

# ...blue smoke and mirrors

themselves. We're a service and we should give them all the rights and full range of services now offered to all student groups. And if you're asking me on a philosophical level whether I believe in them I think that's outside the range of the v.p. internal.

**Gateway:** *How would you assess their first year on campus was the phrasing of the question.*

**Reading:** I'd say they were quite successful, they've got a good following and I'm right behind them.

**Stamp:** One quarter of one percent of the population of the students — I figured it out.

**Reading:** Well, I don't think the v.p. internal should provide any barriers to any organization.

**Greenhill:** Have you got any criticisms of them?

**Reading:** Criticisms of the women's centre?

**Greenhill:** Yes. No criticisms of the women's centre.

**Reading:** No. I don't see my position as being one of a philosopher...

**Stamp:** They are a club and they are under your jurisdiction.

**Reading:** Not in terms of their philosophy, but in terms of their organization. What I want to do is foster the education here.

**Conway:** We can have opinion about the clubs, but I don't think that any of the v.p. internal candidates should state that they are going to get involved with the inner workings of the party — I agree completely with Jeff in that respect. I don't think it is up to us to tell them how their club is to be run.

**Gateway:** *Right — everyone seems to be saying more or less the same thing.*

**Walker:** Surprisingly enough.

**Gateway:** *We'll cut this one off. You have to leave at a quarter to three, Ray?*

**Walker:** It'll be interesting to see if they (Stamp slate) come up with the most moderate position on the women's centre.

**Gateway:** *Can we get one quick question in before Ray has to go? I'd like to ask everyone except Mike Walker and Gord Stamp, why didn't you run last time, and what changed in your mind?*

**Schug:** Well I'd like to say something. I was going to run for president last time but I was one day late — so I got burnt.

**Everyone:** Laughter.

**Walker:** You would have run against Gord?

**Stamp:** He didn't know I was running at the time.

**Greenhill:** I guess the reason I got involved was because I was very critical of a lot of the goings on in the last election, I was really, really concerned. Well, I guess I won't get into the actual nitty gritty there, but I realized that after being critical about if that if I really did care enough about the Students' Union to criticize everybody, it's easy to criticize when you are not involved yourself, but I thought my criticisms were justified. I decided that maybe what I should do was to get involved and try to alleviate some of the problems which I saw existing. I think those problems were manipulation of the student body rather than trying to inform them during elections. I think that some candidates showed quite a lack of sincerity. I think that in a lot of cases now students don't believe that the Students' Union represents their best interests. We do represent them in things like cutbacks — we do represent them on

the big issues — but when it comes to the small issues such as scrip or parking tickets, or such as what's going to be happening with bus passes that aren't valid during a transit strike, students council and students executive hasn't seemed to have dealt with them properly. And for that reason, when I found out that Bill Cottle wasn't going to be running again I decided that I'd try to continue to represent the moderate viewpoint which he put forward, and try to have some continuity and cooperation with the outgoing executive and with the executive members who are already elected in. And I think I can provide that cooperation with the executive members already in office and I can provide the sincerity and honest approach that will maybe turn the Students' Union around, and maybe represent the students needs more fully.

**Gateway:** *O.K. Ray?*

**Conway:** I'm in my fourth year of an arts program and I was going to be graduating this term up until it was announced that the elections had been overturned. I had been approached by one or two individuals separately and was asked if I was considering it, and I just dismissed it out of hand. I hadn't really thought about it. When the Students' Union elections were overturned, a group of individuals approached me and asked me if I would consider it, and I thought about it for about a week and decided that I thought I could make a contribution, not just to maintain the status quo, but actually make a contribution to the Students' Union, so I decided that I'd be willing to give up a year out on a job. Instead of working in the private sector, I thought I'd take a shot here first.

**Gateway:** *Hi Kent.*

**Blinston:** Where's the game?

**Gateway:** *270A*

**Blinston:** O.K., have a nice time everyone.

**Gateway:** *We will.*

**Walker:** We are.

**Gateway:** *OK, does that wrap it up for you Ray?*

**Conway:** Yes, I'll just sit here and wait until the others are finished with this question.

**Gateway:** *O.K., and then maybe we'll just fire a couple more questions at the presidents to be fair. Jeff?*

**Reading:** The reason I didn't run for v.p. internal was that I felt that Dawn Noyes would do an effective job. She's had the experience in the Students' Union and she would do a very good job. She was the only candidate at that time and I thought she would win by acclamation, so I sat out that race. This election is a totally different picture. I feel that the people who are running against me aren't as qualified as me. I haven't seen them around the Students' Union building or at any of the council meetings, and I feel that I have the background to do the job better than the others, and that's basically it. I can also work well with Mike.

**Everyone:** Loud laughter.

**Unidentified:** This is what I've heard...

**Gateway:** *You wanted to say something Gord?*

**Stamp:** Yes, I want to bring this out in the open right now. You (to Greenhill) were representing Bill Cottle as his lawyer at the DIE Board meeting. I find it more than coincidental that now that he's dropped out you are taking his place. I want to know exactly why and how that works.

