

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

Bet on the future

To the editor:

James Reston once said that "an election is not a popularity test of the past, but a bet on the future". Unfortunately, as referendum day approaches, it is obvious that this election is indeed a popularity test of the leaders of today, and of our nation's historical prejudices, and not what it should be about - Will the legal text of the Charlottetown Accord indeed begin an era of commitment on behalf of all provinces towards Canada, and will it be a bet on a better future? The answer is yes, but sadly, many Canadians are forgetting this and voting on the accord for reasons having nothing to do with the legal text.

Some popular reasons for voting "no" have included the idea that the accord would create an imperfect constitution, that the one we have now is good enough, and that the province of Quebec will just want more anyways. These are all very valid arguments, all arguments worth debating.

1. THE DEAL IS NOT PERFECT. True. In fact, neither is our current constitution. I'll address that later. Neither is the American Constitution (i.e. the fact that the president alone is allowed to pardon criminals). The truth is, historians have stated that the Constitution of the Weimar Republic was a very good document. That document was used by Adolf Hitler in his rise to power. Do we want perfection or do we want a workable, sound and good Constitution?

2. WHAT WE HAVE NOW IS GOOD ENOUGH. Oh, sorry, I forgot, an unequal, unelected senate is good enough (sarcasm). The facts are, that our Constitution is not good enough. As far back as the 1960's the slogan of the governing party in Quebec was "equality or independence"; in the west, the entire province of Alberta has less seats in the Senate than Nova Scotia. These are problems that our current constitution fails to address. The Charlottetown Accord seeks to improve the current constitution by signaling, for the first time since confederation, the unanimous consent of all provinces, who agree upon a Canada that is made up of equal individuals and equal provinces.

3. THEY'LL WANT MORE ANYWAYS. This argument was eloquently stated by Pierre Trudeau in his "Say No To Blackmail" essay. Unfortunately, that argument is contradictory to the spirit of the Charlottetown Accord. Not only does it say no to blackmail, it can end the blackmail. A post-Charlottetown nation is one in which all provinces, including Quebec, are fully committed to one Canada. The separatists will no longer have an argument at the constitutional level, and federal-provincial problems can be solved at the political level, leaving the constitution in legal libraries and not on the politician's wish lists.

For those who are undecided and feel their vote won't matter, an historical anecdote should be considered - Jack Kennedy defeated Richard Nixon by an average of 1 vote per precinct in the 1960 presidential election. If the people of Canada decide not to choose this deal, then they are leaving the country in the hands of destiny; if they do choose the Charlottetown accord, they will be the architects of their own destiny.

Kurt Peacock

Native self-government

Letter to the Editor,

A lot of talk has been mentioned about Native self-government. Various peoples have expressed their concern of what it actually means, including not just the politicians, but also the Native peoples of this land. Indeed, there is a great importance of actually defining self-government. I wish to express my concerns as to the definition.

In Canada, there are a great deal of Native peoples, and although the only true common bond among us all is that we all are Native Aborigines (first peoples of the land), each have a distinct way in which we "govern" ourselves. The Micmacs' way of life differs slightly from the Mohawks of Central Canada or from the Dene of Western Canada. To each of us, self-government will take on slightly different meaning. I have just mentioned three Native peoples; as we all know, there are a vast number of Native peoples.

For the above mentioned reason, the defini-

tion of self-government for Native peoples should be broad based, so as to respect the various differences that each Native peoples experience concerning their own governing. In having a broad based (or general) definition each Native peoples will be able to adjust to self-government in a way which is suitable to them (e.g. the way in which they governed themselves in the past, with adjustments to reflect today's modern era).

It is important that we not concern ourselves too much with this definition. After all, self-government is just that, to govern oneself to respect of own cultural beliefs and norms. There are no hidden "phrases", there is no trick to it. After all, Canada as a nation onto itself has been developing self-government for the past 125 years (officially), and longer in fact, prior to years of Confederation. If the Canadian government(s) do not know what self-government is, I am gravely ill as to their confidence in leadership.

