

Amendments proposed by the self-serving

By Fred Loveys

Editor's note: Fred Loveys is ASUO vice-president.

If I were a pessimist, or a politician (both which I cheerfully deny), I would admit that the "Ides of March" may have come too early this year. The ASUO Elections this week take on a double significance, and have meaning not just for the 5 per cent who voted in the primary — but for all students concerned about the management of student monies and service and the credibility of the Student Senate.

The election of 10 new senators (costing about \$1,500) would complete a body which must begin to address itself to the disbursement of the \$60 (approximately) which it receives from each student and the apportionment of an ASUO Budget which exceeded \$850,000 last year. (The Executive is presently revising the budgetary process, and more information on this will be forthcoming.)

Yet of greater import is the effect the proposed constitutional amendments (that are on the Ballot) will have on both the Senate itself and the Executive. As the Chief Elections Officer (sic) I am constrained (by recent senate legislation) from involving myself in the politics of the election.

Nevertheless, the significance of the

three proposed constitutional amendments deserve fair comment from someone qualified to render opinion. It would be negligence on my part if I were not to publicly advise voters on these issues.

There are three constitutional amendments on the ballot. The first, "A", revises virtually the whole of the present constitution, and would provide for the abolishment of the ASUO Senate in its present form, the establishment of an incidental fees committee to deal with the budget, and also the establishment of a special committee to pursue the goal of university co-governance.

Proponents of the "Abolish the Senate" amendment suggest that this kind of "surgery" is necessary to orient students and student leaders to the potential of co-governance. I always saw the present system as a first step towards a unicameral system of University governance, where students would take their rightful place alongside faculty and administrators in an advisory senate to the University President.

In such a forum debate on requirements, tenure, advising and admissions would surely have more meaning, involving as it would each side's exposure to the others, where barriers to change would be more clearly defined.

In such a forum student representation would have to be of a higher calibre than at present if the impact of student opinion is

to have the significance it deserves. This is obviously the direction student government should be moving in. The question which each of us must answer — is the time now?

The other two constitutional amendments, "B" and "C", concern the actual electoral process.

If "A" fails, then these two assume considerable importance. The passage of "B" simply provides the Senate with the power to amend election rules. Presently the Senate shall approve rules established by the vice-president for the conduct of elections. If they do not approve the question arises whether the Senate shall approve rules established by the vice-president, or whether the vice-president has to establish rules which the Senate prefers.

If "B" passes then the Senate can in essence write its own rules — and perhaps write its own ticket for perpetuity.

The vice-president and election board will then merely carry out the rules established by the Senate for senate elections.

Constitutional amendment "C" defines, where the previous wording did not, constituencies for every student, and electoral subdivisions. If this is passed every student who votes will have to state his residency, class status, academic major and ethnic status in order to receive the appropriate ballots.

While this attempts to define constituencies for senators to represent it really is open to abuse and unmanageable under the present circumstances. There is no way to check the accuracy of a student's response: He/she can give any major, or residency, and the poll-worker would never be sure of the validity of such statements — nothing is indicated on any I.D. card.

Verification could only be achieved with some kind of Student Register, but the cost, accuracy, and the propriety of such a document denies its worth for electoral purposes. Amendment "C", in truth, denies the voter the freedom of choice, undermining the essence of a democratic electoral process.

It's evident where my preferences lie on these issues. But I object to constitutional amendments being put on the ballot by a self-serving group without proper discussion of their significance. As a student I'm concerned about the present difficulties which the Senate is in. As vice-president, I may have helped cause them (!), yet I cannot but be intensely aware of the implications of all three amendments.

So discount the bias — and please get involved yourself and vote.

In spite of the seriousness of the issues, I promise you some humor this week — and certainly Wednesday and Thursday will witness the most cultured ASUO Senate election ever. After all — it may be their last!

ASUO senate — been there

By PAT McMAHON

Editor's note: McMahon is a former ASUO senator currently majoring in speech and political science at the University.

Three years ago I arrived at the mystical college of fortune—the University of Oregon. I spent the first few weeks of my "college life" much like freshman "joes". I partied my balls off and had a great time "getting into things."

As I continued to maneuver around campus and discover the ins and outs of good old American "college life," I found myself running for the ASUO Senate.

Much to my dismay, amazement, and wonder I was elected, tah-dah-dah, SENATOR!!! First thing I thought was neat, far-out, and all those good words. But if I were to express myself after watching the Senate deteriorate the past 1½ years (beginning in October, 1971) I could not use such "nifty" little phrases.

