

Elections...

Continued from Page 1

Loveys' decision to have ballot slogans for candidates printed in German violated that implication.

Second, one proposed constitutional amendment, "D," was not printed on the official election ballot along with the other three — it was printed on a separate piece of paper, instead, because of University Press printing deadlines for the official ballots. Itkin said separating "d" from the other proposed amendments "might have influenced" voters.

After several senators spoke in favor of Itkin's motion, the senate voted 21 to zero, with four abstentions, to approve it. Zukin told the senators after the vote that "we may have to revoke on this at a later date" because the action may violate by-laws.

However, after Itkin's motion passed, the senators went on to quickly pass a series of related motions that were based upon their action to invalidate the election.

Senators voted to (1) set up a new election for Feb. 28 and March 1, (2) place the ASUO President personally in charge of administrating the new election, and (3) authorize ballot slogans to be printed in English and proposed constitutional amendments to be printed on the official ballots.

In the wake of the passage of the election invalidation motions, the senate then voted 16 to four, with two abstentions, to breeze ASUO Vice President Loveys' salary until the outcome of impeachment procedures against him had been determined. ASUO Senate President Aukin had announced earlier in the meeting that formal impeachment procedures, as initiated by the senate's governing committee, would begin next Monday. The governing committee has initiated impeachment procedures against Loveys because of his role in the fall term, 1972, ASUO election.

The senate invoked an "emergency clause" ruling twice during the evening — on the motion which tagged the ASUO President with the responsibility for administrating a new winter term election, and on the motion which froze Loveys' salary.

The "emergency clause," when invoked by a two-thirds majority by the senate, rules out an executive veto on the motion involved.

In other business, senators approved a motion by ASUO Senator Andy Holcomb to not put newly appointed ASUO Chief Administrative Assistant Bill Schaub on the ASUO payroll until Schaub's appointment had been approved by the senate.

Holcomb said the executive was dragging its feet in taking Schaub through the senate approval process, because the executive was waiting for students to vote to abolish the senate so that senate approval would not be needed. Holcomb's motion was approved by voice vote.

Matthews wins award

Brian Matthews, the young University physicist who recently constructed one of the few models in the world of an enzyme molecule, has been selected by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to receive a Research Career Development Award.

Matthews, 34, is an associate professor of physics and research associate in the University's Institute of Molecular Biology.

The award amounts to approximately \$100,000 over a five-year period.

Fifteen testify in opposition to bill setting educational goals

By TRUDY NUTTER
Of the Emerald

Opposition to a bill settling goals for Oregon education (Senate Bill 1) was heard Wednesday evening at a Education Committee hearing in Springfield.

Committee Chair Ed Fadeley explained the bill would set goals for all levels of education in Oregon. SB 1 defines functions of the State Board of Education, the State Board of Higher Education, local school districts and other school governing bodies.

It also requires them to adopt a set of goals which are consistent with state educational goals and guidelines:

Individuals equipped with the skills and knowledge essential in a complex society.

Lives enriched by the arts and humanities.

Individuals able and willing to accept their responsibilities as citizens.

Individuals qualified for entry into occupations leading to economic self-sufficiency and able to provide society with qualified manpower.

The generation and dissemination of knowledge acquired by research.

Individuals physically healthy to meet the demands of society.

Provision for a lifetime of learning.

Fifty persons attended the meeting with fifteen testifying—all in opposition to the bill.

"It is not possible" stated C.A. Bauers, who identified himself as a teacher from the Eugene area "to set goals for education on a legislative

Page 10

Unfair labor practices claimed by Eric Stovall

Eric Stovall, former employee of the American Ship Dismantlers in Portland, charged Wednesday night that unfair labor practices by that company were responsible for his termination Feb. 2, and for his two subsequent arrests on charges of trespassing on company premises.

"I had to allow myself to get arrested in order to prove an important point," he told an audience of about 50 students in 214 EMU. The point that must ultimately be tested, he said, is "whether or not federal laws, designed to protect the workers' rights, really do so."

By ROSI WILLIAMSON
Of the Emerald

Stovall, a former University student, was elected in January as shop steward of the Portland local of the International Union of Operating Engineers. He was fired while attempting to assist employees in formulating a list of 14 grievances to be filed against the company. "It was unclear," said Stovall, "whether my duty as shop steward included talking with the workers on company time."

