

# A Midwinter Night's Dream

## CCC Celebrates benefits Campaign For the Arts

Karlin Johnson  
NEWS EDITOR

Clackamas Community College Foundation presents "A Midwinter Night's Dream" on Saturday, Feb. 21.

The production will showcase the arts and benefit Clackamas' Campaign for the Arts in the style of a progressive dinner.

The prologue allows guests to check in and enjoy wine or other beverages while viewing the student art show.

Act I takes place in the Randall Gymnasium foyer. Guests can halt their hunger with delicious hors d'oeuvres while bidding on art pieces and other cultural packages. Instrumental Jazz will be provided by CCC music students.

The cast and crew of CCC Theatre Department's winter production will treat guests to a special vignette from "The Odd Couple" to complete Act II in McLoughlin Theatre.

Dessert is served during Act III in the Randall Gymnasium. Guests are able to purchase theatre seats and listen to grand finale musical performances.

Tickets to "A Midwinter Night's Dream" are \$50 and available only in advance. To make reservations, call ext. 2402 no later than this Thursday, Feb. 21 at 4 p.m.



JESSE LAMOND CLACKAMAS PRINT

Student Jess Hartsock, Art Dept. Chair Dave Anderson and student Tyler Derry create backdrops for CCC Celebrates. Hartsock and Derry are both Phi Theta Kappa honor students.

# celebrates

**Prologue:**  
Studio Arts Building

**Act I:**  
Randall Gymnasium  
Foyer

**Act II:**  
McLoughlin Theatre

**Act III:**  
Randall Gymnasium

**Cast:**  
Student and  
local professional artists

CCC choir

CCC instrumental  
groups

CCC theatre depart-  
ment

Cast of "The Odd  
Couple"

# Gay couples win state-wide marriage struggle

Ben Maras  
THE CLACKAMAS PRINT

Recently a judicial decision to legalize same-sex marriage in the state of Massachusetts was passed 4-3, making it the first state to allow gay marriage.

The ruling will not take effect right away, instead giving the state legislature six months to rewrite the state's marriage laws in order to allow gays and lesbians to wed. No other state currently allows a marriage license to same-sex partners.

The ruling came a week before a constitution convention met to consider proposing an amendment changing the definition of marriage in the state of Massachusetts. If approved, it must be ratified by both houses in two successive sessions, and would face voters no earlier than 2006.

"The people of Massachusetts should not be excluded from a decision as fundamental to our society as the definition of marriage," said Gov. Mitt Romney. "This issue is too important to

leave to a one-vote majority of the [Supreme Judicial Court]."

Massachusetts, which has one of the highest homosexual populations in the United States according to the last census, was thrust to the front of the gay civil-rights movement in November when the marriage ban was ruled as "unconstitutional."

This is the biggest win for gay-rights activists since 1999, when Vermont instituted "civil unions," supported by then Gov. Howard Dean. Civil unions provide homosexual couples with most of the rights of state civil marriages, but none of the federal benefits, such as Social Security.

Opposition to the legalization offered a compromise of Vermont-style civil unions, but was rejected last week by the legislature because "the proposed law by its express terms forbids same-sex couples entry into civil marriage; it continues to relegate same-sex couples to a different status. ... The history of our nation has demonstrated that

separate is seldom, if ever, equal," according to a press release.

Supporters added that civil union is not enough, and only a full strike-down of the gay-marriage ban would work because the Massachusetts constitution forbids the creation of second-class citizens and nothing short of marriage truly treats the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community as equals.

"We declare that barring an individual from the protections, benefits and obligations of civil marriage solely because that person would marry a person of the same sex violates the Massachusetts constitution," wrote Chief Justice Margaret Marshall after the ruling. "[The opposition] failed to identify any constitutionally adequate reason for denying civil marriage to same-sex couples."

