

# Editorial endorsements

## Correction

Monday's editorial endorsing Jeff Warren for ASUO President contained a typographical error that greatly changed the meaning of a statement concerning presidential candidate Doug Benson. This is how the statement should have read:

"Benson, in particular, has shown independent thinking even in the face of losing support from his fraternity, and is not swayed by special interests."

We sincerely hope this error will not have any serious negative effect on Benson's campaign.

## SUAB #1: Harold McLean

Harold McLean, a second-year law student, seems the obvious choice for Position No. 1. McLean says SUAB's effectiveness depends on who runs and how much energy is put into the organization. He says he's willing to devote the time and energy necessary to make his voice an effective one. McLean is in favor of using SUAB's potential power by uniting the group and speaking out on issues.

As a third-year student next year, McLean says he'll have no problem knowing and representing his entire constituency. The group of law students is tight-knit, he says, and he plans to make himself available enough to be able to obtain their opinions and speak for them.

Part of the reason we choose to endorse McLean is his opponent, Michael Leeds, also a second-year student, says the SUAB does not have the power to be effective University-wide. Perhaps one problem the SUAB has had being effective in the last couple years is representatives resigned to being ineffective.

## SUAB #2: Dale Buckley

Position No. 2, Journalism and speech, features a three-way battle in which Dale Buckley should come out on top. Buckley is committed to getting more input from his constituents by actively seeking out students, faculty and graduate teaching fellows. Buckley would also speak with deans of both schools and attend courses to make short presentations and receive feedback about issues important to students. Once he gets this input, Buckley says he will work with the other reps to follow through on the ideas. The best way to sum up Buckley's attitude toward serving on the SUAB is "active."

Mark Kendall seems too concerned

with rhetoric and has poor knowledge of the SUAB's history, including issues like course evaluations and the D grade. Kendall would try to contact students to find out their beliefs, but Buckley is, overall, a better candidate.

The third candidate, Ana Maria Bell, is very enthusiastic and says she is very familiar with many professors in both schools, but her overall knowledge of issues facing the SUAB and the two schools leaves her unprepared at this time for a spot on the SUAB.

## SUAB #11: Salena Baker

In Position #11, art and art history, Salena Baker rates a slight edge over her opponent, Carey Moffett. Baker has more of an idea of what she would work for on the SUAB, such as the release of faculty evaluations and student input into tenure decisions. She also plans on working with the Architecture and Allied Arts student union and, on the whole, seems to be the more active of the two.

Moffett lacks a basic understanding of the SUAB and the University and has no concrete ideas of what to do on the board. As a freshman, Moffett is a bit too green to be effective on SUAB.

## SUAB #12: Mike Haddock

If all the candidates for position No. 12, Psychology, sociology and anthropology, could serve on the SUAB, the board would benefit greatly. Only one, of course, can make it, and our choice is Mike Haddock.

Haddock has spent the last year as sophomore class president and would view an SUAB seat as the next step in being involved. Haddock is knowledgeable concerning the SUAB and the issues likely to come up.

He wishes to keep faculty evaluations and to have them released, and is outspoken enough so that he won't be a quiet member of the board. Haddock also wants to set up academic student unions in the departments he will represent so he'll have easy access to his constituent's feelings on issues.

Owens Harriel has several good ideas, such as establishing test files and job banks in the three departments and working at publicizing the SUAB so more students and faculty will be aware of it. Harriel's main drawbacks are his lack of experience, little knowledge of the SUAB and the fact he plans to see how the Senate operates before "making waves."

Pope also has some good ideas, like establishing a handbook for students on what to expect from the major they

are pursuing in each of the three departments, and improving the academic advising in those departments. Pope also seems to lack a general knowledge of the SUAB, as evidenced by his impression that two people will be elected to this position instead of just one. Pope is also unsure of releasing course evaluations, which would diminish even more the chances of having that accomplished.

## SUAB #14: Donald Heady

As with Position No. 12, No. 14, political science, history and geography, is a difficult one to call. Each of the four candidates have strong points. However, the person who seems to have the best grasp of the issues and responsibilities is Donald Heady, a junior in political science and history.

Heady has a good knowledge of two of the constituency's three areas and would make himself visible to all three. He also addresses issues the other candidates have to be asked about or do not bring up at all.

He favors publishing faculty evaluation, utilizing the SUAB as the ASUO's University affairs sector, discouraging car use around campus to help alleviate parking problems and has several ideas for solving the library's inadequate storage facilities.

Kent Laverty is a very close second choice. Laverty says the SUAB is a potential mechanism for quality student input in matters once controlled exclusively by faculty and administration and plans to make his voice, if elected, a strong one.

