

## Freedom of the press

A SMALL STUDENT PAPER at St. Thomas University is once again the focal point of the debate over freedom of the press in Fredericton.

The *Aquinian*, a seven year old bi-weekly publication of St. Thomas students, has fought with its student representative council before. But last week the staff said enough and walked out, vowing to publish an independent paper, free from censure and closure.

The St. Thomas student council slashed almost \$3000 from the paper's budget back in October. They also tried to pull the paper out of Canadian University Press and wrote a letter to the paper's printer saying they would not pay for any press runs that they did not first approve.

And council president Greg Davis went to Woodstock, where the paper is printed, to inspect the last issue before it could be run off, making the paper miss its scheduled run and causing it to be a day late.

The St. Thomas council wants the *Aquinian* to be an arm of its own body. Its members want their events covered and their views propped. They don't care about editorial autonomy and freedom of the press and they certainly don't take kindly to criticism.

But student papers can't operate that way. They realize that they must protect the interests of their publishers, students on campus, and one duty they must

fulfill is that of watchdog of the student council. As alternative media, they must write about students and for students, including issues that effect the world in which students live.

The *Aquinian* is considered by its SRC as radical. The SRC wants the paper to print only St. Thomas news, and not run stories from other campuses or other interests. They think that by virtue of being the elected representatives of St. Thomas students, they have the right to dictate the paper's content and its constitution.

The power the SRC has is frightening. Not only can its members interfere daily with people working on stories, laying out pages and typesetting copy, it wants to dictate what all the students on the St. Thomas campus can read in their paper.

But the *Aquinian* staff members see that power the SRC holds as dangerous. They realize the power won't concede without a demand, won't go away with a simple request. The power the SRC holds is financial, and the *Aquinian* has turned away from that money source.

As individuals, these student journalists may feel powerless, but as a united force, they can contribute to finding a solution to prevent the squelching of their voices at St. Thomas.

**The Gazette salutes Fredericton's student journalists.**

## A day for Munro

By D.S. SINCLAIR

ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, Dalhousie students will enjoy a day free from classes to celebrate Munro Day. This is a campus-wide holiday to commemorate the generosity of a nineteenth-century benefactor, George Munro. A successful New York publisher with his roots in Pictou County, Munro donated over one-quarter of a million dollars to the school (equivalent to three million dollars today). This gift came at a time when the university was in severe financial distress.

Born in 1825, at Millbrook, Pictou County, Munro became a printer's apprentice at the age of twelve. At fourteen, Munro returned to the school and went on to become a teacher at the Free Church Academy. By the age of thirty-one, he decided to return to publishing, this time in New York city. There, Munro became a very successful publisher, producing inexpensive editions of works of great literature.

Munro began donating gifts to the college by the sea in 1879. The first gift was a chair in the physics department. Over the next ten years the money donated by Munro made the establishment of chairs possible in the departments of history, political economy, English literature and rhetoric, international and constitutional law, and metaphysics. Tutorships in classics and mathematics were also established with Munro's money.

Eager to see that Munro's contribution would continue to be recognized, the students of Dalhousie petitioned the Board of Governors for an annual campus holiday. On July 9, 1881, the Board of Governors heard the petition and approved the holiday. Although the name of the holiday was officially changed in 1938 to 'Founder's Day' in recognition of all the benefactors of the school, the day continued to be known on campus as Munro Day.



## Personal touch

Dear editor:

Mr. Kadyampakeni's letter in last week's *Gazette* was truly enlightening; it is reassuring to see that someone among Dalhousie's student body is willing to take a firm and articulate stance against the monstrous South African regime and those Canadian institutions that help



MIKE  
ADAMS  
1986

perpetuate apartheid. Little had we suspected how deeply the Royal Bank was involved in the repression of Black South African citizens.

Upon reading Mr. K's letter, we both destroyed our "Personal Touch" bank card and transferred all accounts to another bank. After some discussion we decided neither of us could, with a clear conscience, repay our student loans with the RB unless they would guarantee that none of the money repaid would end up promoting the denial of the basic rights of Black South Africans.

