

## Council closes the doors — again...

EATING CORN ON THE COB and drinking pop, students are gathered in the amphitheatre behind the SUB for the first meeting of the Dalhousie student council.

The sun is shining on this warm September day and councillors address the group from their seats on the grass. They discuss appropriately sunny issues—appointments, announcements and new exciting plans. Students listen.

It's January now and neither the weather nor the mood at Dalhousie is quite so friendly. Underfunding, cutbacks and looming strike action by the Dalhousie Faculty Association cast shadows over the student union's sunny plans.

Rather than hosting a September day love-in, council is now charged with the responsibilities of making emergency decisions. They've become actors in the story of Dalhousie's demise—a story worthy of attention by the national media. And they aren't serving corn or other goodies to tempt you to

their meetings.

Instead the council opted to borrow a trick from Dalhousie's Board of Governors—when in doubt, go in camera.

At their Jan. 20 meeting student council decided to move in camera for a special announcement. It's the second time this year non-councillors were asked to leave a meeting.

We still don't know what happened and neither do you. Students should have the right to know what goes on at meeting held by their elected representatives.

While we recognize that in camera meetings are sometimes necessary—job interviews are one example—we'd still like to know "why" if we can't know exactly "what".

Regardless of how trivial the announcement or issue might be, the principle of in camera meetings is something the council itself criticizes with regard to the Board of Governors.

It is a principle not to be treated lightly.

## Curtis case a miscarriage of justice

BRUCE CURTIS IS NOW twenty-one years old.

He marked this personal milestone last Monday sitting in a cell in a New Jersey prison, a thousand miles from his home in Middleton and his lived ones.

If Curtis serves his entire sentence for aggravated manslaughter, he will spend his thirty-eighth birthday in that cell as well.

Something has gone terribly wrong with the American justice system in the case of Bruce Curtis. No-one who knows this quiet, intelligent, studious young man can believe that the crime of which he stands convicted was anything other than a tragic accident. Yet the New Jersey courts have found him guilty of what is, essentially, unpremeditated murder.

No one is arguing that Curtis has no blood on his hands. He admits he was responsible for the fatal wounding of Rosemary Podgis one violent night in July, 1982. But rather than seeing him as a victim of circumstances beyond his control, American justice has painted him in the colours of an instigator, who brought to a head the latent violence in the home of his friend, Scott Franz.

There appears to be something very wrong with this interpretation. Curtis is a peaceful young man, who had never before been far from home, and had no experience of guns. His arrival at the Podgis house must have been like passing through the gates of hell. Alfred Podgis was a very violent man, obsessed with firearms, and he and his stepson were constantly at each other's

throats. We can well imagine the confusion and fear in Curtis's mind as the fateful night approached, the night that saw the shooting of Alfred Podgis and the accidental death of Mrs. Podgis, Scott's mother.

For Bruce Curtis the nightmare continues. His mother says he lives from day to day through the confinement and brutality of prison life, waiting for the day when the unceasing efforts of his family, friends and supporters will see results.

Our thoughts go out to Bruce, and our hopes for his well-being. For we all know the terror of being swept up in events beyond our control, the helplessness and the hopelessness. Bruce's case is an extreme example, but it could have happened to any one of us.

Please help Bruce come home again.

Contributions to the Bruce Curtis Defence Fund can be sent to P.O. Box 1396, Middleton, N.S. B0S 1P0.

## Letters...

The deadline for letters to the editor is noon, Monday before publication. Letters must be signed and include a telephone number where the author can be reached (although telephone numbers will not be printed with the letters). Letters are subject to editing for style, brevity, grammar, spelling, and libel. Letters can be dropped at the SUB enquiry desk, mailed to our address (on page 2), or brought up to the *Gazette* offices, third floor, SUB.



## Corporate ethics

To the editors,

In the article, "Hart House Salvation?" (Jan. 17, *Gazette*), Bill Mitchell writes that I am troubled by the lack of business ethics of United Equities over the acquisition of the Hart House and their proposed developments on Summer Street. I wish to clarify my comments in this regard.

