be budgeted. MOVED BY MURRAY, SECONDED BY ELLIOTT TO START THIS PRELIMINARY BUDGETING BY AT LEAST NEXT WEDNESDAY, AND CONTINUE IF NECESSARY ON THURSDAY. Discussion. MOTION CARRIED. Hockleby announced that CB members should refer to notices written on the blackboard in the ASU offices as well as the bulletin board.

APPOINTMENTS

Women's Studies Committee -- Hockleby appointed Martha Towle to the Women's Studies Committee. MURRAY MOVED TO RATIFY THE APPOINTMENT. DOWNER SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

Academic Vice-Presidency Selection Committee -- Hockleby appointed Kermit Hummel and Diane Marshall to this committee. MOVED BY MURRAY, SECONDED BY BANKS TO RATIFY THIS APPOINTMENT. MOTION CARRIED.

Elections Committee -- Within the next two weeks, people who are interested in being the Chairperson for the Elections Committee should come in to talk with John Hockleby. Hockleby expressed the importance of this position saying that the chairperson does receive a lot of flack, so he or she has to be arbitrary and objective in their decision making.

Legislative Committee -- Hockleby appointed Tom Stables to this committee. MOVED BY MURRAY, SECONDED BY ELLIOTT TO RATIFY THE APPOINTMENT. MOTION CARRIED.

Commissioner Pettit's Visit to U of M -- Hockleby announced that Commissioner Larry Pettit from the Commission of Higher Education will be in Missoula on November 13 and 14. Five hours of his time have been set aside for students from various interest groups to make contact with him. At 1:00 on Thursday he will be in the VIP rooms meeting with group presidents. At 2:30 he is going to meet with the Kainin staff. And at 3:30 Thursday CB members are requested to attend his meeting in the Montana rooms. Hockleby suggested some things to ask him. Matters concerning the funding of higher education, what Pettit does, where state money goes, where he stands on Intercollegiate Athletics and a mandatory athletic fee, what he feels about women's athletics, problems with academics, the library funding and other campus concerns. Pettit has a lot of power over this University and students must go to him with their viewpoints. There will also be a forum in the U.S. Mall Friday at noon which Pettit will be attending.

Governor Judge's Planned Visit to U of M -- Hockleby read a letter from Evan Barrett, Administrative Assistant to Governor Judge. Judge plans to visit each Montana campus seeking student advice and opinions on the actions of state government. Judge would like to conduct a student forum on January 16, 1976 in Missoula. Murray at this time



pointed out that January is only six months before the next gubernatorial election. Dr. Wicks suggested stating the students' dissent directly to the governor when he is here. MOVED BY IACOPINI, SECONDED BY STROBEL THAT THE ASUM ENDORSE THE GOVERNOR'S FORUM AT U OF M. The forum will cost ASUM \$25 - \$30 for setting up a microphone. Several members of the Board expressed opposition to the endorsement of the forum, since it appeared to be a partisan effort. MOVED BY PARKER, SECONDED BY O'GRADY TO POSTPONE THE MOTION INDEFINITELY. Dr. Wicks pointed out that inviting Governor Judge to U of M to discuss issues is not unusual. Inviting Judge would simply be like inviting other state candidates to speak on relevant issues. PARKER WITHDREW HIS MOTION AS IT WAS PREVIOUSLY WORDED. NOCKLEBY STATED THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR AS: ASUM EXTEND AN INVITATION TO GOVERNOR JUDGE TO ATTEND A FORUM ON JANUARY 16. SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

ASUM Secretarial Position -- Nockleby announced that the applications for the permanent position of ASUM Secretary have been received. If any CB members want to be in on the interviewing, leave your name with Jim Murray. He will be in charge of the interviews.

#### VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Athletic Committee -- Jim Murray announced that the Athletic Committee met and set the second Wednesday in January for their deadline and will be reporting by then. Murray met with Harley Lewis Tuesday, and decided that specifics about the poll would have to be aired out before conducting the poll. Other than that, the general concept is now endorsed by both ASUM and the Athletic Department. The committee decided to make more use of Title 9, with Fred Rice being instrumental in that matter. The Athletic Committee will begin to work a bit closer with the Faculty Athletics Committee in recognition of the power the students have in that committee at this time. The individual student committee members hope to come up with a philosophical statement within a week that will be on par with the Athletic Department's statement.

