

Residence not an institution

There are a number of gross inaccuracies and misrepresentations of fact concerning Lister student government in the issue of Feb. 6, written by R. Souddaby and others. Firstly, the authors make a number of ridiculous generalizations concerning the characters of floor Seniors. It is simply not fair to state that they are disruptive influences who make life miserable for others. The majority are conscientious students who have accepted and are carrying out their considerable responsibilities and duties in an effective manner, with nominal compensation. Do you suppose nearly every Senior is actively opposing the dissolution of student government? It's not for their benefit; few Seniors return to Res simply because by that time in their university career, they have outgrown the desire to live in an intimate community. They are protesting the changes, because they realize the potential benefits of

student government will be lost to future residents.

Secondly, the Lister Hall Students' Association is condemned for not running Res in the manner of the "academic institution" which the authors perceive it to be. Lister Hall is not an academic institution and it shouldn't be! The university is an academic institution, but Res is our home for eight months of the year! The LHSA is therefore primarily obliged to be concerned with the social and personal needs of the residents; a mandate which it has well met.

Concerning the proposed changes put forth by Gail Brown, Mr. Souddaby and his co-authors seem to misunderstand their nature. The authors state that "the basic problem is not a fault of student government in principle" and I whole-heartedly agree. But if this is the way they feel, how can they support Brown's proposals which would almost entirely remove the power that student government presently has, and subsequently

turn responsibilities such as control of student services funds and discipline over to an administrative Big Brother?

One of the chief benefits of a student government in Res is the opportunity it presents to students for some tangible experience in running their own lives and participating in an organization serving their peers. This opportunity is threatened by Brown's proposals. Her recurrent rationale for structural changes is that, under the present situation, Lister Hall loses too much money. But by taking action to reduce the deficit (and I have not yet been convinced that her changes will accomplish that) she has completely overlooked the needs of the students in the complex. We need student government in order to achieve the best possible quality of life for students in Lister Hall; that should be the chief concern of the administration.

Doug Torrance
Main Henday
Science 4

Second wind

Adam Singer and Tom Barrett

This year's Students' Union election campaign is the most confusing and depressing one in years. And nothing is more jumbled than those amorphous things called slates.

Of the three groups in the running, one is a joke (the Liberal Democrats), one is incomplete (Olmstead has no candidate for VP Finance and Administration), and one had to kidnap a presidential candidate at the last minute.

So don't buy Alan Fenna's line about how important it is to elect slates intact. His own crew barely knew each other two weeks ago. Besides, there's no reason why reasonable people with different political views can't work together to accomplish things (are you listening, Cheryl!).

Unfortunately there's not much of a positive nature to be said about the presidential candidates.

Dean Olmstead has been an indifferent campaigner whose statements bear an unintentional but uncanny resemblance to the things being said by the Liberal Democrats.

Olmstead seems like the sincere, soft-spoken, apolitical type. He's a very likeable guy but there are real doubts about whether he is assertive enough to provide the effective leadership the Students' Union really needs.

Alan Fenna has run an efficient and impressive campaign, but it's hard to tell if that's a reflection of his competency or of the expertise of the organization behind him.

Fenna's last minute "leap of faith" from the Liberal Democrats to his present slate is certainly a curious phenomenon. It appears Alan has been reborn. Baptized in the waters of progressivism, so to speak. For most of the year, Fenna had the reputation of being Council's most notorious right-winger. I can still remember him accusing Cheryl Hume of attempting to destroy the capitalist system because she attacked the new cabaret policy. Now he's calling his crew the progressive alternative. Very strange. It's *The Invasion of the Body Snatchers* all over again.

In fairness to Alan, it must be said that he and his running mates are not a repeat of last year's Hume slate. Time has revealed that Cheryl is far more radical than the image she projected last year, but this cannot be said of Fenna. In fact, he's probably not as far to the left as he has sounded lately.

And then there's Harvey Groberman. Or, should I say Fraternity. As an individual who has regularly attended council meetings, I can confidently say that Harvey is the most informed and probably the most competent and perceptive councillor. He has a disturbing tendency towards cynicism and silliness but when serious issues arise he has consistently been impressive and convincing.

I have no doubt that he is the best presidential candidate. But what about the voters? Harvey has not offered them a serious platform. How can they judge him? Can I ask them to take my word for it that he'd do a good job? If the alternatives were any better, I don't think I would, but in light of the deficiencies of Olmstead and Fenna, I can say with conviction: Vote for Harvey. He's no joke.

Fenna likely best choice

What does one say? I'm disappointed. The caliber of our presidential candidates this year indeed be much higher. Fenna and Olmstead appear to be the only serious contenders in this five-way race. Harvey Groberman and his platform is the next in line. O'Kurley doesn't seem to have learned very much from his stinging defeat last year. Heavens, how can he expect or even claim to represent the "silent majority". It sounds reminiscent of Richard Nixon. Perhaps if he is elected O'Kurley is not to speak for students at

After carelessly tossing off provincial and national student activity he claims he will lobby the government for the students of the U of A. Does he really believe that he can go it better alone, than with the rest of the students of Alberta through FAS or Canada through NUS? That approach has already proven itself fruitless.

