

OPEN FORUM



Candidates very attentive during open forum

Rob McLellan, Cathy Hanrahan, John Waller, Cindy Hallett, (Elections Officer), Ron Dehmel, Mary Kelly, Paul Arsenault, Mike McNeil.

THE SRC ELECTIONS 1980! FEAR AND LOATHING ON THE CAMPAIGN TRAIL

by James Quick

Sure, the title of this article is a blatant rip-off of Hunter S. Thompson*, but I doubt he reads the *Journal*, so it doesn't matter that much anyway. The reason for choosing such a severe sounding title is because it expresses how a lot of people, (including myself), feel about some of these candidates getting into office, let alone actually being allowed to run for positions of such an important nature.

Before I begin to name names, I think a short rundown of the candidates, and a look at their performances at the Open Forum that was held on Thursday is in order.

First, the candidates for President: **Mike McNeil** — Probably made the biggest impression on the small number (about 50, at any one time)

but only time will tell if it was good or bad. Using the hands-on-hips gunslinger stance, made popular by Pierre Trudeau, McNeil was under an almost constant barrage of questions from the students and each time, like a true politician, managed to avoid the issues and to deliver a song and dance that left many of the students (especially me) with a sour taste in their mouths. McNeil's voice cracked with emotion several times and at one point, according to students at the Forum and to a few of his fellow candidates, he was visibly close to tears.

McNeil ducked the question of whether council had the right to impose a 1.5 grade average on students intending to run for these positions when at the very same time it was trying to prevent the administration from imposing the same regulation. That is goddam hypocritical. But, of course, Mike

McNeil danced his way right around that one, and layed the blame at some Student Councils in the distant past for putting it in the constitution. Total bullshit, since Council, if it had a mind to, could very well have amended the constitution. That was just the beginning, but it got steadily worse after that. I think if McNeil had been asked to state his favorite color, he would have said "plaid", just so that he wouldn't offend anyone and lose a potential vote.

Ron Dehmel — Seems to be a better choice as President, but it comes down to selecting the lesser of two evils. The only real problems that I can foresee with a Dehmel Presidency is that not enough people know about him and that's a damn shame, because, with a little experience he could whip himself into a "fair and just" leader, as opposed to Mike McNeil's "strong" leadership. Oh boy, Mike, I can

almost hear the jackboots now! Shit, I better get back on the track here, or who knows what will happen next.

Although Dehmel seemed a little ill at ease, both in giving his 5 minute speech and answering questions from the floor, he had a fair grasp of the issues and seemed willing to listen to the students who were interested in making comments and suggestions concerning his Presidency.

Don't get me wrong however, I'm not trying to make it seem as if Ron Dehmel is perfect for the job, because he is not. I do not want to vote *for* either of these candidates, but what I want to vote *against* is what concerns me right now.

Next we move to the position of Vice-President Internal, which is rather like the Academy Award for best supporting Actor Actress; it's there, but who really gives a damn?

continued from page 1

Paul Arsenaull — Came on as too "humble". In fact, he went into great detail describing his inadequacies for the job. Hell, students want to be reassured about you being able to do the job, and if you're so sure that you can't do it what's the use in running in the first place. Arsenaull also went on to state that "with the increased weight the title would give him" he would be better able to get things done than a lowly Residence Rep. I would be damned leary of anyone making such a statement. It might well appear that they are on a personal power trip, and not out to look after the best interest of the students.

Cathy Hanrahan — Didn't say much new, but talked of having an "effective" council. Now that makes for nice reading on a campaign poster, but the reality of the matter is that it has just as much a chance of happening as scientist discovering a perpetual motion machine by Tuesday afternoon. Just ask an Engineer for the figures on that! Back to the point. To have an effective council, you must have voter participation, and judging by the turn-out at the Open Forum, and by the total number of votes cast in the elections held in October, nobody gives a flying F*CK. One "effective" council-shot down in flames.

Mary Kelly — Got off to a fine start by not touching on any of the controversial issues, but something she said struck me like one of those 1 ton block that the Coyote on the "Roadrunner" cartoons always seems to get nailed with. It's a pity, too, because, just once, I'd like to see that Roadrunner get what he deserves. Before I regress to far back into my childhood, I'll tell you that Mary Kelly said "Apathy is on the decline". Now anyone making statements like that should be locked up for their own protection, Kelly had merely to lift her eyes into the "crowd" to see just how much student apathy is on the rise. Something that I don't pretend to understand, because I'd be interested to know exactly where my \$62.50 in Student Council fees is being spent. Face it; these people have, or will have control of about a half a million dollars of YOUR money, and spending 2 hours at the Open Forum would have been worth it to find out just where it gets to over the course of the year.

