

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. However, the Emerald does present on this page columnists and letter writers whose opinions reflect those of our diverse readership and not those of the Emerald itself.

PAUL BRAINERD
Editor

Les Blumenthal
News Editor

Tom Kilpatrick
Advertising Manager

ROBB MILLER
Business Manager

Sue Heinz
Managing Editor

Ellen Emry
National Advertising Manager

Steven Smith
Editorial Page Editor

Ron Eachus
Administrative Affairs Editor

Wandalyn Rice
Student Affairs Editor

Stan Horton
Sports Editor

Laurie Padilla
Night Editor

Cindy Boydston
Photo Editor

Chris Houghlum
Entertainment Editor

Rick Fitch
Academic Affairs Editor

Gil Johnson
Salt Editor

John Junkins
Night Editor

University of Oregon, Eugene, Tuesday, May 13, 1969

Sadler guilty of misrepresentation

House Bill 1880, the campus disruption bill, has been the subject of heated debate for some weeks now. Unfortunately, the intentions of the bill leave little room for compromise; less room for fence sitting on the part of student leaders.

In the May 8 letters column of the Emerald, Russell Sadler, chairman of the Inter-Institutional Committee on Higher Education, attacked legislative counsel Eric Lindauer for "misrepresenting, apparently intentionally, my views of the bill."

Sadler, in his letter, asserted that he did not support 1880, as Lindauer earlier suggested, and listed several reasons why he did not.

Sadler's testimony before the committee, however, indicates that he did support the bill at that time. Sadler, not Lindauer, misrepresented the testimony.

As chairman of ISCOHE, Sadler represents the position of all students within the seven state system colleges and universities. Yet in his testimony, Sadler made it clear that ISCOHE never held formal discussions on the bill; that he talked informally with only five of the seven institutions; and even then, that student leaders had registered little opposition to the bill.

This is in direct contrast to the nearly unanimous testimony of student leaders against the bill in subsequent legislative hearings. Sadler apparently equated his personal opinions with the opinions of the seven state schools he represents.

It appears to the Emerald that ISCOHE made little attempt to formalize a stand on 1880 and that the preparation for legislative hearings was confined to personal research on the part of Sadler.

His reservations against 1880 were confined to his fear that the bill was moving through the legislature too quickly.

"I would hope that you (the legislature) would help me sell my constituency on this bill," he said, "by slowing it down sufficiently so this doesn't look like it's being stampeded through the legislature. That's the kind of behavior that raises questions, legitimate questions, from people who do not know the details. Hold it open — long enough to be circumspect, and yet not so much that it should fail in the crush of adjournment."

In opening his testimony Sadler introduced opposition statements to the proposal as views "which may not be my own, but which I have an obligation to present."

Further, Sadler appears to be presenting two complete and diverse points of view to the two different communities.

To the students Sadler wrote, "I am opposed to the bill because 1) of the sneaky way it passed the House, 2) it is sloppily and imperfectly drafted, 3) is not necessary, 4) invites political abuse of its intended purpose, 5) and it is an affront to the students, faculties and institutional presidents of this state."

To the legislature Sadler said "We see a minimum, if any impact at all, on freedom of expression or freedom of speech, and with a circumspect Governor, we don't even see it being trotted out as a threat . . .

"Now you can say that's comprising a position and you would be absolutely right."

Sadler has compromised his position; not only with regard to 1880, but in regard to his chairmanship of a committee that supposedly represents the opinions of over 50,000 students in the state system of higher education.

It's quite true

A mandate from the people

By MIKE O'BRIEN

Now I know how De Gaulle feels. And, like De Gaulle, I don't feel that I made a mistake, but that 2199 out of 2,202 voters were wrong.

That is to say, I received only three votes for student body president in the primaries. Actually, since I voted for myself, I received only two. This isn't as bad as it sounds since, unbelievably, I didn't come in altogether last.



I know that sounds like saying "a little bit pregnant," but the fact is that I actually tied for last with another ticket. And, since there were two people on that ticket, and I'm sure they voted for each other, I actually got more votes. Sort of.

I asked a somewhat befuddled Emerald staffer to figure out my percentage of the votes, and she came up with .0766. This was interesting, because the IBM printout sheet gave me .13. Since I want every voice to be heard and believed equally (Is that liberal enough for a few votes?) I've averaged these two figures and come up with .1033.

It's altogether possible that some people will say that averaging out a couple of figures is a foolish way to arrive at my percentage of the vote, but I can say from personal experience that it's really quite valid. Once I stood with one foot in a bed of burning embers, and the other in a block of ice. The story about how this particular situation came about is pretty interesting, but the point is that on the average, I felt fine.

I'd like to mention one final interesting thing about the two independent votes I received. So far, I've found five people who said they cast them.

Now, as for my plans for the future. Rather than let my two voters down, I have decided, at great personal inconvenience, to leave my hat in the ring. After all, my minority deserves a voice, too.

I have, however, made a major change in my campaign. I now have a running mate. Frankly, I would just as soon have a running nose, but it seems to be the thing to do. Also, it's a way to get one more vote.

My vice presidential candidate's name is Les Blumenthal, and he describes himself as a radical conservative with leftist and rightist

leanings. He wants it made clear, however, that he is not a middle-of-the-road candidate.