Much to our chagrin, further investigation later revealed that our new banks, and in fact, all Canadian banks, had some business dealings with South Africa. Doing the only logical thing possible, we withdrew all of our money and hid it at home — a small sacrifice, considering the moral issue at stake.

In the name of equality everywhere we urge all right thinking students to withdraw any money they may have in Canadian bank accounts, and to refuse to repay any loans which could possibly aid or abet the racist policies of the South African government.

Sincerely,

Jeffery Murphy  
Stephen Conrad

## Keep Litton out of PEI

To the editor,

In the economic study prepared for the government, and just recently released to the public, we are told that "Litton would be a positive step to moving the Island away from a dependence on agriculture." How such a move away from an agriculturally-based economy can be perceived and presented as "positive" is simply beyond my comprehension. If Litton's presence on the Island would have such an effect, then this is reason enough to keep them out.

During the late seventies, there was a growing realization amongst Islanders that our rural way of life was being steadily eroded away (like our rich soil) thanks to the economic policies and programs implemented through the Comprehensive Development Plan; a plan which promoted urbanization, consolidation, and expansion. Small schools were disappearing, and family farms were falling at an alarming rate. Finally we said "enough!" We elected a government on a platform of rural renaissance. We re-established our priorities, and vowed that so-called "experts" were no longer going to be allowed to arbitrarily decide how we would live our lives and plan our future.

Now the consultants are telling us that a dependence on agriculture is a terrible thing. Is this going to be Premier Lee's solution to the present crisis within our agricultural industry: to trade off our dependency on agriculture for a dependency on foreign multi-nationals? No matter how often Premier Lee tells us that the Island's primary industries are top priority, if such was truly the case he would be spending his time in Ottawa lobbying on behalf of farmers rather than Litton. When the consultants say "positive step" are they assuming that our government has a long-term economic policy where Litton is viewed as the first step? Is Litton simply the first of many multi-nationals to be invited to establish here? Let us not forget the platform upon which the government was elected into power. Have we as Islanders changed our minds about a rural renaissance? Has the government? If not, then they should be held accountable for broken promises and false pretenses.

Litton may have chosen us, but I would like to know when did we (as a people) choose Litton? There are many, many questions, that need to be raised and addressed before we can envision the true consequences of Litton's

coming to the Island. Perhaps the most important question is whether we are content to have our future way of life decided for us, or whether we are willing to take an active role in becoming better informed so that we can decide for ourselves what we want. Let us not be fooled into thinking that there are no alternatives.

I am  
actively opposing Litton  
Kevin J. Arsenault

## Profs should march

To the Editor,  
*An Open Letter to the Faculty*

On Thursday, February 13th at 11:30 a.m., Dalhousie students as members of the Students' Union of Nova Scotia (SUNS) will be marching to Province House out of concern about recommendations of the Royal Commission on Post Secondary Education.

We urge our faculty to march with us, to help express our concern. There is a lot at stake for all within the University.

We look forward to uniting with the faculty.

Sincerely,  
Catherine Blewett

President

Reza Rizvi

Executive Vice President  
Dalhousie Student Union

## Glazov well read

To the editor:

Mr. Glazov is obviously well-read on the subject of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, better-read in fact, than most of us will ever be. However, it does not require a great deal of research to realize that the SDI is merely another attempt to establish an American military presence where it has no right to be.

Perhaps we should not be so concerned with the technicalities of the project as with the consequences of creating another "satellite" of the superpowers. But, then, these matters are best left to the "experts"; we all know how trustworthy they are.

Isabel Fearon

## Response

To the editor,

Now that the critics of SDI have had the chance to share their wisdom with Dal *Gazette* readers (Jan. 30th), I would like to answer to some of their attacks on my pro-SDI article (Jan. 23rd). It appears that my critics failed in their task to make a case against SDI because emotions seemed to have priority over facts in their letters. Their assertions of the "danger" of SDI were not only left unsubstantiated, but vague to the point of meaninglessness.

The general point the letters tried to put across was that SDI was "dangerous" and "destabilizing". Why? Well, because, in their reasoning, if one side acquires an effective defense against enemy missiles, it can attack the other side with impunity, making its adversary paranoid and creating a destabilizing