



Please Santa could I have a pass in ... Economics, statistics, and Computer Science.

FEEDBACKFEEDBACKFEEDBACKFEEDBACKFEEDBAC

UNIONS' PETITION

Dear Sir:

In reading your article in the Brunswickan, November 27, 1970, we realized you had been badly mis-informed and would be very happy to hear the real facts about the petition that was circulated in the library.

First things first - the petition was started November 19 and had been circulated through Engineering, Old Arts, Forestry, Chemistry, Biology, Carleton Hall and Tilley Hall. However, it was decided that some of us did not know enough about Unions to sign the petition, so we, the secretaries, not the librarians, asked for a meeting with Mr. Knight, for information about Unions generally. Mr. Knight informed us that he would be glad to answer whatever questions he could, but that he would not express an opinion either for or against Unions, and this he stated again when we met in his office on Tuesday, November 24. The librarians were not approached nor represented there in any way.

While the meeting was in progress the petition was at that time being circulated in MacLaggan Hall and subsequently was sent to the Library.

We are sure you will be glad to learn the true facts about the petition and the meeting in Mr. Knight's office.

Sincerely yours,

Kaye Ketch
Phyllis Cumberland
Dot Moore
Sheila Hanson
Anne Pugh

SPICER EDITORIAL

In your 'Special Spicer Editorial' today you seem to suggest that Mrs. Spicer, in offering her house for rental, may have a moral obligation to let it to students. I do not think that you have made it clear why such a moral duty arises, and I respectfully suggest to you that as a private citizen the lady is entitled to choose her tenants. I do not see why her job as Accomodations Officer at the university should affect that freedom of choice.

Mrs. Spicer owes students no duty beyond that entailed by her job. She works for the university and I would be surprised if she has any responsibility directly to the students as a body or even as individuals. She is required to find accomodation insofar as it is available. This duty may extend to encouraging landlords to let to students, but if they do so it is of their own volition. I suggest to you that Mrs. Spicer is not under any obligation to the university to set an example at the price of her own freedom as a private person.

You have intimated that Mrs. Spicer has done her job well. I agree. Why ask more? Students are not the only ones with rights. We clamour loudly for what we have. Should we not respect those of other people?

Let us respect Mrs. Spicers privacy. She deserves no less, especially from the students of this university.

Yours truly,

Mel Turner
(Law I)

MORE RESPONSIBILITY!!

University has the admirable aim of teaching individuals to think for him or her, self. The student is taught to question, not accept everything, including rules, as they are given.

"(The university) should regard the residences as part of the educational system; not as mere places to live but rather as providing a stimulating and rewarding environment in which full participation in the educational process in a creative sense may be encouraged to the maximum degree." *Unknown source.

The present system provides little means of participation in the system. Learning responsibility is not encouraged by the forcing of rules down our throats. Being forced to conform to rules nuffles any chance of developing personal responsibility. A girl who lives under a tightly ruled system has no chance to develop her own responsibility she has not the freedom to do so.

The residences are controlled by an administration of another generation. They live under the misconception that females do not know how to take care of themselves, that they are of a sub-normal intelligence which has to be rigidly disciplined for its own protection.

This brings to mind a dispicable double standard; the women's residences, compared to the men's residences. Males of this age have the reputation of being reckless and irresponsible, yet are allowed unlimited freedom of movement while women of the same age are herded inside the residence at a given time each night. It has been argued that women would not be able to handle the responsibility; are the men? The administration seems to think so, why do they not give the women the same chance to prove their responsibility.

It seems strange that in a society where at 16, a person is deemed responsible enough to leave home; at 18, a person can cast his vote to choose his country's government; at 16, serve his country in the Armed Forces; and again at 16, drive a car, potentially one of the most lethal weapons available to the public, while persons of this age and older are forced to obey rules which deny that they have even the intelligence to be at university. True, legally we give up our rights to control our freedoms as we enter these

institutions, but the administration seems to be taking advantage of our helplessness.

The administration is under no obligation to control little Mabel's comings and goings although it's nice that Mummy and Daddy know that little Mabel won't be able to run wild once she is free of her strict home life. But when will little Mabel acquire the responsibility and discipline needed to run her life is she never has to rely on herself for these necessities? If little Mabel is not ready for university she should be left at home with her nursemaid.

Fortunately most girls at university are responsible enough to get enough sleep and do enough work to satisfy the administration. Many are forced to live off campus because they need the personal freedom when they would like to have the convenience and conviviality of residence life.

Residence is not a right or a privilege, it is a convenience run by the university for the students. Ideally it should promote freedom and responsibility as well as teaching, the give and take, of communal living and the importance of respecting the rights of "the other guy"

by Elaine Jones

Arts II