

### Friday, September 26, 1969 – A NIGHT TO REMEMBER

Early Evening relatively peaceful.

- 10 p.m. A group was asked to leave because they had a bottle of rye in their possession.
- 11 p.m. Peter L. was caught stealing french fries and was asked to pay for them – he refused – he was subsequently asked to leave the building. He was excessively drunk. He refused to stay out and was forced out on six different occasions.
- 1:05 p.m. Fire alarm pulled – nobody willing to leave the building everyone had to be forced out. The alarm was a prank.
- 1:10 p.m. Dave B. - forestry - in a drunken frenzie kicked in the plate glass door at the rear of the building.

Mounds of debris covered the floor.

### Saturday, September 27, 1969 – ANOTHER NIGHT TO REMEMBER or SEPTEMBER 26, CONTINUED or FOR THAT MATTER, JUST A NORMAL SATURDAY NIGHT.

- 10 p.m. Glass in pinball machine smashed.
- 10-11 p.m. 17 students approached because they were either excessively drunk or they had liquor in their possession.
- 11:30 p.m. Bloody brawl in the corridor outside the Coffee Shop. All participants were drunk.
- 11:40 p.m. Two drunks forcibly escorted from Blue Lounge.
- 12 p.m. 2 empty 12 oz. liquor bottles  
2 empty 25 oz. liquor bottles  
1 empty 40 oz. liquor bottle  
9 beer bottles, found on the Coffee Shop floor.
- 12:30 a.m. Danny A. was found vomiting in the Men's washroom (on the floor and everywhere else he could find). Needless to say he was drunk. It was necessary to escort him out of the building.
- 12:40 a.m. Scuffle developed between the same Danny A. and a friend on the Coffee Shop patio.
- 1-2 a.m. Bodily hauled a number of paralyzed drunks off the tables in the Coffee Shop.

Throughout the evening, the student supervisors continually asked students to clear off their tables when they left. The majority response was 'fuck-you'.

This was intended as only a very sketchy outline of what went on this past week-end at the S.U.B. It makes no mention of thoughtless damage, excessive wear and tear or general abusive conduct. It mentions only specific cases. By no means does this imply that the general conduct is not reflected in the specific. If one was to critically analyse the overall student attitude, I am sure that any of the above mentioned cases could be justified. Surely this is evidenced in the students' unwillingness to co-operate in rectifying situations.