PUB Board Appointment -- There was a misunderstanding between the interviewers of the PUB Board applicants as to whether or not Greg Henderson should be on the committee. At this time Henderson is not necessarily off or on the committee. Zahn expressed her desire for the matter to be brought out in the Kaimin.

#### BUSINESS MANAGER'S REPORT

Christmas Charter Flights -- Wils Ribi wants CB's approval on the financial risk of the flights. ASUM will be responsible for making the down payment which is 10 percent of the total cost of the planes. It comes to \$4,398. All Points Travel will be handling ticket sales, reservations, etc. The down payment will be deducted from the bill from Northwest Airlines, who will fly the jets. ASUM will also assume the financial risk of the charter flights. If the flights do not fill up, the potential risk is the down payment. Tom Raderman has been organizing the charter. For his services, he will



receive two tickets on the charter, round-trip from Missoula to Chicago and also from Chicago to Cincinnati. A build of ten seats has been set by Ribi and Ratterman to protect ASUM if the planes do not quite fill. Therefore, if ten seats are actually vacant when the tickets are sold, ASUM will not be in debt for those ten vacant seats. If more than ten seats are vacant, ASUM will have to pay for the loss incurred. If the plane is completely full, the ten seat margin may become a profit for ASUM to run future charters, or the money can be refunded to the passengers. The entire operation will be audited by ASUM when the charter is completed. Dates of departure to both cities will be on December 19 and return flights will be on January 4. The Chicago jet holds 93 passengers, the New York jet holds 165 passengers. The total cost of the New York charter is \$32,603, with individual tickets sold at \$210. The Chicago flight will cost \$16,390 and individual ticket prices will be \$135. Tickets will go on sale on November 19 and the cancellation date is set at December 4. O'Grady asked why Ratterman needs two tickets for his work. Ribi explained that when the charter flights first were started, there were two people who worked on them. He further explained that Ratterman's girlfriend is helping him with selling tickets, etc. Mike McKinley, ASUM Accountant, feels that the girlfriend should be eliminated because All Points Travel is being paid to do all the work required. Bowen asked when the money we spend will come back to ASUM. Ribi explained that the total cost of the planes is \$42,900, of which we pay 10 percent. When the tickets are sold, \$4,898 will go into account and ASUM will pay Northwest Airlines \$48,900 less the down payment of \$4,898, so that \$4,898 will go into a reserve fund. Bowen asked for an estimation of Ratterman's hours for the last two years. Bowen felt that what ASUM has done is create an institutional placement for Ratterman and his friend, which Bowen can't support when he doesn't know exactly how much time Ratterman has spent working on this project. O'GRADY MOVED THAT ASUM GIVE ONLY ONE TICKET TO TOM RATTERMAN, WHICH WILL TAKE HIM TO CHICAGO AND CINCINNATI AND BACK TO MISSOULA. WARREN SECONDED. Further discussion. MOVED BY WARREN, SECONDED BY MURRAY THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. MOTION CARRIED. The notion on the at this time is to give one ticket to Tom Ratterman. MOTION CARRIED. MOVED BY STROBEL, SECONDED BY MURRAY THAT BUDGET AND FINANCE DRAW UP A JOB DESCRIPTION FOR RATTERMAN TO BE PRESENTED NEXT WEEK. MOTION CARRIED. MURRAY MOVED THAT ASUM AUTHORIZE THE 1975 CHRISTMAS CHARTER FLIGHTS. SECONDED BY DAVIS. MOTION CARRIED. Mockleby made it clear that by the passing of the last motion, ASUM is now taking a risk of a possible \$5000 loss to ASUM.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

Legal Services Committee -- In regard to the memo from John Mockleby to Pam Ward, Pam stated that anyone who has additions to the memo, please contact her because she has to meet with the Law School next week. And for this meeting she will have to prepare a report. Mockleby hopes that CB will give the memo serious thought because in a couple months it is very likely that CB will be faced with the question of whether or not to have Legal Services in the future.



