

# THE BRUNSWICKIAN



Calum Iain Johnston ..... Editor  
 Tim MacKinnon ..... Managing Editor  
 M. Kaye MacPhee ..... News Editor  
 Karen Mair ..... Entertainment Editor  
 Ken Quigley ..... Sports Editor  
 Richard Hutchins ..... Features Editor  
 Katherine Davidson ..... Advertising Manager  
 Timothy C. Lethbridge ..... Technical Co-ordinator  
 Tim MacKinnon ..... Offset Editor

### Advisory Board

Timothy C. Lethbridge  
 Michael MacKinnon

### Typesetters

Cindy Davis, Zoë Green, Cindy Scott, Robin Geneau,  
 David Morrison, Kate MacKay, Marsha Phelps,  
 Anna Trites, Laura Smith, Brenda Madore

### Ad Design

Ernest Dunphy  
 Kevin Grant

### Samurai of the week:

Nusin Brown, Valerie White, Laura Lee Maclean,  
 Kelly Chase, Dawn Leavitt, Helen Burke, Colleen  
 Sullivan, Robin Geneau, Dolores Allison, Spud,  
 Louis Brill, Randy Smith, Alan Brown, Manuel  
 Skoulas, Barry Pomeroy, Danny Samson, Tom  
 Lagage, Mark Savoie, Ian Comeau, Jamie Aitken,  
 Eric Semple, Steve Boyko, Jeff Magee, Drew  
 Brown, Michaelangelo, Lauren Grieve, Avenue Y,  
 Pink, and others to whom we are grateful.

The *Brunswickian*, in its 120th year, is Canada's oldest official student publication. The *Brunswickian's* offices are located in Room 35 of the University of New Brunswick's Student Union Building, P.O. Box 4400, College Hill, Fredericton, N.B., E3B 5A3.

The *Brunswickian* is printed with flair by Covered Bridge Printing, Ltd., Hartland, N.B., (506) 375-4458. Subscriptions are \$20 per year. National and local advertising rates are available at (506) 453-4974. General phone 453-4983. News line 453-4973.

The *Brunswickian* is copyright 1985 the *Brunswickian*. The opinions expressed within are not necessarily those of the *Brunswickian's* editorial board, its staff, its publisher (The UNB Student Union), or the administration of the university.

All letters to the editor must be typed and double spaced, and signed along with phone number. Names may be withheld by request. The *Brunswickian* reserves the right to refuse publication of letters with libellous, sexist or racist material. Letters over 250 words may be edited for brevity.

Articles in the *Brunswickian* may be freely reprinted provided proper credit is given.

# OPINION...

## Aborting a life is wrong

by Manuel Skoulas

"The issue is not choice the issue is life...All other questions are secondary." -Kathy Ford: Letter to the Editor. Dec 6/85.

I couldn't agree more with this statement. I am quite happy that some people in this university were not fooled or tricked by Dr. Morgentaler's misleading speeches. He made it seem that the issue is choice. But he spoke under the assumption that the fetus is not alive until it comes out of the womb. As he terms it, "terminating the organism" is the woman's choice. Many people now believe that, mostly due to Dr. Morgentaler's supreme oratorical skills. I too would probably believe it except for one thing: what if the "organism" as he calls it is a living human?

Would the issue be choice anymore? Absolutely not. But Dr. Morgentaler never talked about that issue. If you listen carefully to any of his speeches, he never directly answers the question "is the fetus alive?" His answer time after time is, "Do you believe a brick makes a house?"

I have two problems with this. First of all, that is not a "yes" or "no" answer. I don't want to hear a direct question answered with a question. Secondly, since when could a brick reproduce more cells and take in food and grow? The last time I checked, a brick did not have such qualities - but a human egg does. In order to make a human, simply fertilize and

give food to a human egg -much like a large plant grows out of a small seed when it is given food. You don't need 10,000 human eggs to make a human like you need 10,000 bricks to make a house. Comparing a brick to a human egg is quite invalid. When people ask, "is the fetus alive?" why doesn't Dr. Morgentaler ask, "Do you believe a seed makes a plant?" He won't because this is a logical comparison. He cannot use his oratory skills to fool people if he uses logical, valid comparisons, thus he doesn't use them. Instead, he throws stupid bricks at us.

