Mental health at law school

ROMA LOTAY and ALICIA JAIPERSAUD
Contributors

We need to talk about it. Why is mental health such a taboo topic, especially among law students? The fact is, many of us are going through the same thing, so we should talk about it.

So, let’s have the talk. What is it about law school that makes law students believe they do not belong? Why do so many of us feel that we got in by fluke? What are the pressures that law students are facing?

In our first year at law school, we are introduced to the curve. Many of us are used to getting As and, all of a sudden, we receive our first semester grades and begin classifying ourselves as B students. We are told by upper year students that most people get Bs and it is not a big deal, but for some reason, that doesn’t help. We think by not getting any As, there are no job opportunities for us. This is simply not true.

In our second year at law school, we somewhat learn how to accept the curve and are a bit more confident with our study habits, but become obsessed with something else – OCIs. The atmosphere in class suddenly changes. We think if we don’t get a summer position, our careers are over. Once again, this is simply not true. It is not the end of the world if you don’t secure a summer position. Life really does go on.

In our third year at law school, we are supposed to finally see the light, but do we really? Many students are still worried about securing an articling position.

All these problems are common to most, if not all, law students. Yet we are still quite reluctant to have an open and frank discussion about these issues. Why is that? One possible reason is our fear of judgment. As students, we are told about the importance of professionalism and constantly engage in managing our image to ensure we are always presented in the best possible light. In this competitive atmosphere at law school, we often worry that talking about our own mental health issues are a display of weakness that could harm our future career prospects. The unfortunate stigma surrounding mental health issues still exists in society and, in some ways, law school may increase the fear of being susceptible to this stigma.

Along with this image-managing, we are often afraid about fitting in. We become preoccupied with the whispers around us that we begin to amend our behaviour to try to convince others – and ourselves – that we belong. We begin to compare ourselves to our conceptions of the ideal law student: the straight-A individual who secures a rare first-year summer position, participates in OCIs and acquires a prestigious second-year summer position, articles at that
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Senators behaving badly

Sam Michaels gets right down to work this week on the page opposite, taking three Senators to task for their well-publicized abuse of reimbursement privileges, and Senator Wallin in particular for her lawyer’s subsequent lack of tact in comments he made about a Senate motion that would suspend Wallin’s privileges of office. Michaels, in the best sort of Obiter Dicta way, exemplifies the public outrage that has inhabited the pages of Canada’s other upstanding newspapers since the tip of the Senate malfeasance iceberg (which may or may not be an appropriate metaphor, depending on your subjective evaluation of Senator Duffy’s exact size) came crashing into Canada’s ship of state last year. As Michaels puts it: “the public is largely in agreement that the suspensions are justified.” Quite right.

Nonetheless, populism alone is rarely a good reason to do anything, which is why we have a constitution and courts to interpret it. They prevent what the Greeks called ochlocracy, which John Adams and later Tocqueville idiomatically translated to “tyranny of the majority.” Thus, the faithful Obiter would be remiss if it did not fully explore the legal nature of the proposed suspensions and find out who is really behaving badly: is it the three sinful Senators, or the angry mob of the majority? In fact, we may be able to resolve the court challenge Michaels predicts right here, right now. If we’re right, you heard it here first.

The Rules of the Senate dictate when a Senator may be suspended. Subrule 15-2(1) provides that: “The Senate may order a leave of absence for or the suspension of a Senator where, in its judgment, there is sufficient cause.” The breadth of this power may be restricted by subrule 15-2(2) which, in turn, provides: “When a leave of absence is granted, it is solely to protect the dignity and reputation of the Senate and public trust and confidence in Parliament.” The trouble with this is that the difference (if any) between leaves of absence and suspensions is unclear. This means that subrule (2) may only apply to leaves of absence, leaving the Senate’s power to suspend one of its members unencumbered by anything but a subjective determination of “sufficient cause.”

We combed the archives of Speaker’s Rulings from 1894 to the present, and the rule has never been interpreted. There is no equivalent rule in the House of Commons, though sitting MPs can be expelled from their seats. This has only happened four times. Louis Riel was expelled from his seat on motion in 1874 following a murder conviction. The writ dropped on a by-election to fill the seat, and the good people of Provvencher re-elected the embattled Mr. Riel. Being on the lam, Mr. Riel did not attend in his place in Parliament, and the House expelled him a second time in 1875 for “outrawl.” Ha.

The House expelled Thomas McGreevy in 1891 following allegations of corruption from another member, but they were never proven. Quebec West re-elected McGreevy in a by-election as well, and he assumed his seat without incident.

The final incident was in 1947, when Fred Rose, the member for Cartier, was convicted of spying for the Soviet Union and imprisoned. The House expelled him.

However, interesting though these stories are, the point is moot. Senators cannot expel each other, since the Constitution provides that they are appointed for life up to age 75 (though the Sovereign may be able to remove them). Furthermore, the debate about what grounds are necessary for a suspension is also moot. The text of the pro forma motions to suspend Senators Brazeau, Duffy, and Wallin begins with the words “notwithstanding any usual practice or provision of the Rules.” This is a significant detail.

Senator Carignan, the Leader of the Government in the Senate, and the Senator who drafted the suspension motions, wanted to make sure that no existing rule stood in their way. Simply put, the suspension of the three offending Senators, in the eyes of Senator Carignan and the Government, is more important than the rules.

Perhaps this is appropriate. After all, the harm to the dignity of the Upper Chamber resulting from the “expenses scandal” isn’t about rules at all. Senators Brazeau, Duffy, and Wallin, along with Senator Harb, who retired in August after repaying a large sum of ill-gotten expense claims, didn’t really break any rules; they abused them. The expense claim rules simply did not contemplate the possibility of an Honourable Senator claiming a seldom-used cottage as an appropriate metaphor, depending on your subjective evaluation of Senator Duffy’s exact size.)
2013: a Senate odyssey

SAM MICHAELS
Staff Writer

This week, the Harper government announced a proposal to suspend Senators Mike Duffy, Pamela Wallin, and Patrick Brazeau. The collective cream of Canada's political crop of incompetence, ignorance and greed, the move was largely supported by politicians and the public, and even spurred other Senators to begin filing more complete tax returns (yes, this is already part of their job anyway, but let's still try to appreciate the small victories).