Others, however, such as Justice Robert Cordy, claim otherwise, saying that the marriage ban is not unconstitutional because the state historically defines marriage as a union

between one man and one woman, and the legislature could "rationally conclude that it furthers the legitimate state purpose of ensuring, promoting and supporting an optimal social structure for the bearing and raising of children."

The decision came only a day after Ohio Gov. Bob Taft enacted one of the most sweeping gay-marriage bans in the history of the United States, citing Massachusetts as the adopter of such a policy. President Bush also has said he would oppose this "deeply troubling" ruling at all costs.

In contrast, a California lawmaker plans to attempt to follow Massachusetts' lead and legalize gay marriage in the state. California is currently one of only two states (the second being Alaska, and although not a state, the District of Columbia) with official state/district registries for same-sex couples.

In fact, last week in San Francisco almost 2,500 gay couples have wed since Thursday.

Because San Francisco does not require a proof of residency to be married, gay couples from across the country flocked to the city to be unified as a couple for only an \$82 marriage application and a \$13 application fee, something which seemed like a small price to them, including the 825 couples who stood in the rain and cold on Thursday to be married.

San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom has said that the marriages will continue until a court stops them.

"The bottom line is I took an oath of office and read that constitution, and nowhere in there did it say that I should discriminate," Newsom said while on CNN's "American Morning."

Thirty-six states have laws to oppose gay marriage. Oregon is among the 10 (the other nine being Wyoming, New Mexico, Wisconsin, New York, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey and Maryland) that lack laws banning or permitting same-sex marriage.

# Drug companies conceal dangers in childrens' anti depressants

Shannon Armstead  
THE CLACKAMAS PRINT

The warning in December by British drug regulators against the use of antidepressant drugs for children under the age of 18 has heightened U.S. concerns about the relativity of their effectiveness, safety and fears of what pharmaceutical companies are hiding.

The proposition for a ban on drugs such as Zoloft, Celexa and Lexapro came about when parents and campaigners, who were upset with the increase in prescriptions by general practitioners, voiced their apprehension. Studies conducted by the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHPRA), also alerted concerned citizens to the potential dangers

of these drugs when administered to children.

The MHPRA studied clinical trials of depressed children held by



actual drug companies in the 1990s. They found details of clinical trials showing the dangers of antidepressants; the most serious, self-harm and

aggression towards others, had been concealed, leaving doctors and consumers in the dark as to the dangers.

The issue has come to the attention of the U.S. Federal Drug Association and several studies that find a link between children's use of antidepressants and suicidal thoughts are now being reviewed. In recent years, studies have been conducted on drugs such as Paxil, Zoloft, and Effexor.

"Across all these drugs, the rate of children who become suicidal is 2.5 times higher than on placebos," said Welsh psychiatrist David Healy.

Manufacturers of these and other drugs have refused to dis-

close the details of their own clinical trials because the companies say they are trade secrets.

According to the Washington Post, researchers familiar with the unpublished data said the majority of the secret trials show that children taking the medicines did not get any better than those taking placebos.

In the United States no antidepressants besides Prozac have been approved for treating childhood depression, thus doctors must rely on their own judgment when prescribing other less familiar drugs.

For example, Paxil conducted studies and found that the drug was ineffective and even caused hostility, agitation and suicidal thoughts and attempts. This product, sold as Seraxat in Europe, sent a warning that it should not be prescribed.

However, no warning was given in the United States on Paxil even though the products are identical.

Drug Industry executives complain that if they start publishing their negative data, it may be concluded that their drugs are ineffective.

Pharmaceutical companies and the psychiatrists associated with them argue that the abandoning of drugs for children was getting rid of a helpful medicine, but it is questionable whether or not drugs ever had a positive effect on children.

Some say that antidepressant drugs are not cures but are used to mask a deeper problem in an individual. Others try therapies such as counseling and natural medicines as alternatives to using antidepressants on children, which may essentially help treat depression rather than temporarily hide it.