Ad Hoc Library Committee -- STROBEL MOVED THAT THE AD HOC LIBRARY COMMITTEE'S REPORT BE ACCEPTED. SECONDED BY IACOPINI. Murray felt that ASUL shouldn't have the responsibility of operating a fund drive among the parents. Strobel explained that the only way the Library has to supplement its funds is from outside resources. Since these have been discontinued by the Alumni Association, the Library is in a failing position. Short stated that we should make the parents aware of the problem. Rahn pointed out that the priorities of other people seem to lie in the Library, too. MOTION ON THE FLOOR WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Budget and Finance Committee -- WARREN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE BUDGET AND FINANCE RECOMMENDATION TO ALLOCATE \$631.15 TO THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE. SECONDED BY BEAULETTE. Murray offered a substitute motion stating why the Library Committee is asking for this money. Nockleby asked Strobel that before the letter is sent out, he come before CB for approval. Warren accepted this as a friendly amendment. THE MOTION FOR ALLOCATING \$631.15 TO THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE CARRIED. Ribi pointed out that something new occurring on all recommendations is presenting a statement which includes rationale behind the Budget and Finance recommendation.

Wildlife Society -- MOVED BY WARREN TO TAKE THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY'S BUDGET FROM THE TABLE. SECONDED. MOTION FAILED. BOWEN MOVED TO RECONSIDER THE PREVIOUS MOTION. ECKE SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED. THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR IS TO TAKE THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY'S BUDGET FROM THE TABLE. MOTION CARRIED. THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR IS TO ALLOCATE \$265 TO THE SOCIETY. WARREN MOVED TO AMEND THE \$265 MAIN MOTION TO PUTTING IT BACK TO BUDGET AND FINANCE'S ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION OF \$130. BANKS SECONDED. The chair ruled the motion out of order since the original motion was amended. BANKS MOVED TO RESCIND THE INCREASE OF \$110 TO THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY. SECONDED BY ELLIOTT. Nockleby ruled this out of order since it was a friendly amendment accepted by the original motion, so all that is required is to amend. WARREN MOVED A SUBSTITUTE MOTION FOR \$130, THIS RECOMMENDATION TO BE TAKEN BACK TO BUDGET AND FINANCE. BANKS SECONDED. Rahn MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. O'GRADY SECONDED. MOTION FAILED. This allocation wasn't requested last Spring because they found out that this year the new officers have more initiative, new programs and ideas they want to do. MOVED BY MURRAY, SECONDED BY ELLIOTT THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. MOTION CARRIED. THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR IS TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION BY CHANGING IT FROM \$265 TO \$130. Roll call vote. Yes: 8 - Banks, Elliott, Ervin, Iacopini, O'Grady, Strobel, Warren, Ribi. No: 12 - Baker, Beaulette, Bowen, Drake, Ecke, Facey, Rahn, Miltner, Johnson, Parker, Short, Warl. Abstain: 1 - Murray. MOTION FAILED. MOTION ON THE FLOOR IS TO ALLOCATE \$265 TO THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY. MOTION CARRIED.

KYLT Compromise Committee -- Warren reported that he, Nockleby and Parker met with Gene Peterson and had an extremely profitable meeting. Four agreements were decided on and need to be ratified by CB. 1. Peterson said that the previous interview that was refused to be aired would be aired, or another interview aired in its place.



The interview will be aired at 5:10 next Wednesday night. (11/19/75)

2. No employee of KYLT will in any way criticize the actions of students or student government unless it is in the form of an editorial, and then we will be notified of it, get a transcript, and given a chance to reply.
3. Peterson gave his word that public service spots would not be aired which encourage students to vote against or for something.
4. A series of mini-debates will be conducted by KYLT expressing both sides of an issue. These debates will be aired on the radio as a continuing program throughout the year.

