

deal," which he obviously thought was Canada's consequence of a Free Trade Agreement.

Second, Ms. Ball states that the cartoon degrades women. The beaver, pictured on our five cent coin, is a widely recognized symbol of our country, and it was drawn with neither male nor female characteristics. And with any knowledge of mammalian anatomy, especially the digestive systems, it is clear that human males can (and do) have sexual intercourse with other males. Thus the beaver was not drawn as a female and neither can one imply it was a female because of the activity depicted.

Finally, Ms. Ball claimed that the Free Trade cartoon degraded Canada. If it did, then it did an equal disservice to the United States by portraying that country as bestial. Ms. Ball also says that "We" voted in the present government, meaning explicitly the Gateway staff but including by logical extension anyone who enjoyed the cartoon, and even anyone who enjoys the Gateway. To this I must add that I did not vote for the Progressive Conservative party in the September 4, 1984 federal election. Further, since I am a fourth-year student and had only been of voting age for about three months at that time, I would estimate that a majority of the undergraduate student body (first, second and some third year students) were minors at that time and thus did not vote in said election.

Let us take pride in the Gateway newspaper for criticism of government, along with freedom of speech, is one of the fundamental blessings of a democracy.

Jon Romalo

Cartoon debate clarified

Re: The Political Cartoon Debate

We wish to express our differing opinion from that of Mr. Darryn Roy. We find that his letter against David Tupper is narrowly based.

In our opinion, Mr. Tupper is being made a scapegoat. He was not filing a personal complaint, but rather, he was acting on behalf of six constituents. It is Mr. Tupper's job as Arts Representative to express the discontent of the students who elected him.

Mr. Roy's defence of a liberal democracy is short-sighted, since his does not include minority rights. It does not matter that only six students out of thirty thousand complained. In Mr. Roy's opinion they "hardly represent a significant portion of the student body." We believe that any number of students, no matter how small, have the right to express their opinions.

Furthermore, we find Mr. Roy's belief that all dissenting opinions are "ignorant and uninformed" both insulting and uncalled for.

Perhaps Mr. Roy should take his own advice and "gain an understanding of something before you condemn."

Rolinda Mack
Gregg Shields, et al.

Principle of cartoon debate

RE: The Political Cartoon Debate

First, let me say that I am dismayed with the attitudes of some people towards David Tupper's "apology motion". These attitudes center around the contents of the political cartoon, printed in the Gateway October 22, but not around the principle of why the motion was brought forward. It is not Mr. Tupper's opinion that was being presented in that motion, rather it was the opinion of students, who took the time to express their concerns to their representative, and wished some action in regards to this matter. From these complaints Mr. Tupper formulated a motion, then brought it forward at a Student's Council meeting. As a representative of the students of the Faculty of Arts, Mr. Tupper is obliged to represent all those concerns expressed to him. It does not follow that he can be held responsible if only six students approach him about a particular issue, just as it cannot be suggested that Mr. Tupper represents all the students (approx. 30,000) on this campus. Therefore, I cannot find any fault in Mr. Tupper's conduct as he merely brought forth those concerns expressed to him. Furthermore, I wonder, of the 23 votes cast, how many of the reps voted on their own views, rather than their electorate's? I suggest to all students that if you are concerned about this issue, approach your student's rep and find out how he/she voted. It may be the case that your opinions

on this issue were misrepresented.

Finally, the issue of censorship need not have entered into this debate. For those offended by the cartoon — a simple apology should suffice. For those screaming censorship, I draw your attention to Dewey's "Apology to HUB" ad in the November 3 Gateway. No doubt upon seeing this "apology" you rushed out to the "HUB Mall Management and a number of patrons" and lodged a formal complaint for their exercise in censorship. Or, perhaps we can conclude that an apology is not censorship?

Denis Huot

You've got the wrong Tupper

Re: The Political Cartoon Debate

Recently, there has been somewhat of an uproar in this paper regarding a political cartoon by Colin Green. I saw the cartoon and, although I did not agree with the political message behind it, I found it to be very humorous.