The reason Les and I have teamed up is that he received two votes for something or other in the primary (he's even vaguer about this than I am) and we figure that our five votes are a clear mandate from five people.

After talking it over, we decided the reason we lost was that we hadn't kissed enough babies. In order to remedy this situation, we've set up a schedule so that any baby who wants to be kissed can have her wish. Our schedule is as follows. Monday through Friday of this week, one or the other of us will probably be at the Emerald office at some time or other.

If anyone desiring this service goes to the office and neither of us is there, we've fixed it so you won't be disappointed. We've each kissed a number of 3x5 index cards which the secretary will give you on request.

It should go without saying that we prefer our babies to be 18 or above. And, being politicians, we have no preference as to blondes, brunettes or redheads. Next week, things might be different, but that's how it stands now.

Our next vote-getting gimmick has to do with our last names. Obviously, O'Brien and Blumenthal are going to appeal to a couple of pretty strong minorities. In order to appeal to even more, we have, for this week at least, amended our names to read Pierre O'Brien-Polanski and Mohammed Blumenthal-Smith. (When you write us in on the ballot, though, Mike O'Brien and Les Blumenthal will be sufficient. The people who count the ballots have as much difficulty reading as Emerald staffers do.)

Our final appeal to the voters is a truly revolutionary one. Les and I realize that nearly everyone covets the pomp and circumstance of public office. So, in order to cater to this desire, we've decided that after you write me in for president and Les for vice president, you can put your own name down for second vice president. If we win, I'm not quite clear on what we'll do with all our second vice presidents, but we'll work something out. One possibility is to organize them into a sort of flying squad capable of putting on instant rallies. Then we can rent our squad out to groups that are concerned about things, but too small to do anything about them.

Above all, remember our ringing slogan — A vote for O'Brien-Blumenthal is a vote . . . probably.

Emerald Editor:

On B.S.U. statement

Emerald Editor:

I feel it necessary to clarify my statements as quoted from the Convocation rally by May 5th's Emerald so there will be no misunderstanding of my intentions.

First of all, I do not support the philosophy of problem solution suggested by the BSU. In its statement of last week, I support the philosophy of the Convocation, which is based on the belief that a system of negotiation can be the most effective means of bettering a university.

I am aware of and sympathize with the circumstances that foster an active and immediate approach, such as the BSU stated. This is precisely why I came to regard the Convocation as a last chance for us to prove that we, as reasoning and intelligent individuals, are capable of examining and understanding the problems of people from different and unfortunate environments; and beyond this, we must prove that we are willing to do something, to commit ourselves to working for solutions in a world that desperately needs for people to care.

Secondly, I would like to re-emphasize the fact that students must remember that the communication and the involvement or uninvolved last week must be aimed at supporting people foremost; all issues must revolve around this support.

Chris Czarnowsky
Soph., English

Write congressmen

Emerald Editor:

On the front page of last Sunday's Oregonian an article mentioned that the Nixon Administration anticipated the retirement of Gen. Hershey.

Included in the news release was a proposal from the White House "to change draft laws to

provide for a lottery to select draftees—and then from a single age group, the 19-year-olds."

We've long protested the present inequities in the Selective Service System under Hershey. Every male student has experienced the anxieties and uncertainties of the draft. If the lottery proposal should pass the present age group of 20 to 25 would be draft-exempt barring a major war.

Do you somehow feel in agreement with such a lottery proposal? We should all make an active effort to see that the lottery becomes a reality. An old but infrequently used means to participate in politics is to write your congressman and urge him to support the measure.

Don't let your representative guess how you feel on this issue. Tell him! Imagine the effect upon a congressman of a large number of letters endorsing the lottery proposal. Letters coming from his local constituents cannot help but influence him and his hopes for reelection.

The U.S. Congressman for Lane County is John Dellenback, 520 Willamette St., Eugene. What is your congressman's address?

Scott Taylor
Sen., Pol Sci.

Curt Smith
Jr., History

* * *

Attacks committee

Emerald Editor:

I am occasionally disappointed by but rarely moved to oppose the efforts of student government.

However, on behalf of 450 students who have competed as University representatives on club sports this past year, I must protest at the destruction of the program at the hands of the fiscal committee of the ASUO Senate.

Last year this program was granted by the Senate approximately \$20,000 and involved actively every student who wished to participate. This year the committee in what one can only presume is ignorance of the values of such a program, have offered \$3,500. This amount is approximately the same as the estimated budget for each of the two largest sports.

As coach of the rugby team, I can testify to the participation of the 60 students who regularly gave up their spare time to practice with no reward except for the opportunity to compete and associate with students of other institutions.

The money that was made available covered travel and accommodation costs of minimum standards. If it is considered that as coach I have a financial interest in the continuation of this program, it should be pointed out that all coaching services are voluntary and unpaid.

What is particularly disturbing is the fact that on the basis of funds provided over the past 10 years, contracts have already been made with other institutions for the coming year. With no funds available, our program must now be abandoned. We cannot ask the students to add further financial sacrifice to their present commitments.

I would urge the appropriate committee to reconsider this decision. After 10 years, has this program achieved nothing that it should be removed so suddenly?

I would suggest there are few programs that have been more successful and involved actively such a number which has grown consistently each year.

We ask no more than the opportunity to continue to serve students.

Bruce Howe
Rugby Coach