

## '07 Council candidates unimpressive

EVERYONE READING THIS EDITORIAL IS QUALIFIED to run for Students' Council. The nomination deadline has passed, but with eight faculties having fewer candidates than seats, there will be by-elections come September, and there isn't a sole person on campus unqualified to be a part of them—at least, that's what the platforms of the current candidates indicate.

Of the 37 people running for a spot on Council next year, 17 of them neglected to post any semblance of a biography or platform on the SU's official elections website. In hindsight, this was probably a smart move, since by not declaring why they were worthy of our votes, they set a precedent for how they would approach their terms on Council and also refrained from coming off as ignorant—just like most of the people who bothered to write down their election promises.

With so few incumbents running for re-election, Council will be sorely lacking in experience come next year, but it's completely unencouraging to see how little the potential newcomers seem to know about the forum in University Hall. For example, Education candidate Hayley Shannon ponders, "How many students actually know what happens in the SU building?" Well Hayley, students queue to buy overpriced and unhealthy food, they use the computer labs in the basement, they buy books and U of A clothing at the bookstore—heck, they even make newspapers there. For student government purposes, however, I'd be more concerned about what happens in U-Hall.

At least Hayley's not alone in her naïveté, as Ag/For hopeful Jacqueline Geller notes, her faculty is small, but that "having a Students' Union Councillor for Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics would give our faculty a chance to get our name out to people who may not know who we are." Boy, it's terrific that you already have a seat then. In fact, you have two, though neither of them serve very well as PR boosters for your faculty, apparently.

Jesse Hahn, Bryant Lukes and Cody Lawrence were all criticized in their SU Executive campaigns for having little knowledge about how the organization works. As such, it's nice to see the trio taking that advice and running for Council as Arts reps; unfortunately, neither Hahn nor Lawrence even bothered to submit a platform, and Lukes' is filled with flaws. His main rationale for wanting to be on Council isn't a desire to serve students, but rather to push an agenda based on his personal beliefs. Then again, at least his platform encourages creativity—he cites how his mother "forced me either to take music class or make a friend." Hopefully she isn't forcing him to run for Council as well.

Joining Lukes in the push for environmental reform in the SU is fellow Arts candidate Brett Grierson, who wants high-powered hand dryers to replace all those paper towels. Of course, those things have their downside as well: they're strong enough to take all the hair off your body. And in an apparent attempt to change Council's role from governing to that of talent agent, Grierson believes that "the University of Alberta needs to do more to promote our student artists, on campus and off." However, this is an issue Council would have very little control over. The only things they could do would be showcase more campus talent in their buildings—it would be a waste of lobbying time to pressure the University in this matter.

The rest of the candidates either make vague promises to try hard and listen to students, or consist of a flock of ruminant quadrupeds from Lister following a shepherd named Michael to the SU—all while making the exact same campaign promises he won on. So it's seriously time for you to run for Students' Council next year. It doesn't matter how bad you'd be at the position—that sure didn't stop this year's batch.

PAUL OWEN  
Sports Editor



CONAL PIERSE

## LETTERS

### Council breakup just sour grapes

In response to Ross Prusakowski's opinion article (re: "It's over between us, Council," 20 March) where he states that "councillors will always want have their cake and eat it too," I just wanted to mention that not only is this grammatically unsound, but is also extremely untrue.

There are numerous councillors this year that are in favour of making changes to the Powerplant, altering fee distribution and removing [student councillors'] pay altogether. To claim that none of the candidates speak to their respective fellow faculty constituents is so far from the truth it begs to question [sic] where these facts are coming from.

Everyone that I have met in both the Arts and Sciences [election] races alone are well know[n], have spoken heavily on other issues within their departments in the past, and are extremely vocal with students and their concerns. Which is why they will each be voted to their respected positions on Thursday and Friday.

People need to care about these elections. The individuals running now are not those who have run in the past. From what has been seen in the SU elections and how many of those same candidates are running now goes to show the dedication that these individuals have. Based on that, I seriously doubt they are running for these positions simply to line their wallets.

CODY LAWRENCE  
Arts II

### Put the 'Plant to rest

I read the article "Hookah plan goes up in smoke" (15 March) and as much as I could stomach the other articles, all the time hoping it was some kind of stupid joke. Why does everyone seem surprised that this idea failed? It should never have been brought up. It has to be the dumbest idea that I have heard in a long time.

The SU's [idea of] promoting smoking, even if it is not tobacco, is ridiculous. Forget this—we could probably start selling crack, heroin or meth. That's where the money is, I hear, and not dried fruit. Or was the plan opium? That idea has a nice ring to it. Powerplant: Bar and Opium Den.

Here is a good money saving plan for the 'Plant: close it down! I cannot believe I have put up with this kind of stupidity for four years. If these SU leaders are as good as we can get, maybe we need to scrap the SU too, and that would save every student a lot of money. And why does the Gateway seem to be defending this idea? Especially in an edition where you give See and Vue a sack-beating for being biased and promoting agendas.

JOHN BYRON  
Arts IV

Letters to the editor should be dropped off at room 3-04 of the Students' Union Building or e-mailed to [letters@gateway.ualberta.ca](mailto:letters@gateway.ualberta.ca).

The Gateway reserves the right to edit letters for length and clarity, and to refuse publication of any letter it deems racist, sexist, libellous or otherwise hateful in nature. The Gateway also reserves the right to publish letters online.

## LETTERS FROM THE ARCHIVES

### Pembinites a lawless bunch in need of supervision

I read with interest the article in last week's Gateway entitled "Why is a Pembinite?" which seems to have been intended as a complaint against the Pembina Hall regulations.

Even had the author not told us so herself, it was quite obvious that she was of the Frosh—for it is only a new student who could fail to realize the usefulness, nay necessity, of strict rules for the women students in residence.

Aside from the desirability of keeping a close supervision over the social affairs of all Pembinites, there is another aspect which seems to me worth noting. The University is a public institution; the eyes of many, especially of the parents of the students, are oft turning to it.

I think, therefore, that even if supervision were unnecessary for the students, it should be maintained for the sake of presenting a conventional appearance to the parents and the public.

But strict regulations are necessary. Many of the Freshettes in residence are away from home for the first time in their lives. And as for the upperclass women, continued freedom from parental control quite reasonably often leads to irresponsibility and individualistic notions.

The Pembina regulation making overtown public dances out-of-bounds has often been criticized. "It seems so unfair to permit non-resident women to go where they please while restricting the pleasures of the residents," say some. It is doubtful whether public dances are wholesome places for any university women, but at least overtown coeds have their mothers to suggest that idea to them.

Lastly, it is considered by many advisable to regulate the behaviour of Pembinites out of regard for the desirability of their occasional indulgence in study. Men students in residence are rarely known to take advantage of their freedom to dodge studying. Most of them have the high standards of professional life and the high cost of supporting a help meet continually before their eyes as figurative spurs to urge them on in the gentle habit of plugging. Hardly so with the women.

I am inclined to think that many other reasons could also be found in support of the strict regulations which your contributor of last issue so indignantly resents.

"MLLE CYNIC"  
11 November 1926

Letters from the Archives is a semi-regular feature where the Gateway runs historical letters that we feel are of particular importance—or are just really hilarious.

Now you can check out all the old-timey fun for yourself! Just go to [thegatewayonline.ca](http://thegatewayonline.ca) and follow the links to the Gateway's digital archives—now with most years from 1913 on...