

# STUDENT SPOTLIGHT

SURVEY OF STUDENTS ON CAMPUS

## Should civilian use of guns be outlawed? What restrictions should be placed on civilian gun purchase?



**Yvette Zmaila, graduate student in Marriage and Family Therapy**

"I think the answer to those questions have to rest with the individual. I don't think the government can outlaw personal use of weapons for hunting and protection. People should be able to censor themselves. Regarding purchase, restrictions on a person's prior gun ownership, criminal record, mental health and age should be considered."



**Richard Dacey, sophomore in Communications**

"To me, rifles and handguns are two different issues. Civilian use of handguns should be outlawed. Hunting rifles should be available to people who can furnish proof they've hunted via current or expired tags. First time buyers should have someone with them. Handguns should include a 30 day waiting period to give the gun ample time to consider the responsibility of owning a firearm."



**George Flanders, graduate student in Education**

"No. I think restrictions should include a 30 day waiting period. While applicant fingerprints are checked with the FBI to screen out people convicted of felons, gross misdemeanors, or outstanding warrants. If any of these are found, a permit should not be issued. I also believe civilian use of automatics and semi-automatics should be outlawed."



**Cherie Johnson, junior in Elementary Education**

"No because it's against our constitutional rights. If they go against that one, they'll go against other rights. There definitely should be a waiting period to check out a person's background."



**Richard Cobb, junior in Criminal Justice**

"No, they shouldn't be outlawed because then only outlaws would have guns as they say. The restrictions they have now should suffice. If I were a crook, I wouldn't go to a gun store to buy one anyway."

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor,

Why are we concerned that four Student Government members visited Florida, Disney World, and Georgia, apparently at CSUN expense? UNLV, as is the case with any good university, is a place to learn *how* to be a professional. These folks are learning how to be professional — politicians.

David L. Weide  
Department of  
Geoscience

Dear Editor,

In the Jan. 30, 1992 issue of *The Rebel Yell*, three articles were devoted to a witch-hunt intended to seek and destroy those sinister officials who chose to go to Disney World while attending a conference. To begin with, there is no conclusive evidence sug-

gesting that the monies received from the hotel room was intended for a trip to Disney World. The fact that the officials involved fully disclosed this information to the business manager proved that there was no intention to defraud Student Government out of these monies.

I feel that we, as a university, have better things to devote our time to. Take for instance, the fact that our Senate Rules and Ethics Chair Senator Scott Fisher (Business and Economics College), requested Senator Jami Nalder to tell a blatant lie to the senate, newspaper, and students regarding this matter. Clearly, Fisher felt threatened by the disclosure of this information. Jami Nalder, however, took a courageous stand against Fisher, and let the truth be known to all. I, as a member of the Business and Economics College, feel personally embarrassed that Scott Fisher has

been elected by my college as a representative. I would encourage all members of the Business and Economics College to investigate the poor ethics exemplified by our senator, Scott Fisher. I would further encourage a petition to remove this corrupt official from office.

Michael McConnell is  
Sophomore in Business and  
Economics

Dear Editor,

I read the editorial, "Abortion activists beg the question," by Dennis Monokroussos, with a certain sense of wonder. I still wonder that there are those people in the world who think themselves the only ones cognitive enough to discern the reality of this wild and mixed-up world. They seem to feel that they are duty bound to step

down and explain this reality to the rest of us. Mr. Monokroussos happily enlightens us to the fact that the only question of real import in the debate over abortion is whether the fetus is a living human being and that anything else is simply skirting the question of "humanness."

I would agree that the question which asks if a human fetus is a living human being is an important question in this debate. I would point out that there are several equally important, if not overriding questions to be considered as well. One of those is whether or not it is even possible for Mr. Monokroussos's question to be answered. There is no scientific test to determine "humanness," as the gentleman puts it. This is because there is no universal definition of what constitutes a human being. Another important question is, if "humanness" is a factor which is subjective, then just whose opinion

shall we use to judge that "humaneness?"

I note sadly that the debate over abortion seems often to be dominated by people who have themselves, no capacity to give birth—either women beyond the age of reproduction or men of a variety of ages. And while I must confess to falling into the latter category, I would qualify my own personal involvement by explaining that I am the father of one wonderful daughter, and am expecting to be a father once again this April. As a father, and as a man, there are few things that make me more angry than someone presuming to step down uninvited, from his self-appointed position as almighty, to explain to poor little ol' me, the true reality, which only he, in his superior wisdom, can discern.

Wesley M. Allison

## Boulder Dan & Dipstik Duck

By Ray Collins

### STATE OF THE ONION

EVERBODY BLAMES THE DARNED RECESSION ON ME... SURE, I MAKE MISTAKES. NAME ONE PRESIDENT WHO DIDN'T MAKE A MISTAKE...

MILLARD FILLMORE?

NANCY REAGAN.