The list of grievances, according to Stovall, included withholding pay, questions of jurisdiction and seniority, and complaints about sanitation and working conditions. "Ship dismantling is incredibly hot and dirty work," Stovall explained. "We work an eight-hour day with only one-half hour off for lunch."

He said workers are constantly subjected to lead and zinc fumes, as well as hot crude oil. "I have scars all over my body from the burns I've received while working," he said.

Stovall pointed out that, according to the National Labor Relations Act, "employees have

the right at any time to present grievances to their employer and to have such grievances adjusted . . . Stovall took his list of 14 employee grievances to the union office, he said, but they refused to process it.

He emphasized, however, that his attack is not against the union. "I see the union as a very necessary organization to protect, at least minimally, the rights of the workers," he said.

In this dispute, however, Stovall said he is dealing with a "weak craft union, established by the company, for the company, and not for the men."

The first of two trespassing charges brought against Stovall in connection with this dispute occurred when he refused to leave company premises following his termination. He remained on the grounds, he said, in order to obtain further testimony from employees concerning grievances they had filed. That trespassing charge has since been dropped.

"They're afraid to give me a trial," Stovall said, "because

they know I'll call witnesses and they'll have no one left down there to work for them. They just couldn't afford that right now." "As shop steward, I felt I had every right to attend the meeting," he said. "I asked them to hold the meeting on neutral ground, but they didn't comply."

Management has since agreed to prepare a proposal of settlement for some of the 14 grievances filed against them by employees. A grievance concerning Stovall's termination, however, was separated by the company from the original list. There has been no official word from American Ship Dismantlers in regard to Stovall's possible reinstatement.

To Stovall, however, this is not just a personal battle for a job. "This is an intense struggle," he said.

"It's hard to say whether I am winning or losing. But that doesn't matter — at least we'll have a better idea, in the end, of where the rank-and-file workers really stand in the legal system of this country."

Everybody's Business

Nuclear Council may have 'sincerity' gap

By DREX HEIKES
Of the Emerald

I had heard so many bad things about the Nuclear and Thermal Energy Council prior to their arrival in Eugene Wednesday for a public hearing on the nuclear and thermal plant siting report that I expected them to be ogres.

Talking with "environmentalists" I got the impression that the typical council member was a guy who would lease out his grandmother as a catcher's mitt.

I was suspicious of the council and prepared to hear them talk out of both sides of their mouths.

Wednesday came. I walked into the hearing and glanced toward the NTEC members . . . ten of them at large in the city council chambers.

But in the next two hours my mind changed. Perhaps the council wasn't so bad. They seemed to take a genuine interest in each and every testimony.

They asked questions — better yet — relevant questions. When William Holser, professor of geology at the University, told the council that air corridors hadn't been included in the siting report, the council wanted to know who they could contact in order to obtain information on air traffic.

When Eugene Water and Electric Board General Manager Byron Price told the council that EWEB had made several meteorological studies in the state, council members wanted to know what the results were of the research done in the Willamette Valley.

So why do a large number of people feel the council is diabolical? I started checking.

Two preliminary hearings similar to Wednesday's had been held prior to the final report and a number of environmentally oriented groups had testified at them. Many of these groups were represented Wednesday. Members of these groups felt that NTEC had ignored virtually all of the public testimony offered in the preliminary hearings.

One complaint was that the same testimony had to be presented for the third time simply because it hadn't been considered before.

Another had asked that meteorological conditions be included in the report, but they weren't. Still another felt the council was wrong in declaring all areas of the state suitable for nuclear plants unless proved unsuitable. She was upset because the council had "repeatedly ignored the point."

The groups were pessimistic about the chances of altering the final report because they felt their previous efforts had failed so drastically. According to these groups, NTEC had been just as considerate and "interested" during the preliminary hearings as they were Wednesday.

The message was clear — these guys give you a smile, a kind word and a lot of attention, and then file your testimony in the trash. The question in their minds is one of the council's sincerity.

Since, by definition, the chief source of input to the council is supposed to be the public and because a tremendous amount of testimony was presented at the hearing, the truth about NTEC will be borne out in their actual response to the testimonies.

Friday, February 23, 1973