We, the Native people only wish to gain the respect and confidence, not just among ourselves, but to the Canadian community as a whole. We have been knocked down too many times but managed to survive somehow. Allow us to stand tall, and once again be proud of who we truly are, the Native Aborigines of Canada.

R. C. Gideon
Native Aboriginal
Micmac Nation

No opinions

Dear editor,

I can recall no opinions for the day I was born without a past. Born with a clear heart and an empty mind, it was a day unlike all the rest, the day I was born void of prejudices. Thus was my approach to life. An innocent approach, smooth and unencumbered. Not unlike the one our Government should have undertaken, in its Constitutional quest. But alas, it's the caste of "the beast" (politicians), to create chaos out of simplicity.

Fuddle minded "the beast", would beguile us with its certitudes. Clogged with threats, it rumbles, "If you don't accept our constitutional package, this country will be TORN APART!" F—K! With such lurking doom, you're compelled to ask yourself: "WHY? Is it for the sins of humanity? HOW? Anarchy, reminiscent of the French Revolution? BY WHOM? The Huns, Hitler, Hussein, or perhaps, your neighbor?"

If anything could shred this country, it would be "the beast".

Sour with failure, "the beast" has had its claws into our Constitution for ten languorous years. To what demise? "AN IMPERFECT COMPROMISE". One, they are eager to scrap for. A political brawl, motivated and centered on their heated desires for historical footnotes. A Constitutional signatory. The ultimate political climax. Yesterday's imperfections = today's miracles.

"The beast" has already gnawed on equality and infringed on basic democratic ideals. Can we really stomach "the beast" chewing up democracy?

Our constitution is a mish-mash cluster of notable British statutes, some Canadian, and unwritten rules of Parliament established by convention and precedent set in Britain. A Constitution is the blueprint for the Government.

How do we reconcile and harmonize our Constitutional crisis?

First, we do not use the formula our Government has used: "the beast feasts".

Second, we must realize that we are in a world class democracy and society. Not unlike a world class athlete who won't merely settle for world class status, but is compelled to GO FOR THE GOLD! We as a democracy, cannot conclude with world class distinction, but must — — — — —!

Third, we must recognize the wholly unique opportunity afforded us at this time in HISTORY. That is, to create a freshly improved, unprecedented form of democracy for the world to envy and emulate.

Fourth, we must realize that we have the capabilities, the resources, and the technologies to succeed. Literally we have the combined knowledge and experiences of all humanity at our fingertips. Unlike the British, French or Americans we won't pen our Constitution by candle and oil with quill and ink.

SOLUTION: Lends itself. It's the BIRTH of a CANADIAN DREAM. An innocent approach, smooth and unencumbered. A

Constitutional Conference of the people, by the people, for the people. A TRUE portraiture. With our universities to research and instruct, we could formulate opinion and ideals. Working together there is no issue we cannot overcome.

The Quebec dilemma. No dilemma, but a simple answer. All they are seeking is protection and control of their unique culture and language. Protection from outside Government and radical entities. Quebec has always been and shall always be Quebec. let...us...protect...her

Word for word, brick by brick, we would construct a democracy for the world to treasure and honor. The pride and joy of a nation...Your nation...Your pride

Your joy...

Who's to stop us?

Just a Canadian.

Wm. B. Carruthers

Declining yes invitation

The following is an open letter to Bud Bird, PC MP of Fredericton, from the Student Action Committee on the Status of Women and the UNB Student Women's Collective

Dear Mr. Bird:

The UNB Student Women's Collective and the Student Action Committee on the Status of Women thanks you for the invitation to join the "Yes" campaign. However, it was decided at our Oct. 6 meeting that we could not possibly support the campaign.

As member groups of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, we feel it was essential to consider how the proposed Constitution will impact on women.

Our main concern lies with the wording of certain key clauses. First, we note that there is no commitment from the federal government to racial or gender equality. There is only a commitment for "Canadians" to be committed - whatever that means.

