

## SETA raised many pertinent questions

Students for the Ethical Treatment of Animals demonstrated in front of President Brand's office Monday to protest the experimentation of monkeys at the University.

The demonstrators staged a mock funeral procession for two rhesus monkeys who will be killed after undergoing experiments in order to study changes in their tissue. SETA hoped to raise awareness of the plight of all animal experimentation on the campus.

The use of animals for experimentation is a controversial subject. Some research has been very valuable. There is no denying that past years of research have amounted to tremendous breakthroughs in the cure and prevention of certain illnesses and diseases.

But SETA's cause invokes important points:

- Replicating past experiments is a waste of time and money, not to mention the animals.
- Testing and killing of animals for such mundane purposes as producing cosmetics is absurd.
- All living creatures have a right to share the planet.

SETA says much of the tests being performed at the University nowadays are duplications of past experiments through the use of computerization techniques.

They are concerned with the experiments of at least three professors on campus, whose grants total almost \$1.3 million. Who should be the final judge on which experiments are worthy and which are not? And what federal bureaucracy is in charge of regulating and distributing research money? And just what is the money used for?

Jumping around like monkeys in Johnson Hall, as demonstrators did Monday, did not free any animals, but it may have proved some points to onlookers.

Civil disobedience is an important right in this country, but sometimes symbolic demonstrations can seem ridiculous and turn people off. Perhaps SETA can convince the animal-research professors to participate in a no-holds barred discussion about testing on the campus.

SETA members may have acted on feelings and emotions at Monday's demonstration, but they also raised a lot of pertinent questions about the way living, non-humans are treated on this campus. But to persuade other to believe in their cause, SETA needs to continue expressing its feelings of contempt to the University.



## Government-run brothel interesting idea

Because of the bankruptcy of the Mustang Ranch brothel in Nevada after the owner failed to pay taxes, the Internal Revenue Service has decided to step in and run the business until it can be sold.

Let's take a look at some of the possible — but unlikely — developments of a state-run brothel.

First of all, in the wake of the latest trend toward summits and treaty negotiations the Mustang Ranch could be the perfect place for a much needed western branch of Camp David. It might be just the place to open up the dialogue and avert the tensions between the United States and Iraq.

Invite Saddam Hussein to Nevada. The desert climate may help him to feel at home. And if the U.S. military carries out its reported plans to bomb targets such as Hussein's mistress' home, he might be in need of the brothel's service, the world's oldest way to relieve tension.

If the government can manage to turn a profit with the brothel it might consider opening up more of them. It would be a great way to raise some extra money to help

pay for the Desert Shield operation in the Persian Gulf. A chain of government-owned brothels could be called "George's Thousand Points of Red Lights."

Of course, it could backfire. With the government running the business it might quickly be operating on a deficit and need to be publicly subsidized.

The idea of government-owned brothels does present some problems. For instance, if they are government owned operations they would need to abide by affirmative action policies. As an equal opportunity employer there could be no discrimination based on age, gender or race.

Government employees are also notorious for simply going through the motions and not being completely devoted to their jobs. This would be a job that required a certain enthusiasm for the work (or at least the strong ability to fake it).

Perhaps the biggest problem caused by a government-run brothel would be that with all the political junkets to Nevada there would be no one in Washington D.C. to pass any legislation.

## LETTERS

### Reject Souter

The United States Senate will be making a monumental decision this week when they vote on the Supreme Court confirmation for David Souter.

Throughout the confirmation process the issue of abortion has taken center stage. Yet, through superb stealth, Souter has managed to keep his views regarding Roe vs. Wade secret to the Senate and the American people.

However, during his seven years on the New Hampshire Supreme Court, Souter wrote many opinions unfavorable to the mainstream views of society. A prime example of his insensitivity, especially to women, resides in a recent 1988 opinion, *State vs. Colbath*, in which he reversed a rape conviction on the ground that the jury should have been allowed to consider the rape victim's "sexually provocative" behavior.

Further, Souter showed a callous disregard for the fifth amendment protection against self-incrimination in a 1987 decision, *State vs. Coppola*, when he found a defendant's statement to police that he would

not confess admissible as evidence of the defendant's guilt. Souter reasoned, "by describing his choice as a refusal to confess, he implied he had done something to confess about."

Surely these two cases do not tell the full array of Souter's views. But what they do tell us is disturbing. Judge Souter is no moderate as he has been labeled in Washington. At best, he holds eccentric and insensitive views toward women and criminal defendants.

The question becomes: What does he have in store for "other" Americans? It's too important to guess. It's time to reject David Souter.

Michael Colson  
Political Science

### Insured

I'm an average grad student. For the second year in a row I find myself writing a letter about the cost of health insurance. And for the second year my wife and I are doing without any insurance at all because of the cost. The cost is now \$525 for one student and \$1,629 (!!) for a student and a

dependent.

These figures surely would be lower if everyone were enrolled. The Student Health Insurance Committee supported mandatory health insurance for all students. In the April ASUO elections the student body rejected mandatory health insurance, favoring individual choice. Maybe the notion of "freedom" appeals to kids who were in high school a year or two ago. Maybe they are still covered by mommy or daddy. Since mandatory health insurance is blocked by the tyranny of the majority, I suggest decoupling undergrads and grads on the issue. Graduate students, especially ones with families, have very different needs from undergrads. Health insurance should not be an issue at all for graduate students — it should be a right, provided automatically to all of us.

David Fashena  
Graduate student

### Postcards

If students at your school are willing to take one minute in a good cause, they can make the world a safer place. Will you

ask them to help?

The facts are simple. Almost a million United States children ingest a toxic substance every year. Tens of thousands end up in the hospital, dozens die.

Many household, garden and auto products are toxic. In 1987, 3,104 kids drank toxic household cleaners; 173 cases were life threatening; 14 kids died.

Current protective measures aren't enough. Mr. Yuk stickers don't frighten kids raised on ghostbusting ninja turtles. Child resistant caps are only required to keep 80 percent of the test age children out of a container for two minutes. Give a child enough time and they offer only minimal protection.

The Poison Proof Project supports these preventative measures. But we acknowledge that they can't do the job alone. We need to child proof the poisons as well as the containers.

Safe bittering agents (such as denatonium benzoate) can make toxic products taste too bitter to swallow. For one-half a cent per quart, our children can get the same protection given kids in Britain, Germany, Japan, Australia, etc.

The PPP's "bitter fight" has been endorsed by the American Medical Association, National Safety Council, American Association of Poison Control Centers, Consumer's Union (publishers of *Consumer Reports*), etc. We have appeared in the *New York Times*, *Parents Magazine*, *Ladies Home Journal*, *Woman's Day*, *Today Show*, the *Home Show*, *CNN*, *FNN*, etc.

But we need to show support for bittering agents in Oregon if our fight is to continue. We aren't asking for money. What we want is for students to send us postcards that state, "I endorse the use of bittering agents in toxic household, garden and automotive products." Include your name and address. If you wish to help us collect signature, we will send you additional postcards and a facts sheet.

We need student help. Your written support will go along way in the fight to make the world a safer place. Please feel free to call me at home (928-2193) if you would like additional information. Thank you.

Lynn Tylczak  
Director PPP