

EDITORIAL

Fee rise wise

The Students' Union is asking students to approve a \$5 increase in fees to ensure the continued provision of quality services, and this request should be met. Students should vote "yes" in the referendum on Friday.

Numerous arguments can and have been made by the SU executives campaigning for the referendum. The best argument is: we need the dollars to maintain the present level of services.

We do not need the money to bail out the Students' Union from its financial predicament, thus removing pressure from the business areas to perform well. If that were the argument being used, the referendum should be defeated.

Instead, students should realize that inflation has been eating away at the purchasing power of Students' Union fees. Fees haven't seen a substantial increase since 1974, and the amount in real dollars coming in to sustain the organization has fallen considerably. When the financial crunch came this year, both service and business areas were put under intense pressure to perform, and this further weakened the position of the service areas.

Now students should act to remove the pressure from the direct service areas, restoring them to relative stability. This is the intended use of \$2 of the proposed \$5 hike.

The other \$3 will go towards planning for the future, something which is sorely needed around the SU. The constitution says that every year six percent of student fees must go into a capital reserve fund, but this fund has never existed except in the mind of accountants.

The proposal contained in the referendum is not like that. The \$3 will go directly into a completely autonomous account, perhaps at an outside financial institution, and it will be used only for replacement and renovation of SUB assets. It will not be used to offset the deficit.

The SU could launch a crusade to slash services and take drastic steps to alleviate the current financial situation, but this would be irresponsible. It would be pouring the fees of students down a drain created largely by SU businesses and would be asking students here for the next three or four years to sacrifice any benefits they might receive from the SU to bail it out. The burden of debt should instead be spread more evenly over a number of years, and should be placed on the shoulders of the areas which caused the crisis in the first place.

The basic purpose of the Students' Union is to serve the students. The \$5 increase in student fees will ensure that students continue to be served at an optimum level at the lowest cost, and for that reason it should be approved.

Editor's note: The editorials appearing in the Tuesday Gateway were most definitely written by me, and no one else. The "renegade editor" responsible for the byline "renegade editor" has been summarily drawn and quartered. It was not funny, and I apologize for the confusion this may have caused.
Keith Krause

the Gateway

If it happens on campus...it's news to us.

VOL. LXXI NO. 36
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1981
TWELVE PAGES

Editorial Staff
EDITOR - Keith Krause
MANAGING - Jim McElgunn
NEWS - Mike Walker and Peter Michalyszyn
PRODUCTION - Robert Cook
ARTS - Nina Miller
SPORTS - Shaune Impey
PHOTO - Bill Inglee and Ray Giguere
CUP - Geoff McMaster
ADVERTISING - Tom Wright
MEDIA PRODUCTIONS - Margriet Tilroe-West
CIRCULATION - Mike McKinney

"Platitudes without action" lives! Oh, and there he goes... "Tricky Dick" Hancock's slate is off and running, with Tom Freeland, Doug Sponer, Elda Hopfe and Garnet DuGray zipping along in satin shirts and designer dresses. Ohmigod! Cathy Emberly has just admitted that the North Gameau Typesetters' Association has never even heard of her. Maureen Laviolette, Stephen Lamoureux, Susan Knowling, Jens Andersen and Mary-Ruth Olson are busily obscuring the real issue: power. And of course there's the joke slate, the Left-Liberal Democrats: Michael Skeet for fuhrer, Dave Chan for vp-mellow, Pater Hammond for vp-dope, Kent Blinston for vp-libel, Alison Thomson for vp-intimidation and Karl Wilberg for Bored for the Ford. And the winner is... you still haven't figured out SU politics yet, have you? Well, neither have we.

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. With a readership of more than 25,000, the Gateway is published by its proprietor, the Students' Union, Tuesdays and Thursdays during the winter session. Contents are the responsibility of the editor; editorials are written by the editorial board or signed. All other opinions are signed by the party expressing them. Copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. The Gateway, a member of Canadian University Press and the Youthstream Network, is located at room 282 SUB, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2J7.

Newsroom 432-5168 Advertising 432-3423

A SAMPLE of REAL GOOD EXCUSES FOR NOT VOTING in the S.U. ELECTION

~ONE IS JUST RIGHT FOR YOU~



Where to in '82 by Keith Krause

When the Students' Union election campaign began this year, at first glance it seemed a split slate would be the best solution. Neither slate appeared to have a monopoly on good people, and in any case one should evaluate each position individually on the basis of the people running for it.

But as the campaign proceeded, the picture began to change. Listening to the candidates speak, conducting private interviews with them, reading their literature and speaking with people involved with student government on this campus is time consuming, but it is the only good way to obtain a clear picture of the candidates and their suitability for the job. The Students' Union is a \$4.5 million operation so the people selected to lead it must be qualified and competent.