Since the 1982 Constitution was passed, Canadian society has seen a shift in decision making power toward the justice system - especially for women's issue. The new Constitution clearly tries to shift the power back to the federal and provincial governments. The new Constitution appears to set up a hierarchy of rights that gives the government the power to supersede the charter of rights and freedoms. We find that dangerous given both the provincial and federal governments record on funding for women's issues and social programs. Two examples that come to mind are the national daycare program that was scrapped ("read my lips" Mulroney-style) and the attempts to blackmail the Quebec Women's Federation into supporting the "Yes" campaign by threatening to cut off their funding.

Also, we have concerns about the wording of the social charter. For example, under the proposed Constitution, it will be impossible for Canadians to legally challenge the government on issues such as cut backs to health care or other social programs.

There are also still many questions to be answered about just what exactly will the role of the senate be. In addition, there has been no movement, especially from Frank McKenna, to ensure women have a fair chance of being elected or appointed to the senate.

We also have concerns about federal spending power being shifted to the provinces. There is no way of ensuring that Medicare and other social programs are the priority of provincial governments. Cuts to social programs can have a devastating impact on women.

Traditionally, women's groups have placed their bets with the federal government to address the problems facing women in society. Under the new Constitution, that powerbase would change and women would have to lobby each provincial government. This would result in fragmentation and make our voices less effective.

The power shift is of particular concern to women in New Brunswick in light of Premier McKenna's hatchet job on social programs last spring. We feel as women, we cannot trust Frank McKenna to represent our interests.

Finally, we would like to say that we believe in Canada and in Quebec as a distinct society. However, we also believe in women. In that belief is our vision of a Canada that is a safer and more equitable place for us to live in. Therefore, we cannot support the proposed Constitution.

Yours Truly,
Rita Boudreau

On behalf of the Student Action Committee on the Status of Women and the UNB Student Women's Collective.

Positive trend

Dear editor,

From observing the valiant attempts of many individuals in the past weeks to correct the depraved minds of certain thirteen-year-olds in our midst, we feel bound to continue this positive trend. Hence, we have taken the liberty, living as we do, in a liberal democracy, of compiling a list of our own suggestions. The following is a list of words, phrases, etc., that we, as intelligent, university-educated young adults, have concluded, should be carefully monitored, if not stricken entirely, due to the obviously degrading, vulgar, and often sexist implications inherent within. Read this guide carefully, and we are sure you will come to the same conclusion.

NO MORE: oral anything, Beaver foods, anything easy or hard, head-cocking, window-caulking, turning anything on, boxing anything in, muffs on rich women, pricking your finger, dinky cars, Jimmys, John Thomas', Richards (Dicks), rods, Woody's, Long John Silver, calling your cat or rooster, sticky buns, shooters, mixed drinks, cocktails, cocktail waitresses, cocktail weinies, building dykes or smoking fags, booty traps, door knockers, smoking hooters, smoking butts, bags, boxes, bases, bats or balls, banging, nailing, screwing, or driving anything, blowing or sucking anything, meat, skin, lip-smacking, eating, naked truths, naked guns, lethal weapons, erecting anything (sorry STU), snatching, coming along, virgin wool, using anything, going down, getting up, mounting, dismounting, getting whacked, wild things, jumping, tightness, looseness, peepers, prodding, poking, pounding, pork, Gumby (Pokey), fruits, phallic vegetables, great horny toads, sticking it to anyone, myth of Sisyphus, hanging, all Greek literature, riding, good vibrations, stroking or petting of felines, frigidity, moist 'n' delicious (adios, Betty Crocker), heads or tails, feeling, coming together, coming as you are, you've come a long way baby, pop goes the weasel, jack-in-the box, creamsicles, jerks, jerky, jerking around, clams, tongue-in-cheek, scoring, stripping anything, sperm whales, claps, crabs, cherry-pickers, all chickens (laying, chicks, cocks), hustling, penthouses, putting anything out, being or becoming lucky, big bird, all birds, blowin' in the wind, planting seeds, Juicy Fruit, bloody marys, slurping, notches (belts, bedposts), getting down to business, pieces, no bonds, nothing bonded, nobody bondable, piercing, penetrating, wrapping, unwrapping, tying, untying, nothing greasy, oily, primed, slick, slippery, or wet.