For the position of Vice-President External we have only one person running. And as we all know, this only requires the candidate to pick up two thirds "yes" on a "yes/no" vote. This is a lot easier than it sounds, because, unless you have a "hate club" on campus, people will

naturally vote "yes" for the simple reason that *somebody* in the position is better than *nobody*. I understand the logic behind this, but it doesn't occur to people that they could hold off the election for this post until a decent candidate presents himself.

Rob MacLellan — Thanked us all for taking time out from our soap operas to come to the meeting, and that about covered all he had to say that wasn't already said before, or that was of any interest whatsoever. MacLellan did come under fire from a certain Heather Cochrane about his ability to deal with the faculty and administration through his Senate seat (if he chose to run again next year) and deal with the students as VP External. A conflict of interest, as Heather called it. Well, Mr. MacLellan gave a good demonstration of how to side-step a question, but I don't think too many people were impressed.

The post as Treasurer has only one candidate running for it, so the same things I said about the "yes/no" vote for the VP External apply here, too.

John Waller — What can you say about a guy running for Treasurer? Not much, believe me. This is the one position where a screw up is least likely to happen. There are so many checks and safeguards built into the Treasurers job that you couldn't sneeze without two Brink's guards

bursting through the door to check on the "disturbance".

That about sums it up, except to say that most of the candidates thought the students asked tough questions, and that this showed students were concerned. Students were not too optimistic, as they thought that none of the candidates had enough knowledge for the position they were seeking and that none of them inspired much confidence.

One final word. Some of you will probably say this article was biased and one sided, but you have only to listen to the candidates to get their side. This article will possibly cost me some friends, both candidates and their supporters, but writing about politics is the fastest way I know, to lose friends!

* Note: Hunter S. Thompson is currently the National Affairs Desk Chief at Rolling Stone Magazine, and is the author of the recent best-seller, "The Great Shark Hunt: The Gonzo Papers, Volume One".

ELECTIONS POSTPONED? ANOTHER OPEN FORUM?

MATHEW 6:3— . . . "let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth . . ."! . . . It speaks of Charity . . . out of context?

Is the "communication gap" a figment of someone's imagination?

Because of a remark made by one of the candidates at the Open-Forum, . . . "not very good journalism . . .", concerning an article published in the January 18th issue of the Journal about the 1.5 quality point average (QPA), the Journal undertook an investigation.

The article in question told students that if they were presently below the QPA they would be unable to run as a candidate in the Student Representative Council elections. The remark, however, was not made because of the publication; it was made because the article implied it was the present Council who adopted that standard. The Journal was advised of that regulation in this manner: "We have included the 1.5 QPA in our Constitution; that shows how responsible we are." Upon clarification of that by Mike McNeil, because he implicated the present Council in the context of that particular discussion, he said the "We" referred to the Council generally because that 1.5 QPA had been in the SRC's Constitution about six years.

After the open-forum McNeil reaffirmed that, but admitted that he had not read the Constitution personally. Further questioning of the other Council members indicated that they had not read it either. One member thought it only said, for the purpose of eligibility, a member of the Association (SRC) who was in "good" academic standing. Was it "good" or was it "1.5"?

DATELINE 9:15am, January 25, 1980.

The Journal, after consulting with a lawyer concerning the legal implications of "1.5 article, was advised to request Student Representative Council to provide proof of the existence of that "mysterious" by-law. The search for that by-law began through Carl McAllister, General Manager, and Rachel Cluett, SRC Secretary. However, McAllister informed the Journal that the "search" was not a priority; "today is Friday and there are certain functions, as General Manager, that must be performed." Rachel Cluett said that she had only been secretary for a year and had all the records for that period; however, she said she had no knowledge of the existence of any previous records.

DATELINE 10:00am, January 25, 1980.

The "search" is on; closer to the by-law but no closer to its content! Legal counsel told the Journal that at this point it could be suggested, in the interest of "fair play", that the elections be postponed until the by-law is found and if the by-law does not state 1.5 as a qualification for candidate eligibility the Nominations be re-opened; allowing other students an equal chance.

DATELINE 10:35am, January 25, 1980.

Carl McAllister has found pertinent information; reprinted here directly from the Constitution and by-laws. There is no reference to the QPA; there is no reference to a

student in good academic standing; only a student in "good standing in the organization in question," which is the Association, SRC.

DATELINE 10:40am, January 25, 1980.

President of the SRC, Angus Capstick was contacted. "The 1.5 is in the constitution and has been there ever since I have been associated with Council; I have read it! And a copy of the Election rules was given to all the nominees and it is there: what the Elections guidelines are." The Journal asked, "does it say 1.5 in the handout; are you sure?" Angus responded, "I believe so"! Point of the information! Since this handout was only given to the nominees, the elections handout is irrelevant to the issue at hand; it does not take into consideration that some students were curbed from running because of the "1.5 article" mentioned earlier in this report which was published in the issue of January 16, 1980!

