Central Board Minutes  
April 6, 1960

ABSENT: Risse, Nichols, Miller, Pemberton, Cogswell, Stone

DISCUSSION OF REVISED PROPOSED CONSTITUTION

Vice-president Duane Adams called the meeting to order in the Silver Bow Room. He said that the Kaimin's statement, "Adams expressed his unwillingness to see the proposed referendums placed on the ballot at this time" was a misleading one, and that he had really said that he felt it was unfortunate that Referendum B was going on the ballot as it stood.

In answer to Lee's Kaimin statement that the new form of government would be a one-man show, Mongar said that the Student Senate was the only group with legislative power. He said Miss Lee's analogy between student and federal government was erroneous. In answer to Morris' objection that by holding spring elections delegates would not be representing most of the time the people who elected them, Mongar said it would be possible to elect delegates from those living groups where there was this problem in the fall. He added the comment that most freshman over-participate in activities anyway. In answer to the Kaimin editorial comment that Kaimin, Sentinel and Venture funds, along with athletics, having to pass a student vote every year is ridiculous, Mongar said that the Kaimin was really worried about having to do a better job to satisfy the students each year. In answer to the Kaimin's statement, "no publication should have to operate in constant fear of stepping on someone's toes and thus committing political suicide.", Mongar said that the Kaimin had been stepping on toes for a long time without suffering from censorship. He said that in the last two paragraphs the Kaimin had hinted that the students don't have the right to govern themselves. He said in that case the Kaimin not in favor of any kind of student government, including the present one.

Morris questioned the advisability of holding half of the elections in the fall and half in the spring. Mongar said they could be held in the winter for all delegates, and that would eliminate the present absurdity of having the old government build the budget that the new has to approve and live under. Bradley explained that the old Business Manager had the experience to make up a wise budget whereas the new one still wouldn't know enough.

In arguing for better continuity in election of delegates, Ulrich said that student government is in a different position because in state or national politics the people in office have been in politics for ten or fifteen years generally, and know what is going on, whereas in student government often the people elected to office have no previous knowledge of politics or government. He said that it takes the new delegate at least six months to learn the ropes. He said he felt his position on Central Board was to provide continuity. Ulrich said he felt it was better to try improve our government within the framework of the old constitution rather than try a radical change.
Mongar said that the new constitution only gave the students the opportunity of deciding whether they wanted continuity or a complete change. Ulrich said that the strength of the class system of representation is that the delegates are responsible to the same people. Farrington said that the class system represented nothing because there is no real tie. Brown said that the University education system had the series of four stages of growth. He said that the student mind at each year is different and unique. Mongar said in that case we should give the Seniors more representation, since they are the most advanced of the four classes. Brown said that the ideal is to have representation from all levels of intellect.

Mongar said that there will be continuity in the administration and in the people in activities of student government. Ulrich said that he couldn't see how there would be continuity when the President, committee chairmen and members can change in one year. Mongar said that this could happen, but the point is that the students have the chance to decide if they want continuity or not that year.

Meyer said that under the new system it could take a bill two months to be passed. He said that this system certainly would not speed up governmental action. Mongar said that efficiency was not always speed, and that the new system would give the students a chance to voice their opinions on matters. Carlson said that under the new system the president would not be responsible to the electorate because once he was elected he would be responsible only to himself, because he would not be running for reelection. He said that under the present system the continuity of Central Board put the president under pressure to be responsible to the students. Mongar said that the Student Senate still had legislative authority, not the president. Bretz wanted to know what presidential authority everyone was afraid of.

Meyer objected to the last sentence of Article II, Section 8: "A majority of the members constitutes a quorum to do business, but one-third may compel attendance of absent members." He said that this was not necessary under the present system, and that with responsible leaders it should not be necessary to compel delegates to meet. Romstad said he felt the vagueness of the constitution was not good because changes were easier made before adoption than after, and the new government if passed might have many problems. Mongar said that the vagueness gave the constitution flexibility to bend with the changing times.

Browman said that Mongar should have enquired into the population figures before setting up the representation. He said that the president would control finances because he appoints the Bureau of the Budget. Mongar said only the Student Senate can appropriate funds. Browman said that the president could keep clubs from coming before the Bureau of the Budget, however. Browman asked how presidential candidates could run on a budget platform unless they had worked on the budget before.
He also asked how the new government was more efficient if it was not any faster, even slower, than the present one. Farrington said that the real question was whether or not the new constitution provided for a more honestly representative government.

Welch asked how the president could run on a budgetary platform when he supposedly had no power to carry out his campaign promises. Mongar said that he hoped the new constitution would start a party system, which was a "tonic for good government." Browman said that this would split into Greek and Independent parties, and bring bad qualities into student government. Meyer said that Article III, Section 4 almost demands a party system.

Hansen objected to the overload of work given to the vice-president, saying that handling the budget alone was a full time job. Mongar said that under the present system the Business Manager must carry out certain duties himself, while under the new system the vice-president could delegate powers. This merely provides for a chain of command.

Martin said it seemed to him that the new constitution was aimed at getting better representation of the student body and a better tool to work with. He said he felt the new representation would not alleviate the old problems. He said that this type of government is ultimate in itself while we are controlled by the University. He said it seemed more practical to go over the old system and reform it rather than change to a completely new system.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Tate
Secretary, ASMSU
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