

Residence rules: the 5 w's

by Dorothy Wigmore
and Martha MacDonald

Mount Saint Vincent University offers the innocent young ladies it takes under its maternal wings the best protection and insurance against waywardness. The

regulations governing the lives of the 450 girls in residence presents a minimum of personal freedom and the right to individual judgements.

First year students entering MSV from grade 11 and new sophomores (students entering

from grade 12) must be in at 10 p.m. on week nights and 2 a.m. on Friday and Saturdays. Old sophomores and Juniors may stay out until 1 a.m. during the week and 2:30 on weekends. With special permission from the sister, the first year students' weekend leave may be extended to 1 a.m. After Christmas this is the regular hour. Students may sign out all night, if they say where they are going, when they will return, and the phone number at which they can be contacted.

RIGHTS OR PRIVILEGES

This privilege, however, may be limited at the parents' discretion. A form issued to parents allows them to choose whether their daughter may sign out a) only to specified places; b) wherever she wants; c) only with special permission each time.

Other regulations are that male visitors may be seen only in the residence lounge, until 1 a.m. Drugs and liquor are forbidden, and offenders are dealt with by the Student Discipline Board.

These rules have been in effect since January '69. Students' Council President, Mary Martin, and Boarder's Council President, Joyce Marchand, feel there is general dissatisfaction with the strict regulations. They hope changes will be made this year.

AND AT SMU . . .

Saint Mary's University residences went co-ed two years ago. Two blocks of the low-rise residence have been allocated to women.

At SMU first year students have weekday leaves of 1:30, and weekend leaves of 3 a.m. Returning students, 18-21, can stay out until 2:30 a.m. weekdays, and until 3 a.m. on weekends. The Dons give late leaves of no later than 4:30, until a total of three have been reached in the month. At that point, if the resident has a good reason, the Dean of Women will grant the late leave. Co-eds over 21 have no curfews.

NO CLOSE CHECK

There is no check-in system for women coming and going in the residence. If the Don feels someone is not in at a certain hour, she can check. Men can visit in the women's dorm on Fridays from 6 p.m. - 3 a.m., Saturdays from 1 p.m. - 3 a.m., and on Sundays from noon to midnight. Men must be signed in and out.

In contrast to the situation in the women's residence, men may have female visitors in their rooms from noon to midnight on weekdays, and at the same times as the women's residence during the weekend. As in most men's residences, they have no curfew.

EQUAL DISCRIMINATION

The same general attitudes prevail at Dalhousie. The women have more liberal rules in Sherriff Hall than in other universities. Only first year students have deadlines which

can be liberalized at Christmas time, if a student attains a 60% average or pass in every subject. Before Christmas, deadlines are 1:30, with five 2:30's allowed each month, and seven 3:30's during the year. This changes to 2:30 and five 3:30's a month, if the criterion is met.

Except in their first year, women do not have to sign out and in. They are asked, however, to move their cards from one slot to the other, for practical reasons, like fires. Overnights, and weekend leaves have to be signed out by all residents. The main door is locked at 2:00 a.m. so that residents have to knock on the door to get in, even if they have no curfew.

Men are allowed in the rooms from noon to 3 a.m. daily, and from 9 a.m. to 3 a.m. on Saturday and Sunday. They must be signed in after 6 p.m.

ON THE OTHER HAND

The same old story applies again at the men's residence. No deadlines are set for coming and going. Residents are allowed female visitors in their rooms from 9 a.m. to 3 a.m. daily. They also receive a key to the doors, so that they can get in after 11 p.m. when the doors are locked.

PLEBES ROLE AT KINGS

The biggest of all shows up on the campus of the University of King's College. About three weeks ago at a meeting of all King's residents, the students decided to follow their own rules. The administration had no alternative, but to accept these for they had no one to carry out their rules.

Under the students' regulations, women have no deadlines, regardless of which year they are in. They will only use in and out tags. Overnights are not to be limited.

However, a problem has arisen. The door is locked at 3 a.m., and residents are forced to get someone out of bed to open it for them. For their "lateness", they receive a \$2 fine. No security guard has yet been found to open the door, or to stay on the desk after 3.

OPEN DOOR POLICY

In contrast to the contradiction existing in the women's residence, the men's doors are never locked. They have a 24-hour visiting period, and can come and go as they please.

Looking over these rules, questions must be asked. The most obvious one is: why? Why have the universities felt it their duty to lock resident women in, literally, and figuratively? Why are women given different rules than men? And, what can be done about these authoritarian rules?

