

# PERSPECTIVES

## Emerald Endorsements

The following are the editorial board's endorsements for the ASUO ballot measures that students will vote on today and Thursday. The editorial board encourages you to make sure your voice is heard. Get out and vote!

TITLE	DESCRIPTION	ODE VOTE	REASON
<b>MEASURE 1</b>	Shall the \$26,212 allocated to the Designated Driver Shuttle, by the PFC, in the spring of 1998 be transferred by the ASUO Executive for use by the Designated Driver Shuttle?	<b>Yes</b>	The fact that the money in question has already been allocated to DDS by the Programs Finance Committee somewhat limits debate on this measure. If passed, the measure would redistribute \$26,212 within the DDS account, allowing them to purchase a new van. We are a bit wary of the "unforeseen payroll costs" and the "administration costs," and would like to see them explained, but the more pressing issue at this point is keeping DDS in business.
<b>MEASURE 2</b>	Shall it be resolved that the students of the University of Oregon formally request the University of Oregon cease purchasing Gardenburger brand products effective July 1, 1999?	<b>No</b>	Frankly, some of us remain a bit baffled as to why this measure is even on the ballot. The measure is nonbinding, so even if it passes it will not directly affect the presence of Gardenburgers on campus. Furthermore, the only place on campus where one can actually get a Gardenburger is in the residence halls, where students continue to consume the product even though an alternative is offered alongside it. We fully support efforts to educate students about the issue of migrant labor and the boycott of NORPAC foods. We also agree that a strong student mandate against Gardenburger's presence on campus would be a valuable tool in negotiations for its removal. However, only about 10 percent of students are expected to actually vote. This measure puts that minority in the position to decide an issue that primarily affects students living in University Housing. That doesn't even come close to being a mandate from the students, no matter what the result.
<b>MEASURE 3</b>	Do you support funding the Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group (OSPIRG) from student incidental fees at a rate which reflects approximately \$2.88 per student per term for a total of \$128,000 per year for two terms beginning July 1, 1999?	<b>No</b>	After interviewing representatives from both the Committee to Re-establish OSPIRG and opposing groups, the editorial board engaged in a lengthy debate on both perspectives. When the dust settled, the majority of members were against restoring OSPIRG's funding. While we all agreed that OSPIRG fights for important issues, several questions remained about how OSPIRG should function as a student group receiving student fees vs. its current structure. Ultimately, those questions were enough for a no vote.
<b>MEASURE 4</b>	Shall the ASUO Constitution be stricken: Rule 12.1: "The regular ASUO election shall be held no earlier than (April 1 and no later than May 1) of each year" and be amended to state: The regular ASUO election shall be held no earlier than (February 15 and no later than April 1) of each year."	<b>Yes</b>	Not too much discussion on this one. The measure would amend the ASUO Constitution so that elections may be held between Feb. 15 and April 1, as opposed to between April 1 and May 1, as currently stated.
<b>MEASURE 5</b>	Shall student incidental fees be increased by approximately \$1.45 per student per term for a period of one year to generate \$72,878 to fund the operation of the Designated Driver Shuttle?	<b>Yes</b>	The Designated Driver Shuttle's decision to bypass PFC and go straight to the ballot could have serious ramifications for both the program and other groups on campus. It's true that if this measure passes, DDS employees will receive some of the largest stipends on campus, but it is also true that few student-group leaders are paid anything near what they're worth. Aside from that, DDS contributes to the overall safety of this campus and the community by keeping drunk drivers off the road and reducing the number of alcohol-related assaults and other crimes. It is more than worth it to part with \$1.45 a term to continue this service. Whether it passes or not, expect to hear plenty more on this issue next year.
<b>MEASURE 6</b>	Shall a student incidental fee be established at \$7.06 per student per term to generate approximately \$360,000 to fund unlimited bus service within the Lane Transit District service area for all currently registered U of O students for the 1999-00 fiscal year? Law students would pay \$10.59 per regular semester and \$7.06 per student summer semester.	<b>Yes</b>	At \$7.06 per term, the unlimited-use LTD pass is one of the few real bargains on campus. The money provides a service that would cost each student \$30 per term to purchase independently. Aside from the fact that the bus is the primary mode of transportation for many students, it's a nice thing to have just in case. Remember what your mother used to tell you when you tried to leave the house without a jacket: it's better to have it and not need it than to need it and not have it.

## Letters to the Editor

### Former ASUO presidential candidate Reid addresses campus

There comes a time when we all need to sit down and finally rediscover why we get involved in anything while we are members of this campus community. Not many people have done this over the course of the past year, especially in the past week.

We'd like to think that every member of the ASUO gets involved in student government because they truly believe that they have the ability and the desire to make things better for students on this campus. I have no doubt in my mind that the two main tickets for ASUO Executive this year have the ability and the desire to make students' lives better.

However, it is impossible to do anything about the issues that we attempt to influence if we continue to waste our time, our energy and our dignity by bickering about every last little thing that may have gone wrong with elections, which is a time when a number of students on this campus make up their mind as to what they think of the

ASUO.

We need to constantly be asking ourselves what course of action truly represents the best interests of the students. What you've read in this newspaper is not what has really transpired. Grievances filed prior to the announcement of the primary election results were not dealt with until this past Sunday.

No injunction filed by Matt Swanson and I has been addressed because the ASUO Constitution Court is just meeting now, Tuesday afternoon, as this is being written. As a general rule, take whatever the Emerald says with a grain of salt because they've got everything mixed up most of the time.

But the time has come that Matt and I have decided that to push forward with the regular barrage of grievances, complaints, appeals, false and/or misleading Emerald articles and editorials, and the many other things that contribute to the continuing trend toward apathy concerning the ASUO, would do two things that neither of us are

about to be a part of.

One, the ASUO Elections would once again alienate a group of people that might still have some glimmer of hope concerning the ASUO. The elections will lose a little bit more of their legitimacy, and the ability of the ASUO Executive for the 1999-2000 academic year would be scarred from the beginning.

Secondly, by pushing forward any further, we put our dignity and the respect that others have for us on the line. If we lose our dignity and we lose all respect, we can't work on the issues that we care about because we don't have any credibility.

We can't do a damn thing about campus safety, or university housing, or renter's rights, or child care if people don't believe that we are involved solely to make students lives' better.

*Dan Reid is the ASUO programs finance senator. Responses may be sent via e-mail dan-reid@gladstone.uoregon.edu.*

### Fix elections process

We, the Multi-Cultural Center Board of Directors, strongly endorse Wylie Chen and Mitra Anoushiravani as candidates for the ASUO executive positions. We write this letter with two intentions: First to support the candidates whose ideals and goals we strongly believe in, and more importantly, to object to the process that allows an Elections Board appointed by the ASUO Executive to recall the election. The MCC board believes this is not a democratic system. We need an Elections Board unaffiliated with the ASUO. We recommend establishing a means to appoint or elect an impartial Elections Board. Furthermore, for the sake of creating an impartial and objective Elections Board, we suggest relocating the office to a neutral location outside of the ASUO Executive office. These suggestion should be addressed to ensure fair and democratic elections for the future.

**MCC Board of Directors**