There are those on campus, and I hope their numbers are few, who were offended by this cartoon. Their arguments are petty and are colored by shallow, humorless ignorance. It is unfortunate that they choose to dwell on the negative. It is also unfortunate that the self appointed champion of this misguided protest has the name David Tupper and I must say I don't like the attention I have been getting as of late.

I do not expect Mr. Tupper to change his name or his views. Nor do I expect the Gateway to refrain from publishing letters to the Editor from disgruntled students who choose to name names. I merely want to inform those of your readers who know me that I am not the David Tupper who initiated the action against the cartoon nor do I support such an action.

Having said this, I would like to ask the Editor, Mr. Campbell, why the Gateway abandoned its policy of publishing the faculty of those whose letters it publishes. This policy, if still in place, might have prevented some of the misunderstanding. Oh, and for the record, I am the David Tupper in Civil Engineering.

David Tupper

A matter of politics

Re: Cartoon Debate

David Vernon Tupper and James Keelan are two peas in a pod trying to defend a losing cause. The PCs of Canada should know how unpopular both the Free Trade and Meech Lake Accords are.

First, the Meech Lake Accord is definitely a defeat for those who want a single and united Canada. Minority rights would be weakened and thus, alienation would exist. There are other major concerns as well including fears of "Triple E" Senates.

Second, the Free Trade deal is unpopular. Since Confederation, US-Canada Free Trade has been a curse. Laurier lost an election due to the same stance PM Mulroney is taking. Also, I strongly disagree with this last minute Free Trade Deal which could make Canada USA Inc.

In his motion condemning the Gateway, David Tupper was trying to defend the PCs stand on Free Trade and not trying to condemn the poor taste of the cartoon editorial. By the way, I believe the cartoon was in poor taste, but I agree that Canada is harmed by this American raw deal.

If the PCs seriously believe that the two accords would benefit Canada, I seriously challenge them to hold a nationwide referendum on the issues!

David Yadallee

Challenge for a response

Re: Track Team Cuts

I realize the masses are getting tired of reading about the plight of the track team, but obviously Mr. Steadward hasn't quite heard enough to stimulate a response. Although I don't know why I expect anything more. He hasn't talked to the majority of the teams since he accompanied us on a trip to Saskatoon. I guess we got carried away on the bus home. Or is it that the track team has no "old boy" in the drinking club? I enjoyed your suggestion about going and finding our own sponsors. That would be feasible if I didn't have to go to school, or track or maintain a personal life. I suppose if I gave up track, I'd have time but I guess that would defeat the purpose. Maybe if I quit school?

No. Maybe if you charged every owner of a Windsor Car Park Pass one more dollar. That would be about \$5,000 dollars. Almost as much as the Hockey team got last year. More than enough to support us considering the uniforms we were using were the same ones used back when Jim Donley's hair color matched that of his eyebrows.

One last question Bob, How do you make a decision? The decision was not only done too late to apply elsewhere, it was also done in such secrecy it stunk. I heard that there was an article in the paper, but after attending a meeting last year where I was told there wouldn't be cuts I trusted that I wouldn't have to look for such an announcement. All I ask for is a response to the numerous letters written for your reading pleasure. Thank you.

Dave Findlay

Privileges of professorship?

On November 3, 1987 as I sat in Rutherford periodicals a startling thing occurred. Across from me sat an individual going through periodicals and, as he did, he used his pencil to underline numerous lines. Thereafter, he closed the books. I could see no sense in this and so I asked him if he owned these books that he felt he had the right to mark them up in such a way. He replied, to my surprise, with the following comments: Yes they are, I am a professor and have certain privileges. I was so astonished that I asked him if he thought he was God, his reply merely — Shut up and mind your own business.

This event draws to my attention two points. The first reflects the reason I began this column. The books in our library, for which we now must pay extra fees, are continually being defaced. There is nothing more infuriating than opening a book or journal and finding neon colors predominating throughout the text. Or perhaps the nonsensical comments accompanying the highlighting exceeds this in annoyance. If the desire to be read by others is so strong, write your own article or book. You must earn the right to be read through the hard work of getting published. The author of the article or book earned that privilege not you!

