

Solve the problem once and for all

Last January the University Assembly defeated a governance proposal that would have given the University Senate more decision-making power. Under the governance proposal only those measures lacking a two-thirds majority approval by the senate would be referred to the assembly.

In February the University Senate, frustrated with its lack of decision-making power, voted to abolish itself and replace the senate with a 12-member rules committee. The University Assembly defeated that, also. This left the University Senate once again with an unclear role and a lack of decision-making power.

Now the problem is re-surfacing. Senate members are asking themselves what is the purpose of a University Senate if it has no power and the issues it deals with simply get rehearsed in the University Assembly. That's a very important question.

The senate should have been allowed to abolish itself last February when it voted to do so. That way the new 12-member rules committee could have been set-up and working for the 1984-1985 academic year. This would have resolved a problem which will now take up more time in the University Assembly.

The purpose of the rules committee would be to deal with one specific senate function — re-wording, re-defining and clarifying legislation. The committee would consist of eight faculty members, two student University Affairs board members, a non-voting parliamentarian and secretary.

Part of the problem within the senate last year was getting enough members to show up at each meeting to get a quorum for voting. However, one of the reasons some people didn't show up was because they felt that regardless of how well the senate did its job, it would be largely ignored by the assembly.

The senate should either be given a more clearly defined role and increased decision-making power, or it should be allowed to abolish itself should its members again agree to do so. A 12-member rules committee would be more effective in legislative issues and would achieve more than the current senate, which now has little effect on the Assembly.

Meanwhile, the University Assembly should spend less time on governance issues and start getting down to important business: curriculums, classes, minor degrees and graduation requirements.

More sleaze for Reagan with Donovan indictment

In the Reagan administration there are those who have resigned or been forced to resign because of their politics and there are those who have come under federal investigation for criminal acts of one sort or another. Administration opponents refer to this latter group as Reagans "sleaze factor."

Within the first group is James Watt, (who resigned because of public uproar over his anti-environmentalist and racist remarks). There are also Robert White and Dean Hinton, U.S. Ambassadors to El Salvador who later became critical of Reagan's Central American policy. Richard Schweiker, Secretary of Health and Human Services, was another one who disappeared from the Reagan administration. White House rumors had it that he was too critical of budget cuts in his department. The list goes on.

Reagan also scores high on appointing individuals to government who later were put under criminal investigation. There is Edwin Meese, investigated for illegal financial dealings. There is Rita Lavelle, convicted for perjury and secret dealings with corporations trying to avoid toxic waste clean-up. There is also Ann Gorsuch-Burford, who was investigated for misuse of Environmental Protection Agency funds.

Now, just when the Republicans were hoping that America would forget about the sleaze factor within the Reagan administration, Secretary of Labor, Raymond Donovan, has to go and blow it. Donovan was indicted Monday in New York on charges of grand larceny and filing false documents. He is the first Cabinet member in modern history to be indicted while in office.

Despite this, opinion polls across the country show that Reagan is still the popular choice for president. Will Americans learn the lesson which led to Watergate and one of the biggest political embarrassments in United States history? Will they vote Reagan back into office the same way they voted for Nixon despite the rampant corruption within the Nixon administration?

Time will tell. But one thing is certain. Those Americans who cast a vote for Reagan should be prepared for more scandals, lies and crime within the highest levels of this government.



'HIMSELF SAYS HE WON'T GIVE YOU A POLITICAL ENDORSEMENT, SIR, BUT HOW WOULD YOU LIKE A FAMINE, A COUPLE OF THUNDERBOLTS AND A PLAGUE OF LOCUSTS?'

letters

Reagan must go

Edward White must be kidding! In the Sept. 28th edition of the Emerald he commented by letter that Ronald Reagan has often encountered jeering crowds on his campaign circuit. This is preposterous!

Reagan's crowds are always friendly, never like the Reagan-sponsored tormentors who haunt Walter Mondale. The reason this is true is not that Reagan is so popular — he is not — but in fact his crowds are hand-picked supporters, and protestors are kept far away.

As a prime example, just last week at a college rally in Ohio, the crowd was so pro-Reagan that the most probing questions were not questions at all, but merely comments of agreement, while the true questioners were kept far away by security forces. This is all completely in line with the Reagan campaign philosophy — polish the image, avoid the issues, and shift the blame for his own mistakes.