In what can only be seen as the inevitable next step, Pamela Wallin has already announced she will be pursuing a legal challenge to the suspension; actual quotes from her lawyer including: "they don't care about the Charter of Rights" and "what we have here is the equivalent of a third-world dictatorship."

I could write a whole article just about how disgusting and insulting it is to refer to Canada as a third-world dictatorship. Populations around the world are fighting real struggles for their rights, jobs, and sometimes lives. It is despicable that Wallin's lawyer, Terrence O'Sullivan, would belittle the socioeconomic and political situations of actual dictatorship countries by comparing the way those governments treat member politicians to how she has been treated. Wallin has been found out as a liar and tax cheat, someone with little regard for the rules. Her lawyer may have a viable challenge based on the conventional process rules for the suspension of Senators, but his comments are totally unacceptable.

At time of writing, it is unknown how Brazeau and Duffy will respond, but there likely will be some challenge to the suspension from all three senators. The bill to suspend them still has to pass the Senate, and when it does, Brazeau, Duffy, and Wallin will have the opportunity to intervene. This is on top of the legal challenge they could bring, one based on the lack of precedent for this type of punitive action. It is, I suppose, a fair challenge given the lack of history for this type of action, and our conventional procedures regarding Senator appointment and dismissal. There is a real potential for this type of action to put too much power in the hands of the legislature, giving the ruling party the power to switch Senators in and out on trivial or trumped up charges.

However, the potential for that type of abuse, especially given our political conventions regarding Senator dismissal, is small. The cases better to establish a system of enforcement based on clear rules and procedures, than to allow this situation to become an isolated event. In fact, if the court comes down on Wallin as sternly as I believe they should, it could create an important standard for the acceptable conduct of Senators. If the court says that the government does have the power to enact these suspensions, a new reality will dawn for all Senators, where their actions, whether criminal or not, can be held accountable through punishment. Our politicians have a long, sad history of being exposed for corruption, and then continuing on with work as usual. Even when they are removed, as happens on the rare occasion, it is often with a pension package, a severance payment, and a new board position waiting for them back at home. Imagine how the conduct of our Senators may change if they thought these luxuries were not guaranteed upon dismissal. We have already seen some impact from the Duffy, Brazeau, and Wallin scandal in the improvement of Senators' bookkeeping. If Wallin's challenge fails, and a new precedent is set that Senators who breach their job's requirements will be suspended without pay, the potential for tangible improvements is truly exciting.

The Senate, limited as it is in its law-making powers, can still serve a valuable role as the gold standard for the principles and ideologies we wish to convey as Canadian. As such, it needs to be filled with citizens of the highest moral caliber; individuals with a passion and love of our country, who respect and adhere to the enormous responsibility of their position every day on the job. So far, Duffy, Brazeau, and Wallin have given us ample evidence that they fall well below any of these standards. How such people can believe that their place in our government is deserved is beyond me; however, it is the reality of the situation. Hopefully the courts will take this occasion to show them, and all Senators, that they are wrong. The appointment of a Senator comes with duties and responsibilities, and if they are not met, or if the position is disrespected, the offender should be removed.
Creators of Wikipedia invent new, immersive form of Wikipedia called the library

Evan Ivrovic
Staff Writer

The future is finally here. The creators of Wikipedia have done it again, inventing a new, immersive form of Wikipedia called the library. “It used to be that you were at a distance from Wikipedia, staring at it from your screen monitor. With the invention of the library, we have revolutionized how you can use Wikipedia so that it is a much more integrative experience. You can grab and touch Wikipedia now, you can smell Wikipedia, and you can even live in Wikipedia. The library is a truly transcendent thing”, said Jimmy Wales, one of the two co-founders of Wikipedia.

Just how does the library work, though? Larry Sanger, the other co-founder of Wikipedia, explains: “The library is largely composed of another invention of ours, called the book. As to what books are, it’s best to think of them as physical manifestations of Wikipedia pages, with the pages all relating to some broader subject matter. Further think of these physical Wikipedia pages as being separated from one another by something called chapters, with the chapters varying in length depending on how much exposition the author wishes to do. This is an imperfect analogy, but it’s nevertheless a useful one. Ultimately, you have to see and use books to appreciate their distinctive qualities.” Sanger continued: “These books then are placed on shelves, with the library essentially being a building with shelves containing books, including other objects and people that are peripherally important. In effect, what we have created here is a Wikipedia you can integrate yourself with, that is sure to shape how we learn and educate others for a long time.”

Some educators, however, are skeptical about the educational value of the library, and discourage use of library sources in class work. High school Anthropology teacher Marissa Ronald said, “More and more students are using library sources as research, but I try to discourage overuse and overdependence on library sources, for obvious reasons. For one, library sources are typically the product of a single author, or at the most two to three, but it’s not unusual for Wikipedia sources to be edited by hundreds of people, and clearly more authors is better than less. Also, library sources lack hyperlinks.”

High school history teacher Sam Michaels, in an impassioned speech, shared his opinion with the Obiter, noting that “listen, at the end of the day, it’s all about the hyperlinks, and library sources just don’t have it. You can’t teach kids without hyperlinks, period. That’s why I think the library is at best a novelty, as in maybe something to do with the family on the weekend. But for proper school work? Wikipedia all the way.”

Of particular worry to educators is the emerging problem of library-based plagiarism. Mark Gonzales told us, “It used to be that you could just copy and paste parts of an essay into Google and then you would clearly know if a student plagiarized from Wikipedia, or if you wanted a more sophisticated tool, you could use Turnitin.com or something like that. Now you have to keep an eye out for students who copy text from books, with some even just blatantly handing in books for their assignments. Even worse, the crafty ones will take ideas and arguments from books, and rephrase them just enough that you can’t tell if they are plagiarized or not. It definitely makes my job as a teacher tougher. What am I supposed to do? Read books? Who has the time for that? And where are the hyperlinks?”

What do high level academics think about the library? We spoke to a famous and renowned professor of philosophy, who chose to remain anonymous, about his opinion on the library. He said, whilst wearing monocle and top hat, “I find it highly unlikely that a paper with even
A bittersweet goodbye

CITLALLY MACIEL
News Editor

I saw this Disney documentary once titled *Earth* (don’t judge me). It showed the long journeys elephants have to travel during the migration period some of them undertake. The particular herd being filmed went through hostile sand storms, days without water, internal heat, and attacks from other animals. At one point one of the baby elephants is about to collapse. You see the mom trying desperately to revive her offspring. It is too late. The heat and lack of water have become too much for the baby elephant to bear. You can tell that the mom is in pain. She looks, in fact, devastated. It is just a truly heart-wrenching scene. I have always found elephants incredibly beautiful and smart. After seeing that scene, I had a new and more solemn regard for them.

