

BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of the Brunswickan. Letters may be sent to Rm. 35 in the Student Union Building. Deadline: 1 pm on Tuesday. Usual maximum length: 300 words. Please include name, student number and phone number

SUB smoking

Letter to the editor,

I would like to address the Student Union administration regarding the absolute lack of provisions accorded to our smoking members within the SUB.

The sole function of our Union, and its administration in particular, is to serve the interests of its members in an equitable fashion.

In the past, the building did not harbor any restrictive policies towards smoking. Although this allowed it to be used freely, it did not satisfy the needs of those who wished to be segregated from the normal free interaction. Therefore, the consideration was provided to them...

Unfortunately, in doing this, a total lack of consideration towards our smoking members resulted. By making the building more comfortable for some, many others were and are being denied normal and beneficial use of the facility, and are being cast out into the elements without any sense of justice or compassion.

If we are to consider a totally fair approach, it is logical that the percentage of smoking and non-smoking members be determined and the building be cordoned off accordingly, but full consideration is not what we are asking for; a token allotment such as the use of Room 26 would go a long way toward solving the problem.

Administrative policies are often mixed in structure over reason. As students, it is particularly important that our extracurricular activities reflect good judgment. If we do not our educational process will be considered a failure.

The motto of this University is "dare to be wise." Ladies and gentlemen of the Student Union administration, I dare you.

A. J. Carisse

Offensive Aquinian

Letter to the Editor:

On several occasions during this past summer, I have listened to a friend of mine who works on the Aquinian talk enthusiastically about the great plans editor Dale Geddes has for the paper; how the Aquinian was finally going to be a "real newspaper" that people may actually take seriously; how it was actually going to have some substance and purpose.

Well, after the first two issues, I have found the paper to be worse than ever (with the exception of some talented writers (sic) - one of which is NOT Dale Geddes). I find the paper more at the level of a junior high school paper being put out by boys just discovering sex for the first time.

I find it almost comical to picture the boys on lay-out night sitting around, eating pizza and giggling over using words like "pussy" and "whore" in the paper (an image of which I am told is not far from reality). However, the picture become (sic) rather pathetic when one realizes that the boys in the picture are actually university educated young men.

With just two issues, you have managed to offend most of the female staff members at the paper (to the point where some are considering sexual harassment charges); many of your advertisers and potential advertisers, many men and women on campus, as well as faculty members at St. Thomas.

The Student Action Committee on the Status of Women have been barged with complaints about the paper. So, on behalf of the Student action Committee, I would like to say: Congratulations, you are certainly off to an impressive start, Mr. Geddes and if you stick with it, maybe in 15 years you will have grown up enough to actually be at the level of a university paper.

Valerie Kilfoil
Student Action Committee on the Status of Women

Tarnished Aquinian

Letter to the Editor,

I am writing this letter because I feel that the reputation of the Aquinian has been greatly tarnished by the actions of editor-in-Chief Dale Geddes, Managing Editor Kevin Nickerson and Layout Editor Jonathon Sears. I feel that the language of the last three issues has given the paper the reputation of being "juvenilia" and a "tabloid paper". The Aquinian is not being taken as a serious newspaper because for the most part it is not.

In the first issue, the Editor, Dale Geddes put down Orientation and advised frosh to instead join the Aquinian where "we like to argue, play loud music, read, write, drink, smoke and (as near as I can figure) be indifferent, pompous, young intellectuals with a craving for anything that reeks of trouble." Overall, this Editorial was not the best way to start off the Aquinian year and was a sign of worse things to come. In the second issue on September 16 it got worse. On page 8 there was an offensive ad for the Aquinian typists put in by the Layout Editor. In addition, because of a misunderstanding between the Editor Dale Geddes and News Editor Allyson Vaughn, there was no News section.