Better yet, why doesn't he just give us a straight "yes" or "no" answer? Because he knows that if he did, that would end his lucrative business and probably land him in jail for a very long time. Why? Because just as a plant is alive even before it breaks through the surface of the ground, so is a fetus alive before it leaves the womb. *Life begins at the moment of conception.* There is a lot of scientific proof to back this statement (depending on whose definition of "life" you believe), and most doctors and life-scientists agree.

For some reason many people are willing to accept that ending a life inside the womb is different than doing the same outside. Well it isn't; ending a life is called murder (at least in the Criminal Code of Canada), and Dr. Morgentaler is guilty.

But Dr. Morgentaler is trying to make abortion legal. If

we start giving people the right to end human life because it's not convenient to have that life around, then we "civilized people" are nothing more than savages. But now that we are out of the womb we don't have to worry about being "terminated" if we are an inconvenience to mommy.

Maybe we should give women the right to "terminate" their kids even after birth, then see how many people are in favor of abortion. Think of all the times all of us were an inconvenience to our mothers; I doubt half of us would be here now.

If we make killing inside the womb legal, then it follows that we should (must, even) do the same for outside the womb, since the Charter of Rights protects everyone from discrimination. And why should abortionists have a monopoly on legal killing? We are protected against monopolies, and it would be antidiscriminatory and thus logical to give everyone the right to kill anyone we choose. Dr. Morgentaler would be pretty high on some people's lists. I'm not into this kind of behaviour. Live and let live.

I don't want to describe how the fetus is actually "terminated" - it's much too gruesome - but I feel I must say a little about it. Dr. Morgentaler points out that the aborted fetus doesn't look human at all. Of course not, because the fetus is smashed into pieces in an abortion.

I'm sorry if I'm upsetting some people, but I can't stand

*Continued on page 19*

## THE MUTANT REPORT



## Municipal gov't in Sports..AARRGGH!!

After spending my Christmas holidays in Toronto, I drove back to Fredericton with a bitter distaste for TO's municipal gov't in the handling of the Dome affair.

Being born and bred in that part of Upper Canada, I've come to grip with the urgency for such a stadium. In 1983 I marched through the city streets, with the rest of Toronto's sports fans, cheering "Argos are #1...we want a dome!" And if you've spent an afternoon, at the CNE, watching a Blue Jay game in anything less than \$10.50 seats, you're well aware of that facility's shortcomings.

Truly the city needs a dome. However, the implementation of this project has been the subject of much controversy, stupidity, and out and out laughter.

I am not an engineer, so I can't comment on the dome's design feasibility, however many who are engineers have labeled the plans ludicrous and a "fantasy".

This problem was paled in light of the chosen location for this monstrosity. At the foot of the CN Tower, it's to be located directly in place of a large pumping station; a plant responsible for pumping water to most of downtown Toronto. Not able to find out where the station is to be relocated, I found out that an unofficial \$95 million is to be spent for "site preparation". Maybe its me but "site preparation" cast illusion of people pulling up weeds, filling potholes, clearing the area of large boulders, etc.. Tearing up a massive complex with such awesome responsibilities does not jell

with my perception of logical thinking.

To add to this painfully humorous situation, the municipal gov't also plans to reroute many an avenue in downtown Toronto to oblige any sorry baseball fans who plan on driving to the stadium. I'm thankful I'll be here in Fred city, when the backlog of traffic this rerouting is bound to create is realized.

I also pity the poor souls who, on game day, have to use the subway for purposes unrelated to baseball. The new stadium will hold around 60-70,000 capacity and with an average 40,000 attendance at regular games, the logical way to get to the game will be packed from end to end. By 1988, the "Better Way" (the Toronto Transit Commission's slogan) will become "no way!"