Thus, I was selfishly sad when I heard about the plans to take Toka, Thika and Iringa, the three elephants kept in the Toronto Zoo, to a sanctuary in California. True, I have only been to the Toronto Zoo once in my life, so it is not like I have a personal, friendship with these animals. I do not even remember whether I saw them or not. However, these three creatures are a part of Toronto, they have been in the city for about three decades now. One of them, Thika, was even born here. But then, I realized that visiting the zoo has always been sort of a sorrowful experience for me. I have always left feeling sad for the animals. Always wondering if they were suffering, or in pain, or sad.

At the same time, I think of the cruel life they live in the wild: poachers, inclement weather, predators, and the effects of human activity on their environment. I can’t help but wonder whether they are better off in a zoo or in their natural habitats. The documentary Zoo Revolution (written and directed by Gemini Award winner Geoff D’Eon) poses a similar question: Are zoos part of the solution, or are they the problem? In trying to answer this question, the opinions of both supporters and critics of zoos are presented.

On the one hand, some critics maintain that the only goal of many zoos is to make money without regard for the wellbeing of their animals. Other critics maintain that the resources being used to run zoos should instead be used to preserve animals in the wild. On the other hand, supporters maintain that zoos play a critical role in the preservation of endangered species. First, it is through zoos that people connect with nature. This connection creates awareness, thus mobilizing people to be conscious about the environment. Second, some of these zoos go beyond the simple display of animals. They also implement programs geared specifically towards keeping endangered species safe and helping them breed. Indeed, some of these programs are critical given the scarcity of species to keep a minimum of three elephants in its exhibit. This requirement rests on the fact that elephants, because of their social nature, need to be part of a herd. Toka and Iringa are older elephants who may be approaching the end of their lives. Thus, acquiring substitutes would have been an inevitable undertaking for the Toronto Zoo in order to comply with the requirements of the Association. In addition, it had become clear that the current facilities were inappropriate for optimal care of the elephants.

The idea of losing the elephants prompted outrage among some Torontonians. Plans to expand and repair the exhibit surfaced. However, the bottom line was that the zoo could not even afford to pay the regular costs of maintaining the three animals, let alone engaging in expansion and renovation projects. A motion was then put before the Toronto City Council back in 2011. It received overwhelming support for the relocation, with 32 out of 40 City councilors voting in favor.

On October 17, 2013, Toka, Thika and Iringa commenced their journey to what, some say, will be a better place for them to call home. There was some commotion at the commencement of the trip. The Toronto Star reported that the People’s Animal Welfare Society (PAWS) had agreed to let Toronto Zoo staff accompany the elephants in their journey. However, the plans were withdrawn after PAWS restricted staff from documenting the trip using pictures or video. According to the Toronto Star, Zoocheck Canada blamed zoo officials for the last-minute delay, accusing them of using the restriction as an excuse to attempt bringing the trip to an end.

This alleged secrecy around the transportation of the animals now adds to the existing concerns regarding potential risks to the wellbeing of the elephants while en route to the sanctuary. However, there is no turning back now. The only consolation is that the Toronto Zoo will supposedly remain involved in the elephants’ lives and will continue to receive reports on their acclimatization progress. For now, let’s hope that Toka, Thika and Iringa have a safe trip and that, once in California, they adapt quickly to their new habitat and make new friends. Toronto will definitely miss them but there is comfort to think that they will be in a better place.
Opinions

Achieving flow: optimizing learning in law school

MICHAEL CAPITANO
Staff Writer

As we enter into Mental Health Awareness Week, I can’t help but observe that, while well-intentioned, it does nothing to solve the underlying problems law students face when it comes to combatting stress and anxiety, and optimizing their learning. How could it? But if this is all the institution we pay tens of thousands of dollars to each year can muster up, it leaves me feeling uneasy that our solid legal education isn’t as solid as we think.

Of the several articling students and lawyers I’ve spoken with, the first thing that they will tell you, emphatically, is that law school doesn’t prepare you for legal practice. Then what does law school prepare us for? The Bar? Well, no: the topics covered on the exam are not mandatory courses; as a standardized test, it has its own study system. If the answer is to learn about the law and hone our critical thinking skills towards legal issues (and why not, it is a school, after all), is it really meeting our expectations? I don’t think so. And it has nothing to do with the quality of our professors, the boundless opportunities the administration provides us with or the community the students strive to make as wonderful as it is.

The problem is one of misplaced goals. It is the same problem that plagues most levels of education. The focus is on generating candidates for the next steps of the greater process; not on ensuring that learning students take part in preparing themselves for it. For example, in the United States, the No Child Left Behind Act is premised on setting higher standards and establishing measurable goals: to improve outcomes, not learning, and incentives are designed around meeting those standards. This doesn’t seem to make sense, especially when considering that positive outcomes flow naturally from improving learning. Transposing this idea onto law school, it is not different. Implementing positive and educational psychology (both growing fields producing a lot of interesting research) into the law school curriculum can go a long way into making the experience far better.

Let’s start with mental health. Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) programs have been around for over thirty years and the science behind mindfulness training has received significant support for fostering self-care, reducing stress and serving as a catalyst for positive growth and development. For an experience as stressful as law school, why isn’t the approximately eight week, $300/per person program (not too steep a price considering tuition was over $20 000 this year) something the administration makes available and mandatory for its students to complete? It will make us better professionals and allow us to productively manage the educational challenges we face.

Now that students are better equipped to handle the overwhelming nature of law school, the next step would be figuring out how to immerse students in their work. In that regard, there is a helpful concept in positive psychology called “flow”. Colloquially, it is known as: being in the moment; in the zone; on fire; etc. Flow is a mental state of complete absorption in an activity and motivation is directed, in totality, to it.

What bars this positive experience and perfect alignment of pleasure in work? Boredom and anxiety—feelings that too often overtake us. How do we enter into flow? When we are challenged to actively apply our knowledge and skills.