And what about Mr. Olmstead? He can't seem to get off the fence. He put forward not one concrete proposal, save stalling joining NUS because the structure is being revised and he wants to wait for the outcome. Well, if he is serious about ensuring U of A concerns are raised in that revision, what

better way than to become a full voting member . . . now. To his credit Olmstead at least sees the value of working with other students in Canada through NUS.

Fenna seems to be the most credible of the whole lot. And his platform could certainly be filled out some. Nonetheless he does seem capable of presenting concrete proposals for the students of the U of A to decide on.

Well, it's been said. I do hope people take these elections seriously, and that whoever is elected takes serious their responsibility. U of A students deserve concrete representation.

Ronald J. Dick
Commerce 4

CRAP is back!

The Conceptual Reality Alternative Party still survives. Le Larke is selling dreams, Rob Thlehh and Art Deke are going to make them and Milfred Campbell is still trying to lay out. We of the CRAP party would like to invite the members of the student body to a ballot casting ceremony at 3 pm on election day, at the HUB polling station because of our inability to distinguish between the *Son of Fenna* joke slate and some of the more serious slates like the Liberal Democrat party, or the Olmstead slate.

The Independent joke candidates are pretenders—they don't know what a sense of humor is even if it hit them in the eye. Like Bored Ford who's going to make "future making decisions" on the board. In our present level of reality, the future is immutable. Only by burning our ballots will you invoke the forces of change. If you feel differently, the CRAP party asks you to vote for the Liberal Democrat party, who use the great principles that made this galaxy what it is today. But remember, we adhere to this extreme measure only for curable idealists.

Thank you
Art Deke
Milfred Campbell
Rene Le Larke
Roob Thlehh
for CRAP

Second wind

An occasional column of opinion by Gateway Staffers

Gordon Turtle

The question of whether students should elect entire slates or split slates in the upcoming election is controversial, and both sides of the issue have legitimate concerns.

While I cannot support the concept of electing slates in their entirety as a principle, we have seen this year that an executive, composed of members of different slates can become embroiled in infighting from their very first day in office. Slates are generally made up of people with closely-aligned viewpoints and each slate runs against candidates of opposed political stances. To demand that political opponents synthesize to form a cohesive executive is both unrealistic and unfair to the candidates.

Looking at the two major slates in Friday's election (Fenna and Olmstead) there perhaps seem little to choose from between certain matchups, such as DeJong vs. Battacharrya, Hadford vs. Bell, and Michaud vs. Frank. But on closer examination, I think that all of the candidates on the Fenna slate are better-suited for their respective positions than their opponents.

DeJong is the current Academic Affairs Commissioner for the SU and his election would provide a much-needed continuity in a portfolio where the issues are complex and longstanding.

While Sharon Bell (Olmstead slate) could possibly be competent in the office of vp Internal, her basic conservatism and controversial reputation as FOS Director would probably render her politically impotent when facing larger issues than cabaret policies. Her opponent on the Fenna slate is Student Help Director Terry Hadford, and she has demonstrated an open-mindedness and competence that make me confident in her abilities.

While Tema Frank is the most admirable of the candidates on the Olmstead slate, Greg Michaud has impressed me with his quiet honesty and his track record on the Student Finance Board. I support Michaud, but hope that Frank will return to COTIAC.

That leaves us with the position of President. Much has been made of Alan Fenna's ostensibly sudden political reversal; once considered a radical conservative, he is now being attacked in some quarters for attempting to appear "progressive."

I think the confusion in deciphering Fenna's political leanings stems from the fact that he has meticulously avoided becoming a member of either of the two major political camps formed in this year's students' Council. He has dealt with each issue in an independent manner, and has not been swayed by the political

posturings of ideological categories.

An example of Fenna's alleged "two-facedness" has been his reversal of opinion on the South African Boycott question. While he did at first oppose the boycott, his decision to support it came long before his decision to run for office: in late September when a representation opposing the boycott was made to the External Affairs Board, Fenna denounced the representation and defended the boycott in a sparkling and well-delivered statement.

At the Council meeting of October 17, 1978, Fenna seconded and supported a Cheryl Hume motion to "endorse the recommendations put forth by the Senate Task Force on Native Students," and to "express its (Council's) support for the establishment of a fund for the financial assistance of Metis and Non-Status Native students attending the U of A."

At the same meeting, Fenna proposed an amendment to a motion to read "...the Students' Union support the Parkland strikers in their struggle for a first union contract, and that the Students' Union publicize on campus the demonstration of October 28."

At the meeting of October 31, Fenna spoke in favor of a motion that proposed the formation of a committee to investigate "incidences of discrimination, particularly in academic matters, against ethnic minority groups." (It is interesting to note that Mike Ekelund, who prides himself on his egalitarianism, voted against this motion.)

All of these instances prove that Alan Fenna is not by any means a conservative wimp, and that his positions on Council matters have been reasonably consistent and at least marginally progressive. Any conversion that Fenna has undergone was most certainly not an opportunistic and sudden about-face for the purpose of running in this election.

Dean Olmstead, however, has shown very little political commitment, and this, coupled with an embarrassing lack of originality in his campaign, makes his bid for presidency a poor joke. As Fenna said at the election rally, we certainly don't need another Jay Spark, and I fear that Olmstead could be just that.

Not without reservations, I support the Fenna slate in its entirety. I am convinced that they are united though independent and uniformly competent and committed to serving the students on this campus.