While I do have a strong interest in the practical application of "business ethics" and "corporate social responsibility", it seems that as regards United Equities, Mr. Mitchell has put a different interpretation on my remarks than I had intended.

I did not accuse United Equities of unethical conduct. Instead, I was drawing attention to the ethical component that is an inherent part of business decisions, especially those that affect numbers of individuals or the community as a whole. The plea is for all corporations, including United Equities, to take full account of this ethical dimension in their business decision-making.

Yours sincerely,  
Donald J. Patton

## Opinionated trash

To the editors,

In your editorial "Swell Guys, Swelled Heads" it was stated:

"When we leave the Grawood on a Friday afternoon after hearing Kenny, Alex and the Swell Guys can we take our student union fees with us?"

Well, when I finish reading the *Gazette* (Opinionated Trash) I wish that I could take my student union fees with me.

Ted Vaughan

## Dawson in defense

To the editors,

To deal with a couple rather emotional responses to my pre-Christmas letter regarding the *Tupper Times* — and attitudes in general.

M.J. Ackerman; I do not recall admitting to having read only one copy of the *Times*, merely to not having read it previous to the *Gazette's* bringing the paper to my attention. Get your facts straight before trying to argue statistics. I'm sorry for you too.

R.M. Schertzer; it is encouraging to see that the bedpan humour of the health profession is *not* intended to be everyone's taste; you will therefore, I hope, forgive me for not laughing.

But can't the people who, in a few years, will be charged with the duty of repairing us all come up with something better? A bang rather than a whimper?

Sincerely,  
Peter F. Dawson  
4th Year  
Political Science

## Don't give it a Miss

To the editors,

In response to Christopher Thurrott's letter which appeared in the Jan. 17 *Gazette*, I wish to comment on his use of the term 'Miss'. I appreciate your comments in support of my opinions on the issue of female equality, however, in a letter on sexist attitudes is it really the best choice of words to use the term 'Miss'?

In the English language the term 'Miss' is used to refer to an unmarried woman. Is it right that a woman's marital status be disclosed by her title while a man's title does not reveal his status? May I suggest that all institutions dealing with people, refrain from the titles 'Miss' and 'Mrs' unless specially requested to do so by the female involved. I am proud to say that Dalhousie University appears to carry out my suggestion, at the current time.

As Christopher Thurrott says, I do stand for equality and refuse to get involved with radical methods of achieving it. My methods may be slow in achieving these goals but at least I gain some support from my male colleagues. The support of men is necessary to achieve true equality.

Amanda-Lynn Penny

## Veteran gladiators retired from forum

THIS IS IT, YOU GUYS.

At this point we at the *Gazette* are ending the personal debates now raging in our letters column.

May we suggest that Brian Fantie and Teresa MacDonald, Christopher Thurrott and Amanda-Lynn Penny, and Peter Dawson and the world go to lunch together and talk about their differences.

We wouldn't want to be the owners of the restaurant they choose but it could be interesting.

## Fantie rebutted

To the editors,

Bryan Fantie has chosen to deny that he made the statements contained in my letter (*Gazette*, Nov. 29). Furthermore, he has said that these statements are personally libellous. I would remind Mr. Fantie that comments are not libellous if they are true. I stand by, without apology, the use of quotation marks in my original letter. As for Mr. Fantie's defamatory ramblings, they do not even deserve comment.

Theresa MacDonald

## Scoop Steuter great, but photo wrong wrong wrong...

To the editors,

As a spokesperson for the Public Works Committee I would like to commend Erin "Scoop" Steuter for her foresight and avant-garde spirit in covering a topic so close to the edge.

It is also my duty to express the PWC's displeasure with the *Gazette* in their choice of photograph accompanying the story. This is not the work of the PWC and we would prefer not to be associated with it. As a note, all work done by the PWC is signed as such.

Thanks to the *Gazette*,  
The Public Works Committee