**According to the flow model, mental state corresponds to challenge level and skill level.**

Flow theory postulates three conditions for achieving this state:

1. Involvement in an activity with clear set goals and progress (provides direction and structure)
2. The activity gives clear and immediate feedback (helps people negotiate changing demands and adjust performance)
3. Good balance between perceived challenges and perceived skills (instilling confidence is crucial)

It would be wonderful if the curriculum was designed in such a way that could trigger flow more often. But with the majority of courses lecture-based and with 100% exams, students are forced to be passive consumers of knowledge and expected to apply it in a highly stressful setting with very little experience doing so. That’s not to say flow doesn’t happen in these circumstances. It is a great feeling when writing an exam for flow to overtake us, it means we prepared and studied well.

Wouldn’t it be nice if courses built up to achieving maximal flow, to make it a goal that students learned so well that flow was easily achievable by all? Well, that depends on the benefits flow has. Evidence suggests that those with increased flow experiences are pushed to grow towards complexity, that is, to flourish; creating an atmosphere that allows for flow can increase happiness, achievement, better performance and competence. Perhaps “Dear Me, Don’t Go To Law School”-type videos would be

» continued on next page
International news: how are you going to manipulate me today?

ALEXANDRA ILIC
Contributor

How do you interpret international news that you watch on TV or read in the newspaper?

Yes, of course, you do interpret them, even though it may be unconscious. Even journalists interpret the facts before informing the world about them. Thinking about journalists as independent may be utopic, even though I like to believe that some actually are. One needs to remember most if not all journalists have a boss that gives directives on what to publish or not, what to show or not. Therefore, what you see in the media is suggestive information; it’s only what X or Y wants you to see and they present it as the truth. Is there a truth? If yes, is there only one? It is the job of politicians to make you think that there is only one truth: theirs. When I refer to “politicians”, I mean every person that is related, in some way, to politics. That’s what journalists are as well.

I may blame them now, because it’s easy for me: I’m a law student full of very good intentions and fighting for freedom of thought and expression. However, I understand them as well and will likely understand them even better when I am in the work market. At some point, I guess, unfortunately, you need to balance the importance of your beliefs with earning a living. The choice may be easy when you have a family waiting for you at home.

Nevertheless, we must be careful about how we deal with information. Everyone is biased in some way. But you can choose to open your mind to different versions of the same story. We hear everyday in the news about conflicts and wars and how each party is dealing with them. But who is behind this specific news channel? Who collected the information and who then decided to show those particular facts and not others?

I may sound a bit irritated, and I have my reasons. I am originally from Serbia. However, I was born in Switzerland. Therefore, I may be biased about the Balkan wars, but at the same time I’ve gained some neutrality from my native country as well. Moreover, I studied public international law, which gave me a third version of the whole story. If I tend to defend Serbs, that would be because I’ve heard much more from them than from other sides (Bosnians, Croats, United States). At the same time, I heard, and am still hearing, that we are the “bad” ones. We did everything wrong and we deserve all that happened to us. Where’s the truth? I believe it’s in between, if we can even pretend to reach it. No conflict is as simple as being black or white. We need to think further and deeper than what the media wants us to see. Depending from which point of view you look at a situation, your conclusions may be totally different.

The Syrian conflict reflects this reality as well. You see one version in the media, but if you investigate a bit more, there are tons of controversies about which country is supporting the rebels and which ones are with the government. And yet, the media and the UN say that the international community should intervene in Syria. But we’re already there! We’re just pretending not to be, while actually being behind the scenes. By the way, who’s the international community and who defines it? The UN, with its five Security Council members?

I’m obviously confused and I’m asking myself all the aforementioned questions. I just truly believe that everyone should make their own opinion about what’s happening in our world. Some people don’t care and that’s fine. But even if you don’t, do not make conclusions only from what you’ve seen once on TV about this country bombarding another one and how it must be horrible for the latter.
vibe: dialed-back hippie decor (loved the giant driftwood table) meets energetic CBD lunch spot. On that note – and since it is OCI season – Ravi’s is a short walk from the Bay Street towers where many of our readers will be locked down next summer.

To the whole office. After arriving, I noticed that service didn’t seem high on the priority list here.

The counter-order lady was barking at us the second we walked in. To be fair though, the lunch rush began pretty much right after we arrived.

Luke: In making my order, I did feel somewhat hurried. And they definitely could make better use of the space.

The counter, tables and drink fridge were too cluttered. I was really pleased, though, to discover the patio in back. Alfresco dining is tough to find in these parts and this little (slightly run-down) patio was a fun place to eat. Barely did I have a chance to take in my surroundings when the food arrived. Honestly, Dan, it took them 3 minutes too make our food.

Dan: So what? The food was quick, who cares? I think the people running the show at Ravi focus on letting the food do the talking, leaving atmosphere and service off the priority list.

Luke: I’m definitely not complaining. The efficiency made the quality even more impressive!

The Food

Dan: Mother of god. My soup was righteous. It was rich with lentil-ey goodness, but somehow still light. The sweetness of the apricots was mellowed out by the drizzled lime crème fraiche, and there was an underlying spiciness from the curry that fit perfectly with the rest of the dish. Topped with some pieces of fried onion, there was a bit of crunch to some bites, which I found to be an interesting addition.

Luke: I’m not surprised that you addressed the soup up front. I thought we were coming here for soup, but it was the wraps that really blew my mind! Both the lamb...
A soulful sunday with Miray

MARIE PARK
Layout Editor

Last Sunday was more than a high-school reunion. In retrospect I took away more appreciation for artists, especially those dedicated to their craft despite the difficult reality of an artist’s lifestyle. I learned too that law students need to look at their lives in perspective, and understand that every profession has seemingly insurmountable challenges: to each their own.

I am interviewing Olivia “Miray” Klugh, an old friend from high school I had not seen since we both graduated. “You need to be young to do this,” says Miray, as she takes a short break from getting the stage and floor set up for the performance. She tells me this is the advice she heard, back as she was an intern in New York, beginning work in her chosen field of computer art and graphic design. She was already beginning her career in graphic design, but turned her attention to music – people who heard samples of her songwriting urged her to take on that arduous challenge that is the music industry.

Growing up in a musical family, Olivia was always interested in the art of making music. In high school, she was part of the orchestra, but also took up the drum kit. Through her undergraduate years at Sheridan College and York University, she also sang for the Gospel choir and was part of a band called Soul Collective. As a performer, though, she did not feel that same satisfaction as she did in the creation of music – and in 2011, she styled herself as Miray, singer and songwriter from my hometown of Oakville, Ontario.

