

# Forum

## An explanation for the last issue

As you may have noticed, last Thursday's edition of *The Gateway* did not measure up to what we feel are the usual standards we have set for a quality paper. We would now like to take the time to clarify the matter.

The paper was run as a protest to our employers — the Students' Union — for what we feel has been indifferent treatment of our proposal for a salary increase.

To be brief, we put forth a proposal to Students' Council last November for our first increase in wages in four years. Since that time we feel the proposal has unduly meandered through their bureaucratic process to the point of it still not being passed with only one month left in the school year. Not only did we find the slow process irritating, but we were also disturbed at some of the opinions expressed towards the work we do, the consensus being we are here for the experience anyway and should not be fixated on the amount of money we make.

We would like to point out that we don't feel our demands are unfair. As editors we put in — in terms of man hours — more than full-time work. This does not include weekend time lost to tracking stories. We don't mind doing this as we are here primarily for the experience, but we feel that if one is to work effectively full-time, one must be paid enough to at least live off the salary. This is not happening at *The Gateway* as most of the editors must work for what adds up to \$3.57 per hour.

In that vein, the decision was made to run what we felt was the first cost-effective *Gateway*, one wherein we realistically equated the work we did with the money we were paid. This paper was extremely ad-heavy, including ads on page one.

However, at this time we would also like to apologize to those who have been adversely affected by the publication of the protest issue. This includes volunteers who submitted articles, advertisers, and especially readers who expect their paper to be used as a forum for campus news and nothing else. We would like all to understand that this move was not motivated by spite. Rather it was an act of frustration taken by those who felt their concerns were not being taken seriously.

The Gateway Editorial Staff

## The Gateway

The Gateway is the newspaper of the University of Alberta students. Contents are the responsibility of the Editor-in-Chief. All opinions are signed by the writer and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway. News copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. Newsroom: Rm 282 (ph. 432-5168). Advertising: Rm 256D (ph. 432-4241). Students' Union Building, U of A, Edmonton, Alberta, T6C 2G7. Readership is 25,000. The Gateway is a member of Canadian University Press.

**Editor-in-Chief:** Dean Bennett  
**Managing Editor:** Sherri Ritchie  
**News Editors:** John Watson, Greg Halinda  
**Entertainment Editor:** Elaine Ostry  
**Sports Editor:** Mark Spector  
**Production Editor:** Juanita Spears  
**Media Supervisor:** Margriet Tilroe-West  
**Advertising:** Tom Wright  
**Circulation:** George Onwumere

And also featuring: Alex Shetsen, Pat Stansfield, Thomas Olsen, Greg Whiting, Melinda Vester, Dragos Ruiu, Carol Ostry, Peter J. Cole, Mike Spindloe, Eric Baich, Alan Small, Jon Ludwig, samson, Jerome Ryckborst, Brian Martin, Doug Johnson, Dan Skinner.



## Letters...

### Feminists are not frustrated

To the Editor:

Mr. Garrett Hall, in his letter (March 24) accusing the organizers of the International Women's Day March of being sexually frustrated, has merely made it evident that he has very little awareness of the basis of the feminist movement. Although I am not a staunch feminist, I take great offense to Mr. Hall's insinuation that my concerns about pornography and rape are founded in sexual frustration. Is he accusing me and other women of bringing these abominations upon ourselves?! This is only one facet of the typical male attitude that has suppressed women since the beginning of time, and it is their attitude that women are fighting in their drive for equality.

Pornography and rape reduce women to bodies sans minds, completely available and abusable — outlets for male frustrations. In order to overcome "the institutions maintaining power in society" that Mr. Hall blames for inequality, women first must overcome the age-old attitude that we are inferior beings. Such a widely accepted opinion was this, that women themselves ascribed to it. We can never overcome the physical differences between men and women nor do we necessarily want to, but we have proven ourselves intellectual equals. Pornography, rape, sexual harassment, anti-choice laws, etc., serve only to undermine this achievement, thus they are placed at the forefront of our attack. Increasingly forceful are these attacks as the crimes become increasingly violent.