Admittedly, Walter Mondale is not as charismatic as Ronald Reagan. However, he does consistently attack the issues, tell the cold, hard truth, and present plausible solutions, things we can never hope for Reagan to do.

Reagan has had both a campaign and a presidency of avoidance and sleaze. When juxtaposed with the honest actions of Walter Mondale, the choice is painfully clear.

I can only hope that the millions of voters who agree with Mondale but are voting for

Reagan anyway will show some backbone in November. It is the only salvation for our nation.

Vincent Strickler
Sweet Home

In bad taste

Second person pronouns designate genders thusly; *he she, him her, his her, his hers.*

When one wants, for simplicity's sake, to use one gender's pronoun to represent both, the logical choice would be the masculine as it contains fewer letters.

Lest the fair sex should feel slighted, we simplify in the next instance by removing a separate masculine designation for title of a single man: *Mr. Mrs., Mr. Miss.*

Thus both sexes may practice humility at times in their common speech.

Women's liberation has tried to borrow from the man's humility with her title *Mz.*, to rhyme with *his*, and taking the "M" from *Mr.* to make *she, her, her, and hers* into *me, mine, more, and moreso.*

Earl Gosnell
Eugene

Contradictions

Amusingly the new right-wing can be totally contradictory. Micheal Cross' "Spaced Out" (ODE 9-27-84) is a case in point.

Surely Cross would quickly castigate Mondale as a "big spender." However Cross quickly condemns Mondale for casting a 1971 vote against the Space Shuttle, a massive un-

productive government spending program.

Surely Cross would tell you Mondale's "promises" would cost Americans billions. However, Cross praises Reagan for promising an orbiting space station, another multi-million dollar gadget. How will Reagan pay for this "promise?" More federal debt Mr. Cross?

Cross says the space station will help energy production research. I wonder if Cross supported Reagan's virtual elimination of the modest solar energy research funding under Carter-Mondale?

Of course, Cross totally neglects the military applications of both the Space Shuttle and the proposed space station.

If space exploration represents such a vast economic opportunity why doesn't the private sector lead the way? Unless of course Cross and Reagan are telling us private enterprise can't meet the challenges of the next century.

Even when it comes to private enterprise the new right-wingers are always eager to find exceptions. Look how the right-wing clowns in Congress run like lemmings when the guru Jesse Helms leads the charge for mult-million dollar tobacco subsidies.

If Cross and Reagan are so concerned about the future they should take a look at restoring the massive cuts to higher education. Care to explain your contradictions Mr. Cross?

John Silvertooth-Stewart
Law

oregon daily emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Monday through Friday except during exam week and vacations by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

General Staff
Advertising Director
Production Manager
Classified Advertising
Controller

Susan Thelen
Russell Steele
Rose Anne Raymond
Jean Ownbey

Ad Sales: David Wood, Marcia Leonard, Tim Clevenger, Laura Buckley, Roberta Oliver, Laurie Noble, Jennifer Fox.

Production: Sharla Cassidy, Kelly Cornyn, John Dorsey, Stormi Dykes, Julie Freeman, Kathy Gallagher, Dean Guernsey, Susan Hawkins, Kirk Hirota, Karin McKercher, Lauri Neely, Kelly Neff, Curt Penrod, Tamyie Riggs, Michele Ross, Peg Solonika, Tim Swillinger, Colleen Tremaine, Eileen Tremaine, Hank Trotter.

Editor
Editorial Page Editor
News Editor
Photo Editor
Sports Editor
Sidelines Editor
Entertainment Editor
Assistant Entertainment Editor
Night Editor

Associate Editors
Higher Education
Administration
Politics
ASUO
Student Activities
Features Editor

Reporters: Sean Axmaker, Shannon Kelly, Allan Lazo, Lori Stephens.

News and Editorial
Display Advertising and Business
Classified Advertising
Production
Circulation

Michele Matassa
Costas Christ
Michael Kulaga
Michael Ciapp
Brent De La Paz
Sheila Landry
Kim Carlson
Mike Duncan
Sheila Landry

Mike Sims
Michael Duke
Paul Ertel
Julie Shippen
Jolayne Houtz
Lori Steinhauer

886-5511
886-3712
886-4343
886-4381
886-5511