Mockleby would like CB to approve of sending the FCC a letter asking them to disregard the previous complaints filed against KYLT in regard to the station's unfairness in broadcasting. PARKER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE COMMITTEE REPORT. SECONDED BY ELLIOTT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Student Union Board -- Dan Cobb, Chairman of S.U.B., explained his proposal to obtain a liquor license and a beer permit for a pub on campus, a copy of which was given to each CB member. Murray asked where the policy behind the proposal came from. SUB discussed this and Dave Hill, Student Action Center, is putting out a survey of the University system to all the campuses. Cobb discussed the history of the liquor law in the city state. Also discussed were the effect a pub on campus would have on the city's privately owned taverns, where on campus a pub would be located, the cost of a liquor license (\$60,000 - \$100,000). MURRAY MOVED THAT CB OFFICIALLY GO ON RECORD AS OPPOSING THE CONCEPT OF A PUB ON CAMPUS. SECONDED BY O'GRADY. Cobb stated that he only wants approval to discuss the matter with other campuses. If CB doesn't want to approve it, he won't take it to the other Universities. MOVED BY WARREN, SECONDED BY FACEY TO CUT OFF DEBATE. MOTION CARRIED. Roll call vote on previous question -- CB opposing pub on campus. Yes: 4 - Drake, Elliott, O'Grady, Murray. No: 15 - Baker, Bowen, Eke, Ervin, Facey, Mahn, Miltner, Iacopini, Johnson, Parker, Short, Strobel, Warl, Warren, Ribi. Abstain: 2 - Banks, Deaudette. MOTION FAILED. MOVED BY WARREN, SECONDED BY FACEY TO ADOPT THE PROPOSAL. Mockleby relinquished the gavel to Murray. Cobb stated that his work on the pub has failed in the past because SUB has only taken "pot-shots" at it. Now he feels that a University-wide shot must be taken and a new avenue of approach used. For this reason, Cobb wants to hire a lawyer. Cobb also brought up the matter of catering for banquets, etc. that UM does. Much more money would be made for them if they had a liquor license. Mockleby doesn't think ASU should bother other schools with this matter. The smaller schools, if they contribute, would do so on a small basis. Also, other schools' interests usually differ greatly from UM's. MOCKLEBY MOVED TO AMEND THE PROPOSAL SO THAT THE FIRST LINE READS: "An ad hoc committee be formed with the University of Montana, and Montana State University student bodies, if MSU wishes to participate,...the committee then having three members apiece...." SECONDED. Cobb made it clear that he not only wants to go to other schools for money, but for their support. Mockleby suggested that SUB ask for support after they decide what they want to do. MAHN MADE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT WHICH



WAS ACCEPTED BY NOCKLEBY WHICH STATES THAT EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE BE INCLUDED, PROVIDING IT SUPPORTS THE EFFORT WITH EQUAL FUNDS. AMENDMENT PASSED. MAIN MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSAL. Roll call vote. Yes: 13 - Baker, Bowen, Facey, Hahn, Hiltner, Iacopini, Johnson, Parker, Short, Strobel, Ward, Ribí, Nockleby. No: 4 - Drake, Elliott, Ervin, O'Grady. Abstain: 4 - Banks, Beaudette, Ecke, Warren. WARREN MOVED THAT CB ACCEPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

R75-24

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Central Board go on record as supporting the establishment of a pub on the University of Montana campus that would service beer only.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Central Board go on record supporting the obtaining of a liquor license which would allow alcohol to be served at catered events.

