

## DIE Board Decisions...

A meeting of the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board was held on 10 February 1982 in order to deal with the following request:

MOVED THAT Students' Council request a Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board interpretation of Bylaw 300 (Nominations and Elections Bylaw); specifically regarding the responsibilities of Students' Council, the Students' Union Chief Returning Officer, and the Faculty Associations in the election of Faculty representatives.

The D.I.E. Board felt the problem was with respect to Subsection (4) of Section 29, Part VIII of Bylaw 300. The Board unanimously recommends that under Subsection (4) of Section 29, Part VIII of Bylaw 300, it be stipulated that when the Faculty or School Association of the respective Faculty or School (Faculty Association) has been designated by the Students' Council to conduct nominations and elections for the Faculty representatives, that the Faculty Association designate a Returning Officer who shall be responsible to the Students' Union Chief Returning Officer.

### Stuffing mailboxes

Re: Cottle Slate's Complaint Against the Walker Executive Regarding the Placement of Campaign Material in the Student Mailboxes in the Lister Hall Residence Complex:

This complaint was originally considered during the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board meeting of 17 February 1982. The Board unanimously agreed that the action of the Walker Executive and/or their representatives was in direct violation of regulations set forth by the Students' Union Chief Returning Officer in the "Instructions to the Candidates" manual. Specifically, the action violated regulations listed on Page 8, "Campaigning in Res and Large Classrooms," Paragraph 3, Section 3, Sentence 1.

A motion to only void the Presidential position of the election was defeated 3-2. A second motion, based on Subsection (1b) of Section 28, Part VII of Bylaw 300, declaring the entire election void was passed 3-2.

Following this meeting, the Chairperson of the Board requested the other members to reconsider the complaint. Upon reconsideration, the Board, using its discretion, unanimously repealed the outcome of the 17 February 1982 meeting during the meeting of 3 March 1982. The Board ordered that a second election be held for the Presidential position only, pursuant to Subsection 2 of Section 28, Part VII of Bylaw 300.

### Proof of eligibility

Re: Request by the Cottle Slate for an Examination of the Proceedings Surrounding the Nomination, and Subsequent Withdrawal, of the Vice-President (Internal Affairs) Candidate for the Walker Executive.

The incident was discussed during the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board meeting of 3 March 1982. The Board unanimously recommends that in the "Instructions to the Candidates" manual and on the nomination form it should be stated that all candidates are required to submit proof of academic eligibility, as defined by the General Faculties Council, to the Students' Union Chief Returning Officer by the nomination deadline.

### Ballot info

Re: Cottle Slate's Request for an Investigation of the Instructions Given to Voters on the Preferential Ballot.

This request was discussed during the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board meeting of 3 March 1982. The Board unanimously agreed that the ballot used in the 5 February 1982 Students' Union Election was properly worded.

The following recommendations were made by the Board as a result of this request:

- (1) The Chief Returning Officer of the Students' Union should place an advertisement in *The Gateway* prior to the election explaining that voting is by preferential ballot and how a preferential ballot operates.
- (2) Section 20 of Bylaw 300 should be clarified as to the fact that voting is by preferential ballot and how such a ballot operates.

### Unfair practices

Re: a Complaint by Don Millar and Lisa Walter against Brian Bechtel, Bill Cottle, Teresa Gonzalez, and Philip Soper relating to activities in the 1982 Students' Union Executive Elections.

This complaint was considered during the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board meeting of 17 February 1982.

The DIE Board unanimously cleared Philip Soper of all allegations made against him in the complaint. The Board also unanimously agreed that none of those mentioned in the complaint were guilty of any unfair electioneering practices as was alleged, and therefore, there had been no infraction of Bylaw 300 Section 27. In light of this, the DIE Board unanimously agreed that no action be taken.

Submitted by,  
Discipline, Interpretation  
and Enforcement Bd.  
Hal Zalmanowitz,  
Chairperson



continued on  
page 6

## Unethical actions in election

Re: S.U. Elections

Politics has been described as the art of the possible. This has been substantiated by the 1982 Student Union elections. As most students are now aware, the Presidential ballot has been overturned by a DIE board vote.

This letter pertains more to the meeting of the DIE board on Wednesday February 17/82, in which the entire election was overturned. This meeting illustrated the depths to which members of the University community would stoop in their bid for office.

Having been present at the DIE board proceedings of February 17th here are our observations.

Many candidates of the 1982 elections participated in events which were bordering on the dishonest. The DIE board proceedings disclosed that Gordon Stamp had been approached by virtually "every member of the Cottle Slate" with a uniform message; Stamp was urged to withdraw from the election due to the fact that he appeared to be splitting the vote away from Cottle. To that end Stamp was assured that his campaign expenses would be covered — presumably by the Cottle Slate. During this meeting, this action was characterized as "coercive" and "unethical". During the proceedings Cottle admitted to approaching Stamp and offered this as justification; "I was not aware that anybody else had talked to him (Stamp)."