REPRESSIVE TOLERANCE

To answer the first question, one must look at the rules made throughout the university. Rarely are students consulted, and if they are, it is always in the context that rules are needed, no matter how liberal a gesture is made. The university seems to

feel a necessity to guard its innocent young tenants from the evils of the horrible world we live in. Otherwise, why would they impose rules on residence students? Most students at university are quite capable of looking after themselves. Those who have to learn should not be forced into a position where they have no choice available. What kind of learning process is that?

Residence rules are a further extension of the administration's control over students' lives. Students who do not live in residences are not controlled to the same extent as those who do. That means that students in residences are discriminated against.

OR SELF-DETERMINATION

The important thing is that students should not be subjected to this authoritarian attitude. It leaves them no choice in controlling their own lives. If a student at the Mount wants to go out for coffee or something to eat at 12 or 1 in the evening, why shouldn't she? If a girl at Saint Mary's wants to offer a male friend coffee in her room late one weekday night, what is the matter with that? The only thing stopping these incidents are the university authorities' opinion of what its students should and should not do.

These examples point out another important problem. Female residents are subjected to stricter rules and hanky-panky than male residents, in every university examined. Its the old double standard. Women are deemed less capable of making decisions, and looking after themselves than men. Men also can do pretty much what they want to, but the poor delicate females have to maintain their innocence and purity.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Having realized that the rules in residences are another control over their lives, and that women are discriminated against in these rules, what can resident students do?

Perhaps the best example is what has happened at King's. The students themselves met and decided to make their own rules. After all, they are the ones affected by the rules.

LAW OR ORDER

If students decide not to impose restrictions, the lack of rules should not be seen as a lack of responsibility and order. In fact, it is an acceptance of responsibility on the part of students. It is also much easier for those who are present enforcing rules, when students are taking individual or collective responsibility for their behaviour.

To repeat the basic argument, students must be able to control their own lives to a greater extent than at present. They should have the choice of what rules, if any, will bind them. Discrimination between men and women and against adolescents in general must stop.



Americanization

(continued from page 5)

central Canada on the chain of imperialist oppression.

THE MIDDLE LINK

He said he looked up the chain and saw American imperialist oppression. He looked down the chain and saw the double oppression of the Maritimes as a colony of both "Upper Canada" and the imperialist giant to the south.

Watkins did have trouble with one question from the floor about the nature of social democracy, the theoretical orientation of the Waffle. While on the one hand supporting the slogan "Power to the people" he could Waffle Watkins also support an electoral system which presently forces people to select who they will give up their political power to every four or five years. The power base of the largely intellectual Waffle was also questioned.

Watkins said he still had faith in the NDP.

ON CULTURE

The teach-in started off on a slow pace Friday night with the session on Americanization of the university and our culture. Fiery Robin Mathews virtually monopolized the evening.

The co-author with James Steele of "Struggle for Canadian Universities", Mathews launched into a lengthy statistical presentation to show that the Yanks were rapidly taking over our universities, Yanks who had little sensitivity to the special needs of the Canadian people.

He said that in 1969-70 approximately 75 to 82 per cent of all new faculty hired by Canadian universities were foreigners. This had critical relevance in the Social Sciences and Humanities, he said.

ENEMY OR COMRADE?

Besides attacking the Canadian government for this sell-out, he

called his fellow panelist, W. A. MacKay, Dalhousie vice president, a "colonial" and Bronx-born Dalhousie sociology professor Don Grady, "a cultural imperialist."

MacKay had earlier rationalized why university administrations were forced to hire Americans.

Grady was trying to make the point that the national origin of a person was not of real consequence but rather the contributions of American faculty to Canadian society should be judged.

Laurier Lapierre, professor of History at McGill University and mentioned as a NDP leadership candidate, decided to speak on the Quebec situation rather than the Americanization of the university.

His rambling analysis of Quebec history, punctuated by references in French to the applause of the audience, was interrupted numerous times by the slogans of Internationalists.

Only about 100 made it up for the 10 a.m. Saturday morning session on labour and Americanization. In his presentation Gil Levine, research director of the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), and a member of the reform caucus of the Canadian Labour Congress, made several substantive points, but the other two panelists evoked little response.

Levine outlined the necessity of decreasing the number of Canadian unions into larger consolidated units to fight the power of the multi-national corporation and praised the Quebec based Confederation of National Trade Unions (CNTU) as an independent Canadian union organization which was accomplishing a great deal for its membership.