Submitted by: Mark Warren

Date: November 12, 1975

Action Taken:

HILTNER SECONDED. More Discussion. MOVED BY JOHNSON, SECONDED BY PARKER TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION UNTIL INVESTIGATION IS UNDERTAKEN AND COMPLETED. MOTION FAILED. WARREN MOVED, FACEY SECONDED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. MOTION CARRIED. The motion on the floor is the adopting of Warren's resolution. Roll call vote. Yes: 14 - Baker, Banks, beaudette, Ecke, Facey, Hahn, Hiltner, Iacopini, Parker, Short, Strobel, Ward, Warren, Ribí. No: 6 - Bowen, Drake, Elliott, Ervin, O'Grady, Murray. Abstain: 1 - Johnson. MOTION CARRIED. Nockleby verified that the Board agree with the wording of his amendment to Cobb's proposal which will read: "An ad hoc committee be formed consisting of two students from each of the student bodies of University of Montana, Montana State University, and Eastern Montana College, if each chooses to participate equally on a financial basis...." There was no opposition to this amendment. Cobb continued with the SUB report. People have confronted him with the questions of why prices have gone up in the Copper Commons and why the Student Fee increase passed last year. Cobb explained the reason behind these actions was that UM was operating on a \$46,000 deficit last year.

Student Walk-In - Nockleby referred to the motion tabled last week stating that \$250 be allocated to the Student Walk-In Clinic. Nockleby then read a memo he received from Dr. Currey, advisor of Student Walk-In, certifying that \$250 will be set aside for Student Walk-In advertising for the year 1975-76. MOVED BY PARKER, SECONDED BY BANKS TO TAKE THE MOTION OFF THE TABLE. MOTION CARRIED. MOTION ON FLOOR IS TO ALLOCATE \$250 TO THE STUDENT WALK-IN. MOVED BY WARREN, SECONDED BY RIBI TO REFER THE BUDGET ALLOCATION BACK TO BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE. MAIN MOTION TO ALLOCATE \$250 TO STUDENT WALK-IN PASSED.



## NEW BUSINESS

Resolution on Student Activity Fee -- Hahn pointed out that before the resolution goes to the Regents, she, with the help of someone else, will have to draw up a very specific route for a student to follow in order to have his fee waived. MOVED BY HAHN, SECONDED BY MURRAY THAT THE RESOLUTION BE ACCEPTED. MOTION CARRIED.

Validating machines -- Hahn reported that ASUM owns some validating machines that should be getting used more often than they currently are. Hahn is interested in finding out more about the condition of the machines or if it would be better economically to get a new machine and whether or not they can be brought over to the ASUM offices for better access to the students. HAHN MOVED THAT BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE STUDY THE ISSUE OF THE FEASIBILITY OF THE VALIDATING MACHINES. SECONDED BY MURRAY. MOTION CARRIED. Ribi will try to have a report in three weeks. MOVED BY PARKER, SECONDED BY MURRAY TO ADJOURN. MOTION CARRIED. 9:45 p.m.

*Sue Johnson*

Sue Johnson  
ASUM Secretary

Present: Baker, Banks, Beaudette, Bowen, Drake, Ecke, Elliott, Ervin, Facey, Hahn, Hiltner, Iacopini, Johnson, O'Grady, Parker, Short, Strobel, Ward, Warren, Murray, Ribi, Nockleby.

Absent: Brown.



## ELECTION BY-LAW AMENDMENTS

(by striking and adding)

Amending Division IV, Article IV, Sections 1, 2 and 3 and renumbering subsequent sections of the ASUM by-laws

Section 1. Each candidate for official ASUM positions shall submit a campaign expense statement, to include all personal, organizational, and donated expenditures, to election committee by the time the polls close on the day of the general election.

Section 2. Total expenditures of all primary and general election campaign expenses by Central Board delegate candidates shall not exceed \$50.00. Total expenditures for each ASUM officer position shall not exceed \$100.00.

Section 3. (addition) The President, Vice-President, and Business manager may combine their campaign expenditures, filing a joint campaign expenditure sheet, should they desire to run as a team, and those expenditures may not exceed \$300.00. Any combination of the three is acceptable. Central Board candidates must file individual financial statements. Each candidate can write off one (1) dollar in party expenses. A party may not spend more than \$20.00 on said party expenses. Beyond that, no party is allowed to "pool" or combine in any way money of its candidates. Store Board candidates' expenditures shall not exceed \$30.00.

Section 4. Any candidate or political party that violates any provision governing elections shall be subject to disqualification.