The second point and more frightening relates to the comments of this professor. I would hope that this is an isolated case in which a professor thinks his position entitles him to live above the laws and regulations of our society, but I fear it may not be so. This professor assumes that his title gives him a status above others that the University. Into what other areas of his social interactions does this extend? Does he feel he has the "privilege" to use others ideas, or the "privilege" to verbally assault another person? The ivory tower in which this professor has enshrined himself must be destroyed. He does not obtain these privileges by passing a candidacy exam or by getting hired for tenure at a University. This individual, and others like him are bound by the same social morals and laws as the rest of us. His position only gives him the higher salary and perhaps respect if earned.

To that professor from Rutherford periodicals, I hope you have considered your reactions to my complaint and will in future limit your pencil to scratch pads.

Pamela Mayne

Remembrance Day is vulgar

This letter is in response to the disasteful practices that occur annually on November 11.

Remembrance Day is a vulgar ritual that glorifies war and those unfortunate enough to have participated, and been murdered in a war. It is ridiculous to be reminded of something that occurs daily in the sequel and spin offs to The "Great" War.

Remembrance Day is an irrelevant patronage of past events that glorifies the dead in a sick creation of pagan society that should be abolished.

Worshipping the cenotaph encourages our remembrance of past enemies and breeds hatred of our potential enemies. It also brainwashes youth into believing that national defense is natural and good. This is wrong.

This civil holiday demonstrates an exaltation of war, which is really the most pathetic display of primal fear that the human species has. Violence is meaningless rot.

Russell C. Janzen
or L'Académie des 110ntoux
Pendant La Nuit Victorienne

Parking problems

I'm mad as hell, and I'm not gonna shop there anymore. The management at Bonnie Doon Shopping Mall wants to tag and tow away my car when I leave it parked at the south end of their parking lot. Everybody is aware of the time and expense involved in dealing with that sort of situation. Realistically, they have every legal right to take such action. But let's talk about other matters that are pertinent to the situation.

I attend school on the typical student budget and my time is subject to a typical student time table. It is convenient for me to catch the bus at Bonnie Doon. Parking at the university is next to impossible. The bus is relatively inexpensive. And the bus connections are such that I can get from school to work on time.

But am I taking up VALUABLE parking space for Bonnie Doon shoppers. What are the facts? The south end of the parking lot is virtually deserted from Mon. to Fri. I'm not putting any shoppers out of a parking spot.

What are some further facts? Consider Bonnie Doon's location in relation to the campus. I do not have exact figures, but I catch the bus at Bonnie Doon. Parking at the mall's livelihood is a direct result of students spending money at their mall. I am confident a student boycott of the mall would shock the owners if the magnitude of these student dollars was made conspicuous by its absence.

Their petty concern over missed parking space is just one more headache I don't need to deal with. As a result, I have stopped parking in their lot; but I have also stopped shopping there.

Perhaps co-operation from other students who put up with their parking concerns in boycotting the mall would force the mall to re-evaluate their "parking policy". Publication of this letter wouldn't hurt either.

Harry Pickard

Hope in Christ's News

I want to thank you for covering the debate on "Humanism versus Christianity" in the November 3rd issue of the Gateway. I believe that debates are an important asset to the university environment because they present both sides of an issue fairly. Both of the debaters, Michael Horner and Robert Nicholls, have presented their issues with a great amount of insight, providing the audience with ample evidence of their world point of view. Michael Horner, who was defending the Christian faith, pointed out that Christianity is not a "blind leap of faith", but it offers much proof to its reliability in 1987. He implied that a person who is seeking a new start in his life due to burdens imposed on him would experience a true regeneration in his life when he turns to Christ. This message, which offers an incredible amount of hope to mankind, is called the "Good News of Jesus Christ."

Sam Girgis

Gateway Staff Meeting



Thursday
4:00 p.m.
Rm 282 SUB
All volunteers
please attend!