**Greenhill:** In a sense it is more than coincidental. DIE Board meetings were on a Wednesday. Bill Cottle approached me Tuesday night after a council meeting and told me about the allegations that were going forward and asked me to represent

him as a neutral objective observer. So I decided I would. I hadn't been involved actively in either the Cottle or the Walker campaign up until that point. But when I looked at the allegations I was no longer objective in that I believed that the allegations against the Cottle slate were at best wrong and at worst slanderous, and I think that was justified when it was acquitted five nothing. When the election was overturned, I was surprised because that wasn't what I was asking for at all — I was asking for the overturning of the 'presidential election' because it seemed to me that there were very questionable electioneering practices involved, and I believe that the president was responsible for the actions of any of his supporters, particularly both his campaign managers.

So as soon as that occurred, I offered to help Bill Cottle, and Bill Cottle wasn't sure whether he was running again, at which point I decided that I was involved enough and interested enough in what was going on and believed that I could make a contribution, that I would run if Bill Cottle was to resign. He had first refusal, and he was very uncertain. But then, the afternoon of the march, Bill Cottle confirmed that he wouldn't be running and so then I decided that I would take his place. That's how the connection stands.

**Stamp:** *O.K., I just wanted to know.*

**Gateway:** *O.K.?*

**Walker:** I really want to respond to a couple of points...

**Gateway:** *Sure.*

**Walker:** Rob's been flying inuendo across the room about the DIE Board proceedings...

**Greenhill:** Thanks-not again...

**Walker:** Well I think the facts are fairly clear. It was established at the DIE Board proceedings that the Walker executive campaign made an honest mistake, unknowingly broke the rules...

**Greenhill:** Made a mistake...

**Schug:** Is this relevant to this election...?

**Walker:** Well I think somebody is going to try and make it relevant and so I should clear up the facts.

**Schug:** Well you didn't bring out the question...

**Walker:** Fine...

**Schug:** Well don't accuse us of bringing it up if we didn't...

**Walker:** (to Gateway) Now don't quote me on that, alright.

**Schug:** (to Gateway) No, quote him on asking not to be quoted, that's what I want you to do.

**Walker:** (to Gateway) I want to clear up a few facts. May I please?

**Gateway:** *Go ahead...*

**Walker:** Thank-you, thank-you.

**Gateway:** *...the issues on the table.*

**Walker:** Right. Well, it was established, it was accepted by DIE Board in their decision that there was in Hal Zalmanowitz's words, "no maliciousness". Now that means, if you'd been able to speak properly, that it was an honest mistake, that there was no intention to break the rules. It has been established since, that the election wouldn't have been overturned had our campaign materials been put on doors instead of in mailboxes.

**Greenhill:** That's not necessarily true. There were three or two definite allegations against the Walker slate. One was concerning putting campaign materials in illegal positions, and considering one of your campaign managers, this was her third year on campus running in an executive election.

**Walker:** Well she didn't do that particular thing.

**Greenhill:** I was under the impression that it was...

**Walker:** It was Don Millar that put the things in mailboxes.

**Greenhill:** Well Don Millar as your campaign manager is supposed to read regulations.

**Walker:** Oh he knows he should have done that.

**Greenhill:** And I think it wasn't the act itself; it was indicative of the approach which seemed to be one of a fair degree of arrogance in the sense that if you believe your above reading regulations and you are involved in a campaign, you're being fairly arrogant. The other allegation which was put forth which I don't know what the results of it are, if it was ever discussed, was the fact that Dawn Noyes was running in a campaign and she was accidentally ineligible.

**Walker:** As a matter of fact that was put forward to DIE Board for a ruling only, there never was any allegation made against anyone.

**Greenhill:** And the Walker Executive was allowed ninety more dollars in election expenses because of that, when in fact she wasn't even able to run. So I think that you're right, in a sense the matter itself was small, but it's just like when you get a mafioso on tax evasion because you can't get him on anything else. I think that in the allegation that was made then, I was very clear as to what we could prove and could not prove. All we could prove was that election regulations had been broken and that they'd been broken by your supporters.

**Walker:** And what couldn't you have proved?

**Greenhill:** We couldn't have proved malicious intent and so we didn't try to prove malicious intent. I think in a sense that this could have no bearing on this election, and I don't think it should have any bearing on this election. I don't think that the DIE Board proceedings are important except as insofar as they've made the students population have to submit to another election.

**Gateway:** *O.K., we'll cut this one off here.*

**Walker:** Bit the bullet.

**Gateway:** *Just a couple of more questions, to presidents, how would you like to see the Gateway seizure lawsuit handled in council next year. Gord?*

**Stamp:** I would sue them to the hilt because I believe that the police are getting away with too many things that they're not allowed to as it is, and for once they got caught with their hand in the cookie jar and I feel they should be nailed as much as they can.

**Gateway:** *Robert?*

**Greenhill:** Yes, I think we should proceed with a legal action, I have no doubt about that and in council I spoke in favor of it. I think there is a real matter of ethics here, the fact that we are supposed to be an autonomous organization and neither the police nor campus security should be interfering — one, with action of the Students' Union, and two, with freedom of the press on campus, and so I believe until we get proper compensation, whether it be financial or otherwise we should pursue it right to the very end. The guilt had better be proven.

**Gateway:** *O.K., Gord says sue to the hilt and Robert says pursue to the very end, does this mean criminal charges here as well?*

**Stamp:** Any charges we can nail them on, because I think freedom of the press and freedom of people's rights and usually the police around beating up people and doing

*continued on page 10*