We must first deal with frustrated men and their means of release before we can conquer their institutions and achieve true equality.

Clara V. Qualizza  
 Agriculture II

### Election leaves questions...

To the Editor:

As a science student, I was naturally interested in the outcome of the election last week. I am appalled that the Science Student for Action slate was so arbitrarily disqualified by the Chief Returning Officer Greg Stewart.

The two *Gateway* articles by Ken Bosman that pertain to the election indicate that "numerous" and "multiple" campaign violations reduce to a single charge of failure to cease campaigning. I learned that this change was based on the finding of five pieces of campaign material posted past the deadline.

I still see literature for the general elections posted in HUB and Tory, yet Mr. Bosman and Mr. Stewart choose to ignore this (as does everyone else). I also find it difficult to believe that this slate would deliberately leave a handful of propaganda posted in order to sway a negligible number of votes. At worst, it seems an oversight on the part of the slate; nothing more serious left from the last election. It is then obvious that Mr. Stewart's decision to eliminate the slate is

not only inappropriate but ludicrous. Can Misters Bosman, Klapstein and Stewart follow this logic?

I find the bias submerged in Mr. Bosman's articles against the slate deplorable in someone who claims to be a journalist. If Mr. Klapstein offered to stage another election with the same people whom he denounced in print as essentially cheaters, where then do his ethics lie? Why is he trying to make a deal? More importantly, why did the slate decline this deal (which Mr. Klapstein insists is in their best interest) and continue presenting their motion to the DIE Board? Didn't you ask yourself these questions, Mr. Bosman?

In the face of slanted journalism, the slate does much to recommend itself by being reserved and restrained. I can readily understand Mr. Boodle's refusal to comment to Mr. Bosman.

Something highly irregular has happened with this election and its aftermath. (When has a slate ever been disqualified?) The science student body has heard but one side of the argument. I look forward to the slate's response to the accusations against them and their disqualification. I also look forward to the DIE Board's no doubt objective judgement on this matter.

C. Harris  
 Science III

### U of A failed in public health...

To the Editor:

Last spring, an article in the *Edmonton Journal* alerted me to the fact that my U.S. born son and daughter were potentially at risk for red measles (rubeola). When I was shunted through the Edmonton Board of Health and then the University Health Services while I tried to find out the risk level for them, I was repeatedly told that they hadn't been immunized according to the Alberta immunization schedule and that they would have to be immunized for everything all over again. Finally, I wrote their Ann Arbor pediatrician of almost 18 years ago and requested his recommendation. Armed with his recommendation to reimmunize for rubeola only, I received authorization from Dr. Pedy at the Board of Health for reimmunization at the Duggan Clinic in October. My son and daughter were thus spared from long queues at University Health Service this spring at the best or rubeola at the worst.

The current red measles (rubeola) "epidemic" at the University of Alberta is an example of simple public health measures amok. The 1984 edition of *Current Pediatric Diagnosis and Treatment* indicated that rubeola immunization of infants under 15 months was possibly suspect and that those individuals immunized before 1971 (when the immunization schedule was refined) were therefore at risk for red measles. Individuals in groups, of course, are more at risk, and adding the stress of university to the mix probably intensifies that risk. Since Alberta had a red measles outbreak in the spring of 1986, the stage was set for another in the spring of 1987. If students had been notified in September during registration of the risk, immunization could have been carried out before the crisis rather than during it. Regrettably, carriers are at their most contagious just before breaking out in spots, and susceptible individuals are unwittingly exposed. Staying away from the "spotty" is simplistic

Letters to the Editor should not be more than 400 words in length. They must include your signature, faculty, year of program, I.D. number, and phone number. We reserve the right to edit for libel and length. Anonymity is allowed at the discretion of the Editor. Submission deadlines for Tuesday and Thursday issues are noon the preceding day. Submit letters to room 282 SUB. Letters do not necessarily reflect the view of *The Gateway*.