

## casserole

a supplement section  
of the gateway

editor  
brian campbell

associate editor  
jim rennie

arts editor  
bill beard

photo editor  
al yackulic



THERE IS NO GAMBLE HERE

—Brian Campbell photo

... the cards say nothing

Wayne Burn's library feature on C-4 and 5 is another side of the same scene.

The last time Burns burned up the paper for Casserole he looked in depth at the lecture system and painted a picture different from the look-and-see version high school teachers pass off on university hopefuls. This time he looks at the heart of the campus, or at least what professors tell us is the heart of the campus, and finds a peculiar disease.

The library is playing the role. The library is studying and not studying at the same time. It is sex and not sex. It is brothel and church.

The library is like the letters you write home to your parents telling them how much work you do—it is not quite a lie.

The whole process of not quite lying is an enduring rot. It is the process of being not quite human. The chronic not quite liar is a man who has sold out what he thinks to what he should think.

The not quite liar has nothing to say after he has complained about term papers, classes, the weather, and the lack of parties.

In fact the not quite liar has nothing to say, because he has probably lost the truth in a book he wasn't reading a few years ago.

# They campaigned on issues

But voter interest and turnout didn't show it

By BILL MILLER

An election with few candidates running. An election based on issues rather than personalities.

An election with a referendum bound to generate interest in the election.

A sure-fire combination to produce a large turnout at the polls in the students' union general elections. Numerically, last Friday's turnout was the largest in students' union history (5,558 compared to the previous high of 5,286).

But the percentage of eligible voters casting ballots fell from last year's high of 51.5 per cent to 48.5 per cent.

Why? With few candidates running, a voter has to make fewer decisions than if a full slate was running. With few candidates running, there are less cross pressures on the voter. Therefore, more people should vote. But they didn't.

With an issue-oriented campaign, rather than a personality-oriented campaign, the election should get down to the basics. There is usually more interest generated in an issue-type election, as opposed to a drab campaign based on who's the neatest guy. With more interest, there should be more voters. But there weren't.

When a referendum is also involved, a referendum that has been an issue since late September, a referendum which caused a big flurry in early October, a referendum which has caused a national focus on our campus, voter interest should increase. But it didn't.

Why? Let's take a look at the results, poll by poll. Polling stations reporting increases over last year's results were the agricultural building, the engineering building, the nurses residence, and Lister Hall.

Polling stations with decreases are the arts building, the medical sciences building, the v-wings, SUB, education, Rutherford and Cameron.

New polls this year were the travelling poll, and the Tory Building.

The Tory poll probably accounts for most of the decreases in other polls, as 1,328 people cast ballots there.

Al Anderson picked up every poll in the presidential race. Runner-up Dick Low only once scored more than half of Anderson's take. At Lister Hall, there were 244 votes in his favor, compared to Anderson's 381.

Barrie Chivers also gained more than half of Anderson's votes in only one poll. He got 88 votes versus Anderson's 143 in the arts building poll. In the engineering, medical science, Lister Hall and Rutherford polls, he gained about one-sixth of Anderson's votes.

The race for the student co-ordinator job held no surprises. Gim Ong ran a gestetnered poster campaign and made no major speeches after the Tuesday rally. He lost to incumbent Glenn Sinclair by a vote of 4,337 to 889. One of Sinclair's 4,337 votes is rumored to have come from Ong himself.

The race with most interest attached was the vice-presidential campaign. On first count, on which this analysis is made, Dave King won by five votes.

The agriculture and v-wing polls produced one vote-margins, one for each candidate, King took the v-wing, arts building, medical science building and a 126-39 lead at the nurses residence.

Enarson led the polls in agriculture, engineering, SUB, Lister Hall, Tory, Cameron, Rutherford (5 votes) and, of course, his stomping grounds, education.

King scored well in the medical science building where slate mate Chivers did so poorly, which is hard to explain. He also gained many votes in the arts building where his confreres hang out. His win at the nurses residence must be attributed to the fact that Enarson did little campaigning there.

King lost by five votes in the Rutherford poll, which is surprising in the fact that

Rutherford is the law students' hangout, and Rutherford voted 233-85 against the CUS referendum, one of King's biggest platform planks.

In the CUS referendum, only the nurses residence favored rejoining the national union. All other polls came out against CUS. The vote was close in the arts poll (129 yes, 148 no) but everywhere else, except the nurses of course, the referendum was shot down.

In the traditional small conservative areas, the referendum lost by far more than the overall 2-1 margin. It went down 188-65 in the agriculture poll, 224-55 in the engineering poll, 145-49 in the medical science poll, and 233-85 in the Rutherford poll.

The referendum went down 495-182 at Lister Hall, where there was a last-ditch effort by the Pro-CUS people to get the voters there to rejoin CUS. Their efforts did them more harm than good, however, and were spread by word of mouth to other parts of the campus, where it hurt even more.

The referendum was designed to get the campus to vote on issues. Anderson, Chivers, and King made the referendum a major part of their platform. Enarson waffled on the issue. Dick Low talked about reorganization and avoided other issues. Anderson and King got more votes than Enarson because they took a definite stand on the CUS issue. Chivers lost out because he could not present his views as effectively as Anderson. Low was a good speaker but he too lost out because he avoided the issue of CUS, among other things.

Campaigning on issues has at last entered student politics here, but its effect this year has not been a good one. Rather than increasing the interest and as a result increasing voter turnout, the issue-oriented campaign did the reverse.

But elected officials now have a definite mandate because they ran on the issues and have a better idea of what is expected of them than their predecessors in years past, and in that way the elections were successful.