At the September 16th staff meeting, Dale Geddes was confronted about the layout ad, the lack of a news section and the overall juvenile groupie mentality of the newspaper. Daizal Samad (our faculty advisor and faculty representative on the Aquinian Board of Directors) addressed these issues as did myself and Ad Manager Heather Wallace. Dr. Samad stated that he felt that the first issues had set the Aquinian back two years and was greatly dismayed that our considerable gains achieved last semester were eroded. Dale Geddes said it was just because the newspaper was getting started and it would improve.

Then came the third issue on September 30. On page 2, the first thing you see is a sexist ad for an Aquinian staff meeting. After addressing the sexist ad the previous issue, I was greatly dismayed to see it happen again. This ad is sexist towards all women especially those who work at the Aquinian. Ad Manager Heather Wallace resigned in response to the ad.

In addition, the headlines put on the news stories made serious news stories look tabloidish. A paragraph about the handbook in my article was edited out. The front cover demeaned the entire paper. This is a university newspaper, not SPY.

In the Editorial, Dale Geddes also struck back viciously at Daizal Samad for his criticism. Dale Geddes said that although it does fit Daizal Samad that does not mean it is directed at him. I find Geddes to be defensive about the whole thing and not one who takes criticism well.

Daizal Samad has nothing but good intentions when it comes to the

Aquinian. Last year Dr. Samad was instrumental in keeping the Aquinian from being shut down and helping the Aquinian staff make the paper something the entire St. Thomas community could be proud of. He is our greatest ally, not our enemy. The attack on Dr. Samad is uncalled for under any circumstances. The reference to heart attack is beneath contempt.

Allyson Vaughn and I are doing our best to follow this up with positive journalism. These ads are clear cases of sexual harassment. His general attitude has also been contemptible. Dale, however, promises to place an official apology in the next issue on the bottom half of page 2. I am personally filing a complaint with the St. Thomas sexual harassment committee. I am also sending copies of this letter to President Dr. Daniel O'Brien, the Sexual Harassment Committee, the Student Union, the Ombudsman, the Aquinian Board of Directors, and the Aquinian Letters to the Editor. This time my remarks will not go unnoticed.

Kelly MacGowan

The Vision thing

To the Editor:

First of all, let us get the wording correct. The UNB Student Union is the entire undergraduate population of students at the University of New Brunswick - Fredericton. In reading Jamie Rowan's article, my assumption is that he was referring to the Student Union Executive or perhaps the Student Union Council, or both. I will refer to these as the student Union Representatives (SU reps) or the Student Union Council.

Now, as a member of the UNB Student Union, I take offence to Mr. Rowan's comments. Where does he get the idea that "it is safe to say that there is no more universally disliked or hated group on campus" than the SU reps? He wrote, and I quote, "No one on this campus knows who the hell these people are. Neither do they know what they are doing for them." Let me ask this, how can you dislike or hate a group of people if you do not even know who they are? I will move on. Mr. Rowan highlighted five areas regarding the Student Union Council. I would like to examine the points he made in his article.

1. Lack of Visibility - The SU Council is very visible in my opinion. Take the Beaverbook, the SU page in the Bruns, concerts, movies, comedy shows, travel Cuts, winter Carnival, Orientation, Alcohol awareness, etc.... I think a lot of people know that the SU Council provides us with a great many services and/or activities. As far as the administrative stuff, maybe not, but why would we care about the memos that circulate form place to place. We are getting pretty good BANG! for our BUCK! I think these "masters of self-promotion," as he put it, do an excellent job of marketing their products and services. Associating names with faces is not nearly as important as realizing what these people are doing for the students.

2. Utility - He says that the SU Council does not serve any useful purpose. Does he honestly think that the many clubs, societies, and services that rely on support from Council each year could survive independently? I doubt it very much. Another thing, if he is able to find a place where the governing body (university or other) functions with NO bureaucracy, please let me

know!

3. Bad Press - The campus media, Mr. Rowan says, has "a duty to report on all the little screw ups." If the campus media were to pay as much attention to the good little things as to the bad little things (screw-ups), more GOOD Press may be generated, and hence, a solution to his third problem. Also, that College Hill Social Club (CHSC) Story is awfully tiresome.