The weight of that night's evidence, however, made it reasonably clear that the Cottle-Stamp affair was not an unfortunate occurrence, but indeed a conscious conspiracy. This is illustrated by the fact that those members of the Cottle Slate who approached Stamp (in Stamp's words "virtually everybody") did so within a two day period and all but Brian Bechtel carried an identical message. Lisa Walter, v.p. external, characterized the act as "downright slimey," due to the dubious implications it contained.

At this point it is important to point out that at least two of the Cottle Slate members who approached Stamp - Teresa Gonzalez and Bill Cottle, - are active members on numerous campus committees and clubs. The one member of the slate who was not implicated in attempting to coerce Stamp to withdraw merely "encouraged him to vandalize Walker Posters." This of course was none other than the present v.p. internal and B. of G. Rep. (elect), Brian

Bechtel. Bechtel in his defense characterized his statement to Stamp as "a tasteless and crude joke." Stamp illustrated personal doubt as to the context in which the statement was made and at one point argued, "I would have felt it was a joke but minutes later (after Bechtel approached Stamp) Teresa (Gonzalez) and other members of the slate asked me to do the same thing."

Because of the above information we find comments attributed to Hal Zalmanowitz (Chairperson of DIE) rather ridiculous.

He states, "that...three innocent people (Brian Bechtel, Roger Merkosky, and Teresa Gonzalez) were being penalized." This statement is ludicrous. Although their actions were unethical and unjust (including Merkosky's as he obviously granted tacit consent) they simply were not illegal according to University regulations.

Zalmanowitz does not make the obvious connection that if such action is not forbidden this poses a serious lapse in the rules guiding acceptable conduct. Instead he argues it's "legal."

Robert Greenhill, who represented the Cottle Slate at the meeting, illustrated a general decline in moral standards when he stated it is "really a shame that

there was so little of this kind of humour in this election." We would argue that such disreputable behavior is not light-hearted humour but a travesty to democracy. Humour indeed; is this, Mr. Greenhill, how you would wish to conduct a campaign?

The Cottle Slate is not the only group which must be chastised. The Walker executive violated regulations when they apparently inadvertently placed election literature in Lister Hall mailboxes. It is disturbing to find that candidates would not adequately acquaint themselves with the rules that guide election procedures.

In this letter we hope to raise some important questions relating to serious events: 1) Why did the DIE board reverse a decision despite the actions of the Cottle Slate including Teresa Gonzalez, Brian Bechtel and Roger Merkosky? 2) Why was the action not publicly condemned even if it did not prejudice the election results? 3) Has the board not tacitly condoned such despicable behavior?

It appears an appropriate slogan for the Cottle Slate could have been "Nixon — now more than ever!"

Oscar,  
Pol. Sc.  
Mary Joy Aitken,  
Grad Studies

## Side-stepping regulations

Politicians have long been famous for side-stepping and smokescreening issues. A good example of this is DIE Board's decision to void the SU Presidential election. We've heard the "wishy-washy decision-making angle, we've heard the 'Kangaroo Court' angle, and in addition, the "political, technical, and flip-flop" angles, but it is not surprising that we haven't heard much about the "we openly violated election regulations" angle.

Curiously, the Walker people don't want to talk much about that aspect of this little incident, but would rather divert discussion down other avenues.

DIE Board was created to ensure that the SU Constitution and Bylaws are interpreted and enforced, and to prescribe disciplinary action in situations

where these regulations are violated. In an election where 23 preferential ballots separates the two leading Presidential candidates, every violation of regulations, no matter how "technical" it may appear to the violators, is significant and must be seriously considered.

I personally hold the view that Students' Council and the Chief Returning Officer would not create these regulations unless they were to be enforced.

I suggest to members of the Walker Executive, their campaign managers, or anyone who considers election regulations as "technical" that they take their concerns either to DIE Board for clarification, or to the proper legislative body for revision.

Tim Sayers  
Comm II  
Die Board

## \$Million loan

Re: "Student loan defaults wreak havoc," *Gateway*, March 9, 1982, p. 2.

No wonder the Canada Student Loans Program is in trouble!! Can you imagine what kind of payments those students would have on their loans! 93,000 students defaulting on \$173,000 million in loans represents an average loan of \$1,750,000!!!

On the other hand, with loans like that, why doesn't the University just increase tuition to \$100,000 or so — that would help our funding problem.


David Prud'homme  
Staff

## LETTERS

Letters to the Editor should be a maximum of 250 words on any subject. Letters must be signed and include faculty, year and phone number. No anonymous letters will be published. All letters should be typed, although we will reluctantly accept them if they are very neatly written. We reserve the right to edit for libel and length. Letters do not necessarily reflect the views of the *Gateway*.

## The Quinlan Sisters

An a cappella adventure



**Time & Date:**  
Tuesday, March 16, 1982  
8:30 pm

**Place:**  
Centennial Library Theatre

**Admission:**  
Adults \$3.50  
Students & Seniors \$2.50

Tickets at Woodward's