The first portfolio for which a "best choice" became clear was the vice president finance and administration position. Cheryl Donnelly (Kirk slate), although she has moderated her position somewhat since Tuesday's editorial, still displays a remarkable lack of knowledge about the operations of the Students' Union, despite all her talk about depreciation and systems analysis. Elise Gaudet (Soper slate) has had the wisdom to realize her limitations, and she is certainly less likely to take drastic and potentially disastrous steps to get the SU on its financial feet.

Neither candidate has been big on policy, but it is impossible in that portfolio to speak authoritatively without being in the job for a few months. That has been Donnelly's biggest mistake; with virtually no previous contact with the SU she is proposing major upheavals.

The next candidate who began to pull away from his opponent was Brian Bechtel (Soper slate). Bechtel has about as much experience as Dariel Dent (Kirk slate), but his grasp of the issues and approach to problems is much more insightful. This man is not stupid, and his suggestion for using a marketing survey of SU business and service areas to evaluate their success can be contrasted with Dent's commitment to improving cabaret policy.

Bechtel is also not afraid to take politically unpopular stands, such as his suggestion that now is not the time to embark on the risky expansion plan CJSR radio is proposing. It would be so much easier to do as the Kirk slate did, and simply say CJSR expansion is a good idea and worry about the details later. Promises come cheap, but Bechtel is not "playing the game."

The external portfolio was the next one to come under careful scrutiny, and here the going became rough. Joanne Stiles (Kirk slate) is an excellent speaker (she is a debater), and often it is difficult to separate the rhetoric from the substance in her speeches. In fact, after listening to her closely, one notices that there is precious little substance. Stiles has a pocketful of platitudes about increased awareness and lobbying and public relations, but her speech in Wednesday's forum contained no reference to students.

External is a portfolio that involves all the items listed by Stiles, but to emphasize only those aspects means that many other issues which more directly concern students would be ignored. Lisa Walter (Soper slate) may not have the style of Stiles, but she has, in her previous involvement with Lister Hall Students' Association and Students' Council, demonstrated more ability to work within the structure of the Students' Union to achieve results.

At this point, the score is: Soper 3, Kirk 0. Which brings this question to mind: If Bob Kirk is so qualified, how come he has been unable to

attract many competent people to his slate?

The choice between Elizabeth Lunney (Soper slate) and Tim Marriott (Kirk slate) for the position of vice president academic is by far the most difficult. Lunney is experienced in dealing with faculty associations and student bodies; Marriott is experienced in dealing with university bodies such as General Faculties Council. The academic position involves a bit of both.

One must then turn to the specific policies proposed by each. Marriott suggests throwing more money at clubs and faculty associations in an effort to build them up; Lunney, while committed to providing more funds, intends to work with these organizations on a personal level. Admittedly, Lunney is an apolitical person in a political job, but she is experienced enough to deal properly with specific issues such as study space, library funding and student evaluation of teaching on a more than superficial level.

This race should go to Lunney, by a hair. Finally, one comes to the presidential candidates, and the answer to the question posed earlier is clear. If Bob Kirk could not find the most qualified group of candidates to run with him, he should not be given the job of Students' Union president.

Kirk has also attempted, throughout the campaign, to be all things to all people, with the inevitable result that he pleases few and offends many. His slate was carefully crafted to appeal to as many campus groups as possible, ignoring the personal differences that have now emerged within the slate.

Phil Soper did not approach the campaign in this way. He approached people he felt he could work with and were qualified for the job. This has netted him the best people both individually and as a group.

Kirk has a wealth of experience working with the university administration, academic staff and various policy organizations. This is his strong point. Unfortunately, though, his experience is not directly relevant to students; his slogan "It's time to get back to academics" shows this. His idea of the Students' Union as part of a larger community is laudable, but the president's position is a "people position," and is not designed for that approach. One suspects he cares little about things like clubs and SU finances and other purely "Students' Union" issues.

Phil Soper, on the other hand, has his experience on the student level, with Students' Council. He is not removed from students in the way Kirk is, and this helps explain his honest and open approach.

Soper simply is not in this election to win at all costs, nor is he prepared to scurry around trying to gain student support without laying his cards on the table. His lack of cynicism and awareness of his strengths and weaknesses is vitally important in a job that requires working closely to coordinate the efforts of many people. Kirk does not deal with people nearly as well as Soper does.

So, one begins by analyzing candidates individually, and one ends up supporting an entire slate. That is a bonus, for it indicates that the people who are best qualified for each position are also committed to working together as a group to achieve their goals. Each individual on the Soper slate is strong enough to deserve election on his or her own merits; together they make a powerful and deserving team.

And teamwork is what will make the Students' Union a strong and stable organization, now and in the future. On Friday, students would be wise to vote wholeheartedly for the Soper slate.