



Campus night watch planned

by Don Truckey

Evening patrols on campus to discourage sexual assault may be the next step in a widening effort by the Sexual Assault Committee to protect U of A students. Jean Lauber, universityademic vp and chair for the committee, said Monday the patrols would be a "preventative measure." She added the committee "really doesn't know the

extent of the problem, but that's no reason to be complacent—or to over-react."

"One doesn't wish for a great bloody rape on campus to point out a need for protection," Lauber said. "We shouldn't wait until after the fact; there should be preventative measures even if the extent of the problem is undetermined."

"It's appalling that it's not possible to get information from anybody," Lauber said in

reference to Campus Security's refusal to comment on the severity of the problem.

In addition to their preventative function, Lauber said, the patrols would be used to gather on-the-spot information about the frequency of sexual assault at specific locations on campus, possibly resulting in public warnings or better lighting in those areas.

The patrols could be operating "in a few weeks,"

Lauber said, if the proposal goes through the Board of Governors' financing committee and the university planning committee this week.

"I would hope to have one male and one female on each team," Lauber added. "Their functions would include discouraging loiterers and providing escorts where requested."

Since winter weather increases the possibility of indoor

assaults, the patrols will pass through campus buildings as well as covering outside walkways.

Institution of the patrols is the committee's top priority, Lauber said, but added that other measures have been taken, including an increase in outside telephones on campus connected to Campus Security or city police.

Additional story p.2

Anything worth having...

The Gateway

...is worth cheating for. —W.C. Fields

LXVII, NO. 34. THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON, CANADA.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1977. TWELVE PAGES.

Responses tabulated

Responses to a December questionnaire distributed by the department chairmen's committee concerning reorganization of the university's power structure, have been tabulated and made public.

Only 568 responses were received from 1,800 questionnaires distributed and this low turnout may perhaps be attributed to a ban by the Association of Academic Staff University Alberta (AASUA) and the Arts Faculty Executive Council. The two groups urged their

members to reject the "ballot" questionnaires because while they offered a checkbox for those supporting the proposal, they did not offer a checkbox for those opposed to the proposal.

Thus, while 215 staff members voted support of the proposal (38 per cent), 317 (or 57 per cent) voted in some manner against it — with 32 writing their complete opposition to it, 95 checking the box indicating support with reservations, 89 checking the box indicating restructuring is needed but in a different manner, and 101 indicating the present system is satisfactory.

Only 19 members indicated they were uninterested in the issue and only eight responses clearly indicated they were not answering because of AASUA's ban.

Board's delay

A Board of Governors decision on the tenure status of Dr. Anthony Vanek has been referred to Feb. 4.

A delay in providing pertinent information concerning the matter to board members resulted in the postponement.

The board will hear a tenure appeals committee recommendation calling for Vanek's reinstatement.



Engineering Week begins.

And, of course, so do the "Queen" contests. The candidate here is discussing the inverse relationship between the electrical conductivity of human skin and the emotional resistance of sexual stereotypes.

Canada balks at grass clause

OTTAWA (CUP) - Canada refused to sign portions of an international treaty which would require it to extradite persons for marijuana offenses.

The treaty, the United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, signed late last year, includes a clause demanding automatic extradition of offenders to their native country. Canada has declined to accept those provisions of this

revised 1961 agreement.

According to an official with the department of external affairs in Ottawa the main reason for the government's refusal to agree to those provisions is because consideration is being given to changing the status and penalties of the marijuana — cannabis — laws in Canada.

Under the U.N. convention cannabis is lumped with heroin and other narcotic drugs.

Because the proposed Canadian legislation might remove cannabis from the category of drugs under the Canada Narcotic Control Act and since the punishment for simple possession may be reduced officials have balked at signing all the provisions of the convention.

Cannabis crimes under the convention would be considered serious enough to warrant extradition from Canada to another

signatory country to the convention, even though in Canada the same cannabis crime might not be considered serious enough to warrant extradition under Canadian law.

In refusing to sign parts of the convention, signing with "reservation" in diplomatic terms, Canada remains free to determine if the drug offense is both serious enough in Canada to warrant extradition as well as

being extraditable in the other country. By placing "reservations" beside the particular paragraph they don't agree with, Canada effectively doesn't accept as law those provisions.

A bill with proposed amendments to existing cannabis laws in Canada passed the Senate with amendments in June 1975 and was sent to the House of Commons.