

Smoke screen

We are glad to see the steps taken by the staff, administration and Associated Student Government in providing no-smoking areas for those who do not enjoy breathing noxious fumes while they eat.

However, (there's always a however) we still think more could be done.

Setting aside a few tables with removable signs is only a gesture in our estimation, and does not do much for solving the problem. What good does it do to sit at a no-smoking table when the smoke from the adjoining table drifts over into your face?

If the tables were not so close together this idea might work, but as it is, it's not the best plan.

What about setting aside the small dining room? We realize that a lot of the staff, faculty and administration sit back there and don't like their privileges infringed upon, but why not make it no-smoking just during the peak lunch hour from 11 to 1 when the cafeteria is the most crowded. It could be open to all at other times when the tables alone would be sufficient.

There have also been non-smokers who complain that this plan would shove them out of the mainstream. "We want to be out front where we can see", they say. Well folks, you can't have everything. It is only logical that the largest area be given to the smokers, since there are more people with the habit than without.

We do feel that there are alternatives to the solution that has been presented, which is really not a solution at all. Maybe some other things should be tried before the signs are made permanent fixtures of a few tables.

" I SEE THE NORML MEETING IS OUT NOW... "



Other viewpoints

Visualization needed

Editor's note: This article was an editorial in the Jan. 20 issue of the Siskiyou, the Student newspaper at Southern Oregon State College in Ashland.

At a time when budgets are being written and politicians are prepping for the primaries, the air is rancid with justifications based on the best interests of "the students" or "the people of the state of Oregon".

I do not intend to sound flip at this point. For many of the people verbalizing such concerns actually do have some grasp of "The best interests" of the people, as they visualize it. The operative word here, however, is visualize.

We all have images of "the school", the "average student" or "the people" by which we function. But regardless of the

reality of those images, a large part of any image is wrapped up in our own needs, shaped by our own drives and often non-existent apart from that. It may be healthy for all of us to occasionally pinch ourselves with the reality of our own self-interests in order to bring clarity to the task at hand.

Must we avoid speaking in terms "of the people"? Of course not. We are often entrusted with the responsibility of caring for the interests of others in a particular fashion, which is to the best of our ability. But if we can all agree to recognize the extent of our own self-interests when we think or talk or write budgets "in the best interest" of that imagined majority, we may all find ourselves a little less rigid, a lot less hostile and more open to change.

Commentary

NORML takes new direction

By Mike McCarty
Associated Student Government
President
For The Print

The National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML) has begun to work in a new direction towards its goal of legalizing marijuana for recreational use.

It has decided to pull back in its efforts to get the drug legalized in Oregon, soon, and is instead concentrating on educating the voter as to the different directions this legalization can take.

NORML's future directions committee says that the organization should become more aggressive in its efforts to present marijuana related issues to the public, and should continue to lay the ground work for the eventual legalization of marijuana.

There is a universal agreement among NORML activists that some day we must have and will have a system by which smokers can obtain marijuana legally.

Rather than stomp for legalization, NORML should educate

the public to the differences between "legalization" and "regulation." Legalization is defined as commercialization with advertising; regulation denotes a system in which marijuana could be obtained legally without all the

advertising glamour.

It is felt that there will be more success with the general public in lobbying for regulation than for legalization, and it is toward this that our efforts should be directed.

the print

19600 S. Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, Oregon 97045
Offices: Trailer B -- Telephone: 656-2631, ext. 259 or 278

editor Happie Thacker * news editor Cyndi Bacon * arts editor Marlene Clark * sports editor Ann Breyne * copy editor Scott Starnes * photo editor Brian Snook * assistant photo editor Lorraine Stratton * staff reporters Hallie Brown, Randy Frank * photographer Sam Baer * production staff Mary Cuddy, Jack Tucker * business manager Paul Byers * professional adviser Randy Clark * office personnel Tommi Davidson, Crystal Tompkins

Opinions expressed in The Print do not necessarily reflect those of the CCC administration, faculty or the Associated Student Government. Editorials, columns and signed letters reflect only the opinions of the editors and the persons signing them. Correspondence should be addressed to the above address.