To create – to merge new vibes with the old school, along with Japanese pop – became her passion. She describes her music as “Mopop” or “Synthpop,” and since 2011 has been performing her own songs in preference over covers. Her stage name, Miray, speaks of her Japanese heritage and an “evolution from Olivia - the casual, the past – to the present.”

And last Sunday was one more night for Miray to take another step in achieving her goals. This time, she was on the stage with three other very talented and aspiring women – Sarah Jordan, Oyane, Miray, and Lilly Mason. Each came with a different life story, but a common philosophy brought them together: to work hard for your goals, as no one else will put in the effort for you to succeed in your stead, and that it is up to you to be persistent in the faith in yourself. That with this in mind, you will be satisfied that you had given your all, wherever you end up.

I think it’s important for us, law students, to consider that philosophy. In many ways in our future profession, we are expected to fit a typical mould. Deviations in character are scrutinized, and many feel penalized to openly opine in a non-conventional way. We as a student body create ideal goals and markers of success that are highly artificial (how many OCI’s did you get?).

We need to think critically about the purpose of our time at law school – the beauty is in the process of learning and the dreams that we develop under the tutelage of experienced mentors. We need to understand that achievement is done internally, through our well being and self-development, and not simply through the tangibles we achieve in the physical world.
A Little Sheep Told Me: Having a less complicated life

ANGIE SHEEP
Arts & Culture Editor

My night class, which should have ended at 10pm, ended nearly half an hour late. As people quickly filtered out of the room, eager to get home, I stood up and marched out slowly; my bus had already departed and it was uncertain when the next one would be. This meant that I wouldn’t arrive home until 11:30pm since I live downtown. On the entire way home, my annoyance level kept increasing, but this frustration eventually gave me my “eureka!” moment. I realized that this was only the beginning – a late night finish is quite common in the legal profession. At the same time, I realized that this is not what I want for the rest my life. I realized life doesn’t have to be so exhausting, demanding or complicated if I decide it so. I, therefore, am currently on the mission to simplify my life and have been putting into practice advice from all kinds of sources – family, friends, strangers, the Internet. And it’s actually given me so much relief and joy as a result. So in this issue, my challenge to you is to take steps to have a less complicated life; it’s definitely doable and luckily, it’s all within your control.

Figure out exactly what you want

What exactly do you want? Are you doing the things that will take you there? The answers to these questions are extremely difficult as life is full of distractions. In a world where there's constant stimulation, noise, and advertising to dictate what you should want, it’s hard to self-reflect on this matter. But you must. In order to figure out how to simplify your life you must decide what is most important to you – family? Money? Prestige? Love? A great friend in psychology and education asked me this question a few weeks ago and at the time, I was at a complete loss. I eventually answered that I would really like a job because I need the income; but the way I am headed, there will never be enough money for the sake of having money; it’s a means to an end. That’s what really got me thinking and on my way home from my prolonged lecture, I finally figured something out. I knew that I love traveling and most of my income will certainly go towards funding that, but the way I am headed, there will be no time left for it. Two weeks vacation will never be enough; it’s time to make a change, go on a different path. What do you love?

Give your most “importants” your best

In figuring out what you want, you are likely to also discover what’s most important to you. For many, it’s family, significant others and/or friends. But if they are absolutely the most important “things” we have in our lives, then why are we always giving them our second best? Third best? Or worse? I find it ironic that we don’t give our best to the people we value the most. Instead we choose to stay at school or at the office longer and go home and face them after we’re completely spent. Although they may be very supportive and understanding, even those who care for you most will be fed up if their love goes unreciprocated. I know that I want to travel endlessly (thus I need to get a job), but when I envision myself gallivanting around the world, I see somebody else beside me; I am not alone nor do I want to enjoy all the great things in life alone. Therefore, I should make the most effort in retaining the “things” that are most important to me, and give them my best; because they are simply that – the most important.

Believe that everything usually turns out just fine

Life becomes unnecessarily complicated when we choose to hold on to the little annoyances or grudges that bring us down. So just let go, especially of the things that you have little or no control over. Focus on what you can change or do. The other stuff will seem trivial in a matter of days or weeks. It’s important to reflect on what you can do better or differently, but to obsess over and tirelessly replay what you should or could have done will only bring more stress. Don’t put so much pressure on yourself.

Be a peacemaker, not a troublemaker

We are presented with so many situations where we can choose to be helpful and kind or just a pain in the butt. When you opt to create trouble or drama, it simply lowers your own quality of life because the consequences of that are likely to harass you in the future. It may also demean your reputation and lead to further misunderstandings. So it’s more beneficial for you to be the bigger person, and this will often be followed by appreciation and admiration. If you don’t have anything nice to say, revert to peaceful silence.

There can never be too much laughter in life. It has been shown to effectively reduce stress levels and elevate mood and life outlook. If you suddenly realize that you don’t laugh as much or as wholeheartedly as before, something is wrong. We all go through stressful stages in life (100% exams anyone?) but laughter becomes an even more important component in these times. So find something that brings you joy and never let it up. It’s much easier when you can laugh through these times.

No one else was put on this planet to make you happy

It is so easy to place responsibility on others to bring you happiness by doing or saying certain things, but this often leads to blame and resentment when they fail to do so. I’m not sure what gives way to this sense of entitlement but it’s time for an attitude change. I am also guilty of this and have been trying to replace expectation with appreciation. Whatever someone else does that results in your increased joy should not be mindlessly overlooked. And if there is a person who brings you abundant joy (lucky you!), try to avoid getting into a habit of then expecting it. For example, I love having the bed made. For some reason, it gives me a sense of serenity and order in my life. My boyfriend, on the other hand, cannot seem to grasp this concept; his excuse is that we’re going to be sleeping in it again (whatever). However, he’s been making the bed for my sake though there are still odd days where he is too lazy to do it and it takes every ounce of me to not get angry. However (after counting to a hundred), I then recognize that he does this only for me, so I should attend to and appreciate the effort he makes rather than when he fails to do so. This concept seems so simple yet it’s always neglected, especially in times of annoyance. But remember, a positive reward tends to lead to repetition of the act (Pavlov’s dog, right?).