Carl McAllister said that an "emergency" meeting of Student Council would have to be called by its President: Angus Capstick said, "As far as I am concerned the 1.5 does exist and you (the Journal) can go to press with anything you want but I am not prepared to call a meeting to discuss this matter any further"!

DATELINE 11:00am, January 25, 1980.

A copy of the by-laws on the calling of meetings was obtained from SRC's General Manager, also reprinted here. The first option has

been ruled out by the President; two options remain: a simple majority of Student Council through a signed petition or, within forty-eight hours of a signed petition from at least 10 ten per cent of the Union Membership — the students.

DATELINE 11:00am, January 25, 1980.

SRC treasurer Wendall Carroll said, in response to a Journal question about how he felt concerning this situation, "It doesn't have to be in the Constitution and as far as I'm concerned no Council told you or anybody else that the 1.5 was in the Constitution!" As incredible as that may sound, disregarding Mike McNeil's reaffirmation of the 1.5 at the open-forum Thursday, that is Wendall Carroll's position!

DATELINE 11:30am, January 25, 1980.

President of SRC came to the Journal office saying that the 1.5 is not in print so he will call a meeting; however, it is unlikely that the meeting will be called today. He said that Council could amend the by-law at that meeting to include the 1.5 QPA as a qualification. It was pointed out to Angus, however, that if Student Council was to take that kind of action, amending the Constitution to cover a mistake already made, neither he nor The Student Representative Council would be looked upon with favour. A wrong action to cover a previous mistake would not make the "right" kind of decision! An alternative to any improper handling of this is a

signed petition of 10 ten percent of the students who are in the Union: all full time students!

As far as the Journal is concerned says Journal Editor, Len Boudreau, "If the Student Representative Council takes any course of action other than postponing the elections and reopening the Nominations, in the interest of "fair play", the Journal will prepare a petition for circulation at Saint Mary's University!"

Two of the candidates Ron Dehmel, running for President, and Mary Kelly, running for Vice-President Internal, both agreed that if the 1.5 regulation does not exist in print . . .

FLASH . . . ANGUS CAPSTICK HAS JUST CONFIRMED THE JOURNAL'S FINDINGS; THE 1.5 IS NOT IN PRINT! . . . and will take appropriate action! . . . both candidates said it would be beneficial

to re-open the nominations and this entire election procedure would get on the right track, and, another open forum would more than likely be filled to capacity. Mary Kelly and Ron Dehmel are prepared to face this issue of "Communication Gap" head on!

At least one more candidate will be in the running; Derek MacDonald will contest for the position of President.

DATELINE 12:18pm, January 25, 1980.

THE JOURNAL HAS GONE TO PRESS! FURTHER "SPECIAL" EDITIONS OF THE JOURNAL WILL BE PUBLISHED AS NECESSARY TO KEEP THE STUDENTS INFORMED UP-TO-DATE! OUR PRINTERS ARE ON STANDBY TO FACILITATE "IMMEDIATE" COVERAGE!

Qualified Persons

7. (a). (i)
 - i. Only a qualified person may hold a executive position in the aforementioned organizations constituted under the S.R.C.
 - ii. Only a Qualified person may be appointed by the S.R.C. to any responsible position, or agency under the jurisdiction of the S.R.C., unless otherwise provided for in these articles.
8. (b). For the purpose of these articles, "qualified person" shall mean:
 - i. A member of the Union,
 - ii. A member in good standing of the organization in question,
 - iii. A person who complies with all provisions of the said organizations constitution as ratified by the S.R.C.

MEETINGS

2. Meetings of the S.R.C. shall be called by the President when;
 - (a). He/She deems it necessary;
 - (b). He/She is required to by a petition signed by a simple majority of the S.R.C.
 - (c). Within forty-eight hours, upon presentation of a petition signed by at least ten per cent of the Union membership.

