

LETTERS CON'T FROM PG. 4

see, the letter was not raising issues of morals, or ethics, or behaviour. Nor was it advocating less education in sex or birth control. Rather, if you read between the lines, that first letter was asking us if we thought such advertisements make UPEI look like a school with class, or like a second rate institution.

Of course the quality of this school is not dependent upon the advertisements the SUN publishes. But how this school is judged and seen by people off the campus is most certainly influenced by what you say and do. You say it is none of their business. You are probably right. The SUN is a journal for students. But it is not a private document. It is and will continue to be read beyond campus limits.

You say the opinion of people off the campus does not matter? How strange! I never found I had so many friends that I could afford to offend them without good cause. Do you think this university is so free from problems that we can do without friends?

You say, "What about our freedom? Doesn't education imply freedom to express ourselves?"

Certainly it does. But is it necessary for those who are liberated to wave their freedom about like a flag in a forty knot gale, just to see it flap?

If the issue of teaching sex by the gospel of Julius Schmidt is, indeed, so important - Fair enough. Then stick by your guns and may the devil take public opinion.

But, if offending

many people who want to be your friends is also important, maybe you should think about that too.

Every generation has its own hang-ups. God knows, mine has enough for all of us. But don't let the main hang-up of yours be the falaacy that you invented sex.

Yours sincerely,  
Ivan Kilpatrick  
Business Administration

Dear Editor,

On behalf of the Irish Heritage Society and the many visitors to our third annual exhibition (Robertson Library, March 17-19), I thank you for the fine coverage your newspaper gave to our activities. We are grateful for your interest and your accurate reporting of our societies objectives and projects.

Yours Truly,

Brendan O'Grady  
Dept. of Eng

Dear Editor,

The S.U. elections have come and gone, and the promises which were solemnly made seem less likely to be fulfilled with each passing day. In specfic we are referring to the comptroller, who not only did not come thru with the promises he made in 76-77, but it looks as if the same is going to happen this coming term.

Our major complaint is the lack of tables in the barn. It is espically enoying when one looks back to last Oct. when the force was told that the tables would be in within two weeks. Some five months later... and nothing has been done and it doesn't look like it will be.

The rest of our grips vary from not having an emergency phone installed to not repairing costly damages in the barn.

Members of the CP force

Dear Editor,

We as authors of the article "Forget the Seals ...Save the Babies", are writing in response to the letter by Robert Gifford (in last week's issue).

First, we shall direct our comments to the introductory ones made by Gifford. He stated that some of the materials went "beyond the bounds of... good editorial judgment." May we infer from this that Dr. Gifford is an advocate of editorial censorship? If so, would not that same censorship be applicable to any advertisements which readers find "beyond the bounds of propriety and good editorial judgment"? (I think everyone knows what we are talking about.)

Second: The letter stated that the "Diary of an Unborn Child" and the "Ballad of the Unborn" both "sink below any acceptable standards of argument on the issue." These pieces were not intended as arguments; rather, they are works of art-poetry to be precise. I wonder if Professor Gifford has ever read "Flanders' Fields". Dead men do not write poetry either, but their imagined thoughts are certainly poetic. Poetry does not usually have persuasion as its purpose. The indignant writer apparently does not realize that a poem needs only "to be".

True, "unborn children" --and we must confess our happiness at Professor Gifford's terminology-- do not write ballads. But, (as our article stated), they do think...and breathe

and move and feel pain. Why shouldn't one get "emotional" about people killing them?

Third, it was inferred from our article that we regard those against the seal hunt as hypocrites. Here he missed the point entirely. Our article simply called for a long hard look at our priorities as intelligent, moral citizens. We made no comment whatsoever on the good or evil of the seal hunt; the suffering that man inflicts on other animals is a trivial matter when one is confronted with the suffering that man

inflicts on his fellow man (particularly his helpless, innocent, fellow man).

Now, to the irrelevant statements made in the letter: The "argument" proceeded to criticize those who denounce both contraception and abortion. Incredibly, he states, "One's choices are then limited to further over-population... and repressing the adult human being's desire for sex." This implies that the adult human should not have to restrain any of his "normal" sexual desires. Surely the professor did not intend to make such a broad statement.

And as far as over-population goes... Even if the world is over-populated, is that a good enough excuse for abortion/infanticide? Euthanasia? How about exterminating those deemed "useless to society"?

Next, we allude briefly to the "argument" that many children "conceived in lust" have not been aborted. So what?

It seems that Professor Gifford has missed

LETTERS CON'T ON PG 7

BETTER THAN BY CHOICE CHANCE



Information re:  
Birth Control, V.D.,  
Pregnancy Counselling,  
Pregnancy Testing

PLANNED PARENTHOOD ASSOCIATION

76 B Kent Street

across the

Charlottetown Hotel

892-8141

THE LEPAGE SHOE Co. LTD.



GRATON STREET  
894-4748

The home of  
good shoes  
since 1902.