It’s hard to have a simple and uncomplicated life, but it’s not impossible. I hope these tips will help you in meeting that mission. And once you start that effort, the rest seems to fall into place just fine.

Give your most “importants” your best

Laugh, that is all
Editorial: Senate misbehaviour

The law is no stranger to unwritten rules. After all, the entire basis of a common law system is that gaps in statute are not gaps in law. Unspoken rules for civilization are embedded in civilization itself, and it is up to judges to tease out the law. In some areas of law, these rules are made codified. The Income Tax Act contains a “General Anti-avoidance Rule”. It empowers the court to admonish a taxpayer thus: “strictly speaking, you didn’t break any rules, but you’re a weasel and what you did isn’t fair.” The Senate is about to do the same thing to three of its members.

If the Senate’s own rules don’t prevent the suspensions, what else could? There is no statute, constitutional or otherwise, governing the Senate’s ability to suspend its members. One of the founding principles of a bicameral Parliament is that each House is master of its own affairs. Any statute law must pass both houses of Parliament, and it for the Commons to vote on a bill regarding Senate rules would be abhorrent to that principle of mastery. The Rules of the Senate have the force of statute there. The document that creates the Senate, the Constitution Act, 1867, speaks only to eligibility for Senate appointment, and is silent on what happens once a Senator assumes their post.

Indeed, it appears that, on the matter of suspensions, the Senate of Canada truly is master of its domain. It has unlimited power to discipline its members, short of expelling them. In other words, by overriding its Rules, the Upper House is operating within the bounds of the law, but without regulation.

The irony is snicker-worthy. Like its very own Senators Brazeau, Duffy, Harb, Wallin, and the remaining undiscovered multitudes of housing allowance abusers, the Red Chamber now has only its judgment and ethics for guidance. The three Senators who faced suspension last week once ventured into that territory, and each made a bad decision. Now, the Chamber has made its own decision. We don’t know if it was right or wrong. That’s not our job; that’s the Honourable Senators’ job. Here’s hoping they were right.

Mental health

Dealing with mental health issues at law school does not make you weak. It does not mean you cannot handle the stress and pressure that law school brings. It does not mean that law school is not for you. By talking about it, we are recognizing there is a problem. The problem is not with us, but perhaps with law school as an institution.

We do not have the solutions to all these problems. Our point, however, is that we need to talk about all of these issues. We need to have an open and frank discussion in order to determine how law schools, and specifically Osgoode, can relieve some of the stress and pressure that law students are facing. We will be having this open and frank discussion to start off Mental Health Awareness Week on Monday, October 28, 2013. We hope to see a good turn out. After all, it is absolutely necessary to have the talk.
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I thought I was becoming an elitist when I booked the tickets. How does this read: third-year law student takes a trip on Thanksgiving weekend to a world-class Shakespeare festival, sees two productions, enjoys a dinner at a restaurant that requires reservations weeks in advance, and spends an afternoon perusing boutique chocolate and book shops. "Shit," I thought, "this is going to make me look really bad with all those social justice types." I took stock of my assets and liabilities to reassure myself that I was still poor. I ate some ramen to atone for my financial sins. But the truth is that my weekend in Stratford was anything but elitist, and wasn’t even that expensive.

Let’s start with transportation. The Stratford Festival operates a daily bus service between the Intercontinental Hotel and Front and Simcoe Streets in Toronto and the Festival’s three theatres. It departs at 10AM on performance days, and returns at 5PM, after the matinée show. A round trip ticket costs $20. The fare is so low (less than a third of VIA Rail’s lowest economy class fare to Stratford) that the denizens of Stratford have joined festival-goers as a secondary market for the Festival’s three theatres. We attended the matinée performance of Alexandre Dumas’ The Three Musketeers before dinner. The humour-laden tale of 17th century French political intrigue is simultaneously fluffy – full of skilfully staged combat, bumbling, drunkenness, and dick jokes – and cerebral. After all, until the last few scenes, it isn’t clear which of the dastardly, scheming villains is truly behind the misfortune of the eponymous musketeers. It was 150 minutes of fun. Unfortunately, it was also billed as the “family performance,” which placed two young children behind us, one of whom had a recurring (and audible) flatulence problem, and the other of whom engaged in spirited discussion with his mother throughout the entire performance about the subtleties of who was “good” and who was merely “pretending to be good.” I congratulate the child on succinctly establishing a theme of the play. His mother should have known better.

After dinner, we returned to the Festival Theatre to find the stage entirely redressed for the evening performance of Fiddler on the Roof. Several members of my family had already seen the performance, to their great pleasure. I was completely unfamiliar with the story, having never seen the film. I had moderate expectations. After all, at its core, the Stratford Festival’s company is not a musical theatre company; it is a Shakespeare company. Or so I thought.

Fiddler takes place in the village of Anatevka, located in present-day Ukraine, around the turn of the 20th century in Tsarist Russia. The plot is inspired by a series of stories by Jewish folklorist Sholem Aleichem. In more ways than this, however, Fiddler is a quintessentially Jewish story. In the beginning, the Jewish community in Anatevka is insular, living in a courtose but uneasy peace with their Russian neighbours.

Tevye, the main character, devout father of five daughters, and a good-natured but perpetually downtrodden schlemiel, holds fast to the traditions of his faith to make his difficult existence bearable. One by one, three of his five daughters leave the family home. The first, against the recommendation of the village matchmaker, marries for love. The second marries a revolutionary socialist. The camel’s back breaks when Tevye’s third daughter marries a Russian Gentile. At the same time, by order of the Tsar, Jewish communities all over the Empire, including the one in Anatevka, are progressively intimidated and eventually deported. Despondent over his daughters and his deportation, Tevye and what is left of his family drag their belongings from their home and set off to join a cousin in the United States.

It’s not a very happy ending, yet the audience cannot help feeling hopeful. The reasons are twofold. First because, after three hours spent getting to know the characters, the audience is convinced of Tevye and his community’s resiliency in the face of discrimination. The script is chock full of typically Jewish humour, includ-
It was a remarkable performance. Scott Wentworth was stellar as the archetypal Jewish hero Tevye, a performance perhaps informed by his simultaneous portrayal of Jewish anti-hero Shylock in The Merchant of Venice. I certainly felt sheepish about my earlier assumptions about the Festival. The production was world-class, certainly on par with, if not surpassing, the Festival’s Shakespearean efforts. I later discovered that Wentworth has previously been nominated for a Tony Award and this production, had it taken place in New York, may have earned him a second.