Nominations

PART B—NOMINATIONS

1. There is hereby constituted a Nominating Committee which shall consist of:
 - (a) the President of the Association or his appointee;
 - (b) two persons who are either
 - (i) officers of the Association, or
 - (ii) members of Council, and
 - (c) two members of the Association who are neither officers of the Association nor members of Council, none of whom shall be candidates in the election in respect of which they are to act.
2. (a) The persons referred to in (1) (b) above shall be appointed by Council with one month prior to the elections;
- (b) The persons referred to in (1) (c) above shall be appointed by the other three members of the Nominating Committee within two weeks of their appointment.
3. The Committee shall nominate qualified candidates for each position for which an election is being held.
4. "Qualified candidate" means a person who is a member of the Students' Association;
5. (a) any person not nominated by the nominating committee who is a qualified student as defined by Section 4 of BY-LAW 13 Part B may ask for a review by the nominating committee.
- (b) any person not nominated by the nominating committee who is a qualified student as defined by Section 4 of BY-LAW 13 Part B may be nominated by presenting to the chairman of the nominating committee, a nominating paper signed by at least 15% of the members of the S.A.
- (c) any person not nominated by the nominating committee who is a qualified student as defined by Section 4 of BY-LAW 13 Part B can request that the nominating committee post their reasons for not nominating him. The nominating committee must comply with this request within 24 hours.
6. (a) No person shall be nominated for more than one position in the election for officers of the Students' Association.
- (b) no person shall be nominated for more than one position in the election of members for Council.
7. Nominations in each case shall close at five o'clock in the afternoon on that day which is eight days prior to the date set for the election.
8. Upon the close of the nominations, the chairman of the Nominating Committee shall prepare a list of all candidates, whether nominated by the Committee or by virtue of Section (5) hereof, and shall
 - (a) post copies of such list in prominent places on campus by 12 o'clock noon of that day which is one week prior to the election, and
 - (b) furnish the chief returning officer with a certified copy of such list.

Attention all students, societies, faculty, administration and others (if there are any others); this is a **Clean-up-Your-Act** NOTICE. "It's one thing to wallow through the bulletin boards and walls when the myriad of notices and posters, buys and sells, special events, meetings — whatever, **WHEN** they are all upcoming. **BUT**, assuming the responsibility of posting also makes you liable to

promptly remove posting when their dates have gone by."

Another way to Clean-up-Your-Act is by promoting in the Journal; doesn't cost you anything more than the time it takes to deliver your posting to the Journal.

Penalties for outdated notices? AISEC, are you still Dreaming about your Auction? Or are you having another Auction on January 18th?



Len Boudreau has expressed the issues publicly! The Journal serves as a focus for those issues.

OPINION POLL POSTPONED BY JOURNAL AT THIS TIME ... JOURNAL ELECTION PREDICTIONS POSTPONED ...

1.5 Average

c) Students who are required to confer with their academic advisor will be notified by their Dean and will be expected to meet with their advisor within the time frame indicated in the Dean's notice. Students who have not yet officially declared a major program or concentration and who therefore do not yet have an academic advisor will be assigned to a faculty advisor by the Dean. Students who are required to confer with their academic advisor and fail to do so, or who fail to make appropriate efforts to resolve problems which are affecting their academic performance may be placed on Probation by the Committee on Academic Standing with the approval of the Dean.

NEWS BULLETIN:

TWO STUDENTS HERE AT SAINT MARY'S WERE ASKED WHAT THEIR POSITION WAS CONCERNING THE SENATE BY-LAWS ON ACADEMIC STANDINGS.

THE TWO STUDENT'S INTERVIEWED; MARK CHERNENKO AND SCOTT DONKIN PLAY ON THE SMU FOOTBALL TEAM. BOTH STUDENTS SAID THEY WERE IN AGREEMENT WITH THE 1.5 QUALITY POINT AVERAGE: BOTH SAID: EVEN THE SPORTS WORLD HAS ITS STANDARDS; IF YOU DON'T MEET THOSE STANDARDS YOU DON'T MAKE THE TEAM! THERE IS NO REASON SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY SHOULD NOT BE AFFORDED THE SAME. AN AVERAGE OF 1.5, GIVEN THE FLEXIBILITY THAT IS BUILT INTO ARTICLE 3,c, IS NOT UNREASONABLE. AND IT IS NOT ALL SWEEPING AS WE WERE LED TO BELIEVE: IT

WILL BE ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS.

THIS PARTICULAR PIECE OF INFORMATION MAY NOT HAVE BEEN AS SIGNIFICANT AS IT IS: BOTH STUDENTS ARE PRESENTLY UNDER THE 1.5! WHEN ASKED WHAT THEY EXPECT THEIR AVERAGE TO BE WHEN THE REGULATION IS ENFORCED: AT LEAST 1.5! IF NOT WE'LL TAKE THE CONSEQUENCES!

Other students the Journal talked with are of a similar opinion, but a poll will be taken if that proves necessary. However, while the 1.5 QPA is not the main concern, there is a particular concern that Cathy Hanrahan expressed: the procedure concerning the appointment of academic advisors. ADVISORS from a different faculty should not be appointed for a student who is majoring in another area. For example, in my case, Kevin Cleary appointed a GEOGRAPHY ADVISOR AND MY MAJOR IS ECONOMICS! Check that one out; to whom it may concern.