Laverty, a freshman in political science, plans to keep in close contact with all three departments and favors moving the SUAB chairer into the executive. Laverty is enthusiastic and says he would put the time and effort needed to make the SUAB a cohesive group.

The other two candidates, Natalie Pool and Jim Pasero, talk of issues like faculty evaluations and constituent communication, but they both have drawbacks. Pool is too concerned with constituent issues and not enough with University-wide ones. Pasero has a "not too much can be done through SUAB" attitude and says he'll only be around one year of his two-year term.

## 3 shine for EMU Board

Three of the six candidates for EMU Board are safe bets for next year: Barb Selby, Bill Nelson and Amy Tobias. The other three, while acceptable, are not outstanding.

Both Selby and Tobias know the EMU well. Tobias this year has been director of the Information and Grievance Center and has a good knowledge of what students like and dislike about the building. Selby, although she has no formal experience with EMU functions, has spent considerable time in the building analyzing its assets and defects.

Selby would like to see the EMU used more and advocates more in-building signs and publicity. She also thinks the room scheduling policy needs revamping. We agree. Selby suggests doing informal headcounts to see what parts of the building are used most and make plans accordingly.

Her only weak point is that she does not favor a tavern, yet she has plausible reasons for not doing so. Selby says security and parking would be the tavern's biggest problems.

Tobias favors the tavern as well as other revenue producing facilities in the building. She thinks the businesses would help bring the EMU out of its yearly deficit. She also plans to get more student input to determine building use.

Nelson, again, favors the tavern proposal. He also favors making the EMU more appealing to increase student use and suggests a coffee house-type atmosphere for the fishbowl. He also would try to create more interest for the Recreation Center to combat its continual losses.

Communication with EMU administrative staff is another strong point for Nelson. He plans to stick up for his positions, but realizes that good communication can improve his chances to pass policies.

Corey Henkelman, Tom Christ and Eric Frazier round out the list of candidates. Of these three, Henkelman is the strongest. He advocates "as much student input as possible" in running the building, which is appropriate since about half of the EMU's budget comes from incidental fees.

Christ had no specific goals for next year or issues to deal with. He seems willing to work, but wants to 'get his feet wet' before committing himself. To be effective, he should probably do his homework and be ready to work when he starts.

Frazier displayed a "general dissatisfaction" with the EMU. He, also, didn't have a clear idea of the issues he'd be dealing with as a board member and felt he'd "have to be around awhile to catch on."

## Ballot Measures

### Amendment #1, yes

The ASUO will change a little bit if a ballot measure concerning the structure of the SUAB passes this week, and the changes seem for the good. The measure calls for an amendment to the ASUO constitution to allow the SUAB to have a more effective role in University affairs. It also will allow the ASUO to work more effectively with the SUAB, and decrease the duplication of effort in the two offices.

It is anathema to the ASUO that the SUAB has in the past been a weak organization. Part of the reason is because the students on the board are heavily outnumbered by the faculty on the University Senate. That leads to another

complication: the students on the SUAB sometimes lose interest with the office after being in for a time. With the new structure, innovative ideas and interest in the office will probably increase with the added responsibility.

Vote "yes" on proposed amendment No. One. It's a good idea for improving the overall effectiveness of the SUAB and the ASUO.

### Amendment # 2, no

The ASUO's second ballot measure proposes an amendment that we can't see any reason for and don't think should pass. The amendment calls for a change in the constitution to allow ASUO officials to be recalled after peti-

tions containing signatures from five percent of the student body have been gathered. Presently, 10 percent of the students must sign petitions to recall an official.

This measure would make recall far too simple. Five percent of the student body is not enough people to ensure that a recall would be fair and desired by any more than special interest groups. The 10 percent requirement ensures that wide-based support for a recall is necessary and, should the necessary signatures be collected, a more serious situation.

We think this portion of the constitution is best left alone. Our recommendation is for a "no" vote on proposed amendment No. 2.

## Of course, yes for Mallard

One of the most attractive items on this year's ASUO ballot is the candidacy of Mallard Drake for University duck. Drake has been a fixture of the Emerald's editorial page for nearly three years, and has always shown himself to be versatile; a superlative Frisbee tosser, a magnificent disco dancer, a skier worth many a word of praise, and a duck well worth representing the University.

Then there is Donald. Donald is a dull, classless anachronism who was selected for the position by default; there was no other duck worthy of the post at the time. Now there is.

Mallard Drake will, if given student support, have a good chance of representing the spirit of the University. For nearly three years, he has been a suave, intellectual all-round duck. He's also home-grown, so to speak. Cartoonist-artist Steve Sandstrom conjured the duck from imagination here at the University, not in California. The interest in Mallard has been reflected in media from Eugene to Portland.

The duck is the emblem of the University. It's high time we had a duck from the University to represent the University. Say yes to making Mallard Drake the University mascot.