For one year I lived and based everything around my ASUO responsibilities. I found that the only way to learn was to listen and the only way to solve a problem was through discussion then action—not the other way around. If you were to sit in the Senate at present you would find senators who want their constituency to believe they have the only solutions to all student problems, when in reality, they don't know their ass from a hole in the ground.

The caliber of our student government has gone from half-way decent thinkers who used responsibility and reason as their first priority to an over abundance of kids playing high school politics.

I have seen the Senate change from a problem solving body to a political ambiguous farce comprised of "little boys" trying to prove their manhood through manipulation of minds.

The thing that strikes me the funniest in the ASUO is all the name calling and threatening happening on the third floor EMU (otherwise known as the insane senator sanctuary). For a real trip drop up on 3rd floor EMU—it's a zoo.

Is it little wonder to any of us why the faculty and state government won't respond to student needs when we send to represent us a group of snot-nosed kids using their 3 R's —Ranting, Raving and Ridiculing?

Is it little wonder why we have an inefficient Senate when a person can run for office and win with eight votes or better yet when my roommates ran our dog last year for the ASUO Senate and the damn canine nearly won?

Is it little wonder that students get screwed on athletics when a good majority of ASUO representatives don't even know what shape a basketball is (much less how to dribble one)?

Is it little wonder that money allocated to projects and programs has been skimmed on the average 60 percent of their budget to pay salaries (some up to 90 percent) when we elect or President appoints power hungry people. Through mismanagement and carelessness our

student incidental fees are being squandered by senators who vote without any comprehension of what they are doing or voting for.

It is for this reason our student government has failed us, not, as some say, the structure.

Is it little wonder why deserving programs who need help financially don't get it?

I wonder...

Letters

From Davis

I am running for re-election to the Senate because I feel I still have a job to complete. As chairma of the Public Relations Bureau, I plan to send student speakers all around the state conveying the students views on matters of importance. I also hope to redefine the Public Relations Bureau to have more of a viable role.

As for my voting record in the Senate, I strongly support such things as minority projects, ESCAPE, Forensics, Illahe School, Drug Information Center, Draft and Military information, SEARCH, University Feminists, Students Community Projects, of any organization I feel is worthy of funding.

So I ask for your support to continue the job I've already started.

Jim Davis

Candidate for Re-election
To Sophomore Senator

For Burgoyne

I am damn tired of games that people in ASUO government play; the practices of writing letters and columns for the Emerald and using simplified and generalized phrases such as 'sandbox politics' and 'the ship is sinking' are particularly offensive. But I would like to comment on the social science senate race, so please bear with me.

Liza Burgoyne is a candidate in this race. She has had experience in working in the university, with the state legislature, and on McGovern's campaign. Specifically, she has served as legislative coordinator for the Political Science Student Union (PSSU); in this capacity, she has dealt with key university administrators, and she has had contact with several state legislators. She was the McGovern campaign coordinator in the dorms last fall. I believe her background in these areas makes her a viable candidate for the social science position.

Liza has outlined her positions and priorities in her campaign material; I urge you to examine it. She is not only cognizant of the internal problems and issues of the senate, but she is also interested in getting the senate working with the university faculty, the university administration, the Eugene community, and the state legislature.

I have worked with Liza in the PSSU. I have seen her work and her effort to retain four faculty members of the political science department. I know that she is a concerned and sincere person who deserves to be elected to the senate.

Bill Beardsley
Political Science

From Siegel

Fortunately, the enthusiastic non-support of the APATHY INTERNATIONAL FRUITCAKE PARTY on

behalf of the apathetic student body resulted in the impressive defeat of two of its candidates. However, one, who happen to be me, Lee Siegel, the AIFP candidate for the ASUO Senate-Playpen Off Campus Potty Seat, did survive the grueling primary campaign. I attribute this to the general failure of normally apathetic students to react with the usual lack of vigor, and thus, my unfortunate victory.

However, the race is still on, and I will continue to assert my lack of principles and seek a compromising position on every issue. Little known to most students is the FDA approved fact that the Apathy International Fruitcake Party is guaranteed to help build your student body twelve ways.

Thus, the AIFP provides necessary roughage for your governmental system to aid in the smooth removal of rationality from the legislative tract, as well as providing the minimum pre-pubescent requirements of vitamins B, U, L1, L2, S, H, I, and T.

There is little else I can say except Vote For Me Because If You Don't I Might Get Very Depressed And Take A Sideways Leap Off The Ferry Street Bridge. Thus, if you value my life you had damn well better vote for me.

Remember, a vote for the AIFP is a vote for absurdrealistic politics at its worst. Say Nothing, Do Nothing, Be Nothing.

Lee Siegel
Apathy International Fruitcake Party
ASUO Off Campus Potty Seat