The best part: through a program that allows people under age 29 to purchase affordable tickets for certain performances, we were able to obtain our tickets for Musketeers and Fiddler for $25 each.

The one sticking point about visiting Stratford is accommodation. The municipality has written its zoning bylaw to deliberately exclude tall buildings, including hotel chains. This leaves few options: expensive B&Bs, awkward morning meals included; overpriced (but clean) small hotels, or run-down motels. Even the motels were relatively expensive, so we splurged, stayed in a hotel, and chalked it up as a necessary evil.

We also spent the day in Stratford on Sunday, which gave us a chance to have brunch and a beer at Mercer Hall, another reasonably priced purveyor of delicious things. After the meal, we perused the wares at independent bookstores and chocolate shops, both of which were also surprisingly affordable (in fact, I purchased a hardcover book by Malcolm Gladwell that explained why Tevye’s grandchildren would have been so lucky to live in the United States in the 1930s for $6.99, which is better than the Amazon price).

I could have spent a great deal more money to have a less relaxing experience here in Toronto. Two days of top-notch entertainment, food, accommodation, shopping, and transportation came in at under $170 per person. It’s not free, but the value is incredible, and I no longer feel like a poor pretender to the posh. If I were a rich man, I would have had exactly the same weekend.

Jurisfoodence

and the chicken were slow-roasted and expertly-spiced. I love Indian cooking generally, but finding the right heat-level can be difficult. This place nails it: the wraps are just hot enough to wake the palate but not so hot as to overwhelm the freshly ground cardamom and cinnamon notes. The toppings were excellent too! Their use of fusion reminded me of Why I Love Toronto food so much. The Indian-style chutpota was a delight and the chutney perfectly played off the sweet potatoes. In fact, the toppings were so good that they stood on their own. I could have done without the spinach.

Dan: I loved the spinach, but I’m the kind of person that likes green veggies with every meal. I honestly couldn’t say which wrap was better than the other. Loved ‘em both.

Luke: The soup I chose (germophobia prevented sharing here) was very good, but not spectacular. Like the wraps, the soup had just the right amount of heat. Also, I really appreciated the freshness of the porcinis and the way they were chopped -- a coarse shred, not too chunky. Still, it was somewhat on the salty side and could have been served at a hotter temperature. Next time I would definitely go with what you ordered or maybe the chowder.

Dan: Ha! I knew it! I knew you messed up by ordering that mushroom soup! Mixing pan-Asian fusion wraps with traditional European soup was a recipe for disaster. That said, I bet the corn chowder with blue crab that you passed on would have blown your mind.

Amenities & Service:

Luke: This is not a table service kind of place, but the staff were solicitous. They were clearly more than time card punchers; they seemed to take pride in the food. I also liked how the kitchen was open and the cooks said thank you as we left.

Dan: Solicitous huh? You’re going to get us fired from the Obiter if you keep this up. I like that the combo comes on a lazy-Susan rotating platter. Nice touch. Overall, I’d say that Ravi run a pretty tight ship in terms of delivering and clearing food -- prompt and effective. No frills, but hey, it’s the food I’m after.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score: Ravi Soups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities &amp; Service:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food:</strong></td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service:</strong></td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atmosphere:</strong></td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall: 3.5 sossbosses out of 5
#nosossforyou
Horror movies, like all movies, fall somewhere along a spectrum. At one end, there are original and genuinely scary movies – *The Exorcist*, *The Blair Witch Project*, *Halloween*, *Saw* and, most recently, *The Conjuring*. At the other, there are campy, poorly acted, over-the-top “scary” movies that make you laugh as much as they make you scream – *Army of Darkness*, *Child’s Play*, *The Hills Have Eyes*, *Slither*, and *Killer Klowns from Outer Space*. Movies that fit into these two groups are memorable either because they are good or so-bad-that-they-are-good; whichever group you choose a movie from, though, at least you know you’ll be entertained.

Unfortunately for *Carrie*, a remake of 1976’s film adaptation of Stephen King’s novel of the same name (his first published novel), it fits into neither of these categories. Instead, it remains in the middle, stuck in a kind of horror movie purgatory; it is not thrilling, scary, well-acted, funny, or over-the-top. It’s just boring. And really, that’s the worst thing a horror movie can be.

The story is well-known and not at all original. Carrie White, a high-school student in Anytown, U.S.A., is bullied, seemingly by everyone. Her mother forces her into a locked closet to pray for her sins; her fellow students throw tampons at her and chant “Plug it up!” after she suffers the misfortune of having her first period in the school’s shower following gym class (yes, this really happened, and a video of the whole incident was posted to YouTube by one of the particularly bitchy students), and her gym teacher slaps her in the face because of her understandably dramatic reaction to this cruel behaviour.

Carrie finds solace in her telekinetic powers – she can lift her bed up all by herself! Feeling bad about the whole tampon throwing thing, The Pretty Student with a Heart asks her boyfriend, Captain America and Bro Extraordinary, to ask Carrie to prom; he obliges. At prom, though, we all know what happens: a student, unhappy that she was banned from prom because of her role in the tampon throwing/YouTube incident, covers newly-minted Prom Queen Carrie with pig’s blood with the help of her Nothing But Trouble boyfriend.

Carrie loses her shit, substantially overreacts, burns down the school, and a bunch of kids end up dead. Carrie kills her mom and her house collapses on her. She dies. The End.

There is nothing memorable about the film, outside of a few classic lines taken directly from the 1976 original. The dialogue is bland, the character development is weak, and the actors provide nothing more than the bare minimum required to generate clichéd versions of characters we have seen a thousand times: The Social Outcast, The Bitchy Girl, The Emotional Jock and Jockette, The Crazy Mom, and The Unconventional Gym Teacher. It’s all very tired and lacks any semblance of inspiration.