We may not agree with what you say, and we'll fight to the death to keep you from ever saying it again.

Yours in purity,
Persons United against Sexually Suggestive and Expressions and Innuendos

Administration involved in alleged discrimination case

Dear Editor

In his recent article concerning the allegation of discrimination by a professor in the Faculty of Administration, Dr. Kwame Dawes suggests that "it is time the University administration stepped in". In fact, the administration had been involved actively with this case ever since Dr. Dawes first brought it to our attention. I have met frequently with the complainants, as have the Dean of Students, the Registrar and other university officials. These meetings explored all the options available within the university's procedures to deal with their complaints. To date, the students have not decided whether they wish to avail themselves of our internal procedures or whether to take the case for external adjudication. They have been informed that it is their decision whether, when and how to proceed. The Administration cannot and should not interfere with their right to choose their course of action. Sometimes following due process takes a little longer than hasty action, but it usually serves the rights of complainants and defendants alike to a just resolution of their disputes.

Dr. Tom Traves
UNB Vice-President (Academic)

Bruns wins Media Bowl

Dear Editor,

The weather was a just a little too dry and there was an hour delay before we started, but Media Bowl XXIII happened despite it all. This long standing tradition of friendly physical competition between UNB's two media empires was played out Saturday, October 17, on the pitch below the UNB Physical Plant-contrary to the two-page spread in last week's issue of the Brunswickan.

Fifteen Bunnies of Death composed the roster of CHSR's team. The opposition fielded a team consisting of a handful of Brunssies (five in all), a few use-to-maybe -Brunssies-in-the-past types and several ringers from CFB Gagetown. I would like, at this point, to congratulate the Bunnies of Death for their valiant performance against this coalition team; your efforts and ambition remain unparalleled. Alas, the energetic enthusiasm of the Bunnies were (sic) not able to ward off two quick fourth quarter touchdowns, and the clock expired with a 14 - 28 score, in favour of the coalition, on the board - Kudos to the coalition team.

Although the Bunnies of Death were unable to secure their third consecutive Media Bowl victory, our minds may rest in the knowledge that the Brunswickan, due to an obvious sense of inferiority, were (sic) forced to resort to the importation of talent (ringers) in order to muster the courage to confront the Bunnies of Death. Besides, there is always next year.

Once again, I would like to congratulate both teams for the providing the best football this campus has seen in a dozen years (some may question the record of the now defunct Bombers) and await next October.

Unstoppably yours,
Lapin de Mort,
The Ever-Ready Bunny of Death

Campus Police misconceptions

Dear editor,

As a former CP, I would like to address any possible misconceptions arising from an article in last weeks Bruns.

To begin, moving the line back five feet at the Aitken Social would not allow people to return to the social area after relieving themselves. Allow me to explain. If a social is doing well, there are two line-ups. You pay your money and get stamped first and you wait in the second one for room in the social. A one in, one out situation exists due to capacity regulations. At Aitken House, if this second line is moved back about 20 feet to allow access to the washroom, you then have a crowded, chaotic situation at the foot of a stairwell. It is a matter of priorities.

Again, regarding line-ups, if a social is going well and there is a long second line-up that is twenty minutes long at, say 11:42, with stamping over at midnight, why add 30 or 40 people to the line if they will not get in? Could it be that the house committee sponsoring a social only wants your money and does not care whether or not you get in? After all, they can blame the Campus Police.

I was not at the Aitken Social, so I will offer a possible explanation, based on experience, concerning the "innocent" fellow who was thrown out. While dealing with the individual who obtained a fake stamp, the "innocent" fellow may have become verbally abusive. Part of the job, you say? Wrong. CP's are human, they will only take so much abuse. Maybe the CP was just being an idiot. They exist. I hate to disillusion anyone, but they exist everywhere. I have even met a few on various house committees.

In closing, I would recommend to anyone who has a problem with CP procedures and is organizing a social event to contact the Campus Police Chief before the event, air your concerns, and present an alternative. Attempting to gain roles in a future house election by trying to embarrass the Campus Police can only foster bad relations.

Kyle Scott
Former CP