4. Money - All I can say is that the money we pay in student activity fees each year is put to very good use in providing the programs we have at UNB.

5. The Vision Thing - He mentions that "the SU's idea of vision is getting their names in the paper." Funny, I have not seen many of the SU Representatives' names in the newspaper yet this year. And another thing, he seemed quite unhappy about the use of flashy posters during elections. Hey! Good poster design is good marketing and good marketing WINS elections.

In general, I found that the article did not say much in terms of fact. It was nothing more than a few rhetorical statements targeted at the SU Council and its members; just another attempt to take a shot at UNB'S STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE Council. I do not see the reason, though, for making misleading comments about the SU Council, especially when Mr. Rowan appeared to be so concerned for the Student Union and its reputation.

One last thing. He hinted that the SU Council should find a way to involve the students. The SU Council cannot make someone join a club, but it CAN and DOES provide ample opportunity for one to get involved. To re-emphasize my point from earlier - Who the Student Union's elected members are and what they do are separate issues. As long as we see that our money is bringing Yuk Yuk's, Basic Instinct, and the Tragically Hip to UNB, we will be happy. Whether our President's name is Dean, Wayne, Kevin, Greg, or Eric does not really matter.

To the Student Union Executives, Councilors, Clubs, Societies, and anybody else involved: THANK YOU! I commend and salute you for all your efforts. It is your people who keep the fire going in terms of UNB Pride. Keep it up!

Kevin Ferguson

Voting yes

I will vote yes in the Canadian referendum because the Charlottetown accord is a step ahead for all Canadians, male and female. While the deal does not give Women new rights it does not take away any acquired rights and it does represent a breakthrough that may make other things possible for Canadian women. Mostly, it represents for all Canadians, an agreement to work together. Canada needs this agreement.

Having worked, in 1981 and 1982, to obtain the sexual equality clause of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms,

and having fought against the Meech Lake Accord in order to protect that clause, I would not now support any constitutional changes that would threaten those gains. Constitutional protection of the equality of the sexes and of the legitimacy of equity programs is very important. Canadian women are envied for the strength of the constitutional protection we obtained 10 years ago. Those clauses are not threatened by the Charlottetown agreement.

The Charlottetown accord reflects values highly held by Canadian women. The social charter gives social programs and social rights greater protection than ever before. For the first time ever, the governments of Canada have committed themselves, in the constitution, to a health care system that is comprehensive, universal, portable, publicly administered and accessible; to providing adequate social services and benefits to ensure that every Canadian has reasonable access to housing, food and other basic necessities.

The constitutional commitment to high quality education, to the protection of the rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively and the protection of the environment are all reasons why Canadians, female and male, should support this agreement.

I will not speak at length of the economic benefits of the new guarantees for regional development, equitable distribution of wealth between the provinces and for better infrastructure, roads and imports. I'll just mention that these measures will contribute to a stronger and healthier economy from which we will all benefit.

We must also remember that groups that have an urgent need for constitutional protection of their rights, such as New Brunswick francophones and First Nations peoples, have made significant gains under the Charlottetown agreement. Solidarity requires that we support these groups at this time, especially since half of their members are women.

Many women's group support a yes vote in the referendum. Some do not. I believe we all agree on the goal of advancing women's rights, but our strategies are different. I for one believe we have a better chance of furthering women's rights if we vote Yes. I believe a Yes vote gives us a chance to get on with the kinds of real changes in women's lives that a constitutional amendment will never give us.

Madeleine Delaney-Leblanc, Ex-Chairperson
Advisory Council on the Status of Women

Due to space restrictions, the Brunswickan was unable to publish all letters to the editor. However, they will be published next week. We apologize for this inconvenience.

Shades Of Light

288 Regent St.
455-1318

Passion Clothing
Jewelry
Pottery
Glass
Pewter
And lots, lots more



10%
Student Discount
with I.D.

EXCELLENT!
Check Us Out