My favourite scene from the movie is the second-to-last one. The Pretty Student with a Heart, having survived the worst prom night ever, speaks in front of a judge about Carrie’s role in the prom night massacre. She says that although Carrie had some kind of power, she was just like anyone else; she was pushed and “you can only push someone so far before they break.” Her speech acts as some sort of Extreme Public Service Announcement (EPSA) against bullying: if you bully people, you may push them too far, and you never know who you’re pushing too far. The person you are bullying may even...
Wikipedia libraries
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a single library source would meet the stringent demands of the peer review process. In my mind, there is no known worthwhile academic journal that would take seriously a paper with that kind of unreliable research acting as its epistemic foundation. Perhaps the invention of the library is a net positive with respect to the promotion of the public good, as there is a growing body of empirical evidence suggesting that the library encourages learning amongst youths. However, despite this, I find it to be indubitably true that the library has no place in academia, though perhaps there is some possible realm where this certain fact of our world is actually untrue.’

He continued: “I would also like to add that library sources lack hyperlinks, with an abundance of hyperlinks being a quality that I consider to be highly valuable to a work’s academic credibility and accessibility. The library is an interesting novelty, but Wikipedia-based research has been the scholarly orthodoxy for some time now. The library is, simply put, a woefully inefficient and unreliable means of research.”

Sanger and Wales, despite their enthusiasm about the potential for the library, acknowledge its shortcomings. “At Wikipedia we understand that the library, though promising, is imperfect. For one, we promise everyone that we are working hard on the lack of hyperlinks problem. We have some promising new technologies that we are thinking of incorporating into books called bibliographies and footnotes that we think can mimic the functionality of hyperlinks. However, we are still in the testing phase with these technologies, so it will take some time before they can be available in a commercial setting. We just ask people to be patient, and give the library a chance.’

All that remains to be seen is if people will give the library a chance, as Sanger and Wales hope that they do.

Ministry suggests changes to tuition billing, deferral fees

ANQI SHEN
CUP Ontario Bureau Chief

HAMILTON (CUP) — A new proposal by the Ontario Ministry of Colleges, Training and Universities suggests new tuition billing, flat fee and ancillary fee policies could be in place by 2015.

The proposed changes would clarify what universities and colleges can charge under ancillary fees and make tuition billing available on a per-term basis. The proposal would lift the current moratorium on flat fees while imposing an 80 per cent threshold.

Both CFS-Ontario and OUSA responded to the proposal, citing some welcome changes but continuing to push for altogether eliminating deferral fees and flat fees.

CFS-Ontario chairperson Alastair Wood said, in addition, that more universities should waive interest charges for students who rely on Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP).

At York University, for example, students who don’t receive OSAP on time are not charged interest for September, January and/or May.

Deferral fees in Ontario range from $0 at York, Queen’s, U of Windsor and Wilfrid Laurier to $100 at Algoma for students deferring 50 per cent of their tuition.

On the issue of ancillary fees, the Ministry’s proposal clarified that students should not be charged for credential completion or graduation.

OUSA commended the Ministry’s direction but also added that students paying for e-learning materials for evaluation purposes should receive a rebate of “no less than 20 per cent” that should already be covered in tuition.

Flat fees have come under scrutiny because students taking less than a 100 per cent course load can be charged for taking a full course load.

The University of Toronto, one of nine Ontario universities imposing a flat-fee, started doing so in 2009. It’s the only university in the province to charge students taking only 60 per cent of a course load the same tuition as students taking a full course load.

Munib Sajjad, president of the University of Toronto Students Union representing 46,000 undergraduates at two campuses, said he believes the Ministry is making progress but more work needs to be done.

“Our main concern is that it should be a 100 per cent cap on flat fees and that imposing any kind of threshold would make education even more unaffordable. There are many students who take less of a course load to handle other financial responsibilities.”

Sajjad said the UTSU also opposes “penalizing students for circumstances beyond their control” by charging deferral fees to students who rely on the OSAP to pay tuition.

“It’s not a fair thing to do just because the university feels they need to get the money on time,” Sajjad said.

In addition to late fees or deferral fees, students are charged interest on their unpaid balances. At U of T, the rate is 19.5 per cent annually, which resulted in $1.8M in revenue for the university last year.

Carrie
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have telekinetic powers, far more powerful than your tampon-throwing abilities.

This message — even if it manifests itself in a rather extreme manner — is perhaps fitting and admirable given the growing recognition within our society that bullying is shitty and kids, no matter how different or eccentric they may be, should be treated as equals.

Then again, my admiration for the movie quickly wore off when I realized that another underlying message of the film seems to be that you should listen to your mother, no matter how abusive and insane she is, no matter how many times she tells you that she should have sacrificed you to God when you were born, no matter how many times she tells you that you have sinned when you have done nothing wrong, and no matter how many times she locks you in a closet to pray. After all, it was Carrie’s mother who voiced concern when Carrie told her about prom: “They’re all going to laugh at you.” She couldn’t have been more right.
Halloween is just around the corner and with it comes another Osgoode Hall Athletics Association Halloween pub night and the opportunity to be whatever you want to be for just one night. Whether that happens to be a sexy bumblebee or flirty nurse is your call. While it’s easy for a female to dress as a “sexy” version of just about anything, there is a lot of pressure on dudes to come up with something creative or humorous in order to stand out from the crowd.

This got me to thinking – what if Toronto’s local sports teams were to go out for Halloween? I’ve come up with costumes that would be fitting of each of the Jays, Leafs, Raptors, and Argonauts that are sure to make you feel better about your own get-up this year.

**Toronto Blue Jays – Firefighter**

The Jays 2013 season can really only be aptly described with one phrase – crash and burn. That’s why a firefighter costume would be appropriate, as they try to put out the flames and recover whatever they can from the smoldering ashes for next year.

I would have said sexy firefighter, but there is nothing sexy about this mess.

**Toronto Maple Leafs – Hangman**

Nothing would be more suiting for the Leafs than the Hangman, given how they choked in the playoffs last year. Unfortunately it was their own execution that they were orchestrating with their sloppy play in the 3rd period of Game 7 of last year’s series against the Bruins.

**Toronto Raptors – Bigfoot**

The Raptors would be perfectly comfortable masquerading as Bigfoot. They are after all, a bunch of gentle giants who are used to not being seen.

**Toronto Argonauts – Ghosts**

Like ghosts, there is considerable debate as to whether the Toronto Argonauts truly exist. Did you know that the Argos won the Grey Cup last year, or that they lead their division this year? Of course not. Just like the rest of Toronto.

I would have said sexy firefighter, but there is nothing sexy about this mess.

**Andrea Cyr**
Sports Editor

Hopefully you have a better Halloween costume idea than this.