

*David Miller*

When I first came to UNB, first year underage girls were not allowed to stay out on weekends past 2 a.m., before Christmas and 3 a.m. after Christmas. Anyone is certainly conscious of the fact that you can get laid equally well before 2 a.m. as after 2 a.m. Rules such as these are gradually being stomped out, but it is hard to rid the system of its basic archaic philosophy of operation. Thou shalt protect thy daughter.

I hope to God that I have the sense to not protect my daughter in the sense of the above cliché, but rather to teach her a morality with which she is happy, and that I can reconcile to my own values; in that order.

The fact of the matter is, and I am not alone or original in articulating this, that the women's residence system actually encourages the type of behaviour it preports to prevent.

The pressures placed on the girls entering residence are enormous, forcing her to become part of whatever group that dominates her wing.

More than that, these pressures often force girls to get a boyfriend for status reasons, and more often to get a boyfriend for escape reasons. To get away from the drinking, noise, and occasional lesbian attacks.

Proctors, which potentially, and, in fact most often, are of immense value in dealing with the symptoms of the dilemma posed, but not with its root causes.

I would not maintain that the women's residences are so imperfect as to be as bad "as all that", but I would say very strongly that the unnatural condition of hundreds of women together causes problems for a high percentage of the girls.

At any university there should indeed be women's residences patterned along the existing lines. For some they may work best. There should be a gradual emphasis towards co-ed residences isolated wing by wing, or room by room as the situation merits. There would be far fewer pressures, as both sexes would tend to respect the other, and if any group of wandering men came in to harass the girls, or make noise, then the guys living there would, I'm sure, get together and beat the shit out of them.

Prohibition doesn't solve anything, as everyone knows. Why adult members of our society should be treated as if they were children, I cannot fathom. The girls themselves could not want to be treated in such a manner, but the spectre of the part is a hard ghost to deal with.

I know that many girls in residence are happy and would not want it changed. I also know that many girls are unhappy, and even worse, I have known many girls who were screwed up because of the system. The paradox of 1920 prudery and 1976 promiscuity when it is accentuated in this manner is damn hard to face.

It is well known by the senior administrators at this school that changes should be made. They refuse to act because the fear of making a mistake is stronger than the awareness of the necessity of change.

I have a feeling that only economics will force an issue that essentially is a moral one. I, for one do not intend my moral to be governed by money.

§ § § § §

I bitch about the residence system because the morality of it all is indecently low. It offends me that I cannot sign my full name to a paper and walk in to be able to knock on a girl's door. That I am not responsible enough to not damage something, or make noise, or bother the women who are in their own homes. If I damage something or make a nuisance I should be given a fair trial and punished accordingly. Making a girl come down from her room to get me is like honking your horn in front of her house and you not getting up to knock on the door in a civilized manner. I am not a criminal and I am prepared to be responsible for my actions. If the women in residence choose to use the rules to 'hide' from men that may wish to see them, then I say that they are childish and immature, and perhaps they shall never grow up.

I am worried about the poor off campus girl who, separated from the benefit of these protections, is daily exposed to the hazards of rape and physical damage of her property.

Not so long ago, I made the statement in a calm voice to a beady eyed little security guard that I was not a criminal, and I felt pretty bad about waiting till the girl on the fourth floor got off the phone so I could call up and get the girl I wished to speak to, to come down and vouch for my existence. He implied that he would throw me out if I didn't keep quiet.

In my time here, I have found the security guards to be just the best; you could talk to them. Always willing to help you out, and trusted you to behave in a rational manner. The statements that this particular one made absolutely devastated me. Visions of fellow students being beaten, "up against the wall hippy" and shot on the steps of Kent State went through my head. And I wondered about morals and about being trained for life at a university that by definition states as its purpose to promote freedom of knowledge and expression.

## Council does two-step

By GERRY LASKEY

This week's students' council meeting was embroiled for one and a half hours in a controversy over the showing of the film "Return of the Dragon" starring Bruce Lee by the Overseas Chinese Students' Association (OCSA).

The controversy surrounded the nature of the film being "entertainment" rather than "educational" or "cultural". The fact that OCSA members were being admitted free and the public charged was a major point of contention. Some councillors said this went against the SRC policy of not funding private entertainment. Another issue was whether this was basically a fund-raising event. The debate started with the argument over the nature of the film.

A spokesperson for the OCSA, professor Anthony Lister, said that he was at first "skeptical" about the showing of a Bruce Lee movie with part of the \$600 OCSA budget for films. But, he said, he had seen very good critical reviews of the movie in the London Sunday Times, and that it did present a part of Chinese culture.

Professor Lister said that in the past OCSA saw only Taiwanese films which he said were of little value. He said the new OCSA policy was to procure films representative of all Chinese culture, primarily the mainland, but also some samples from Taiwan and Hong Kong. He said that the Bruce Lee film in question was one of the best Hong Kong produced films available.

After professor Lister spoke some more debate took place over the same questions of private

entertainment and fund raising.

A motion was brought forward by Steve Berube and Steve Whelan "to refuse to fund the OCSA movie 'Return of the Dragon'." The motion was defeated by virtue of five abstentions which, under "Robert's Rules of Order," count as negative votes.

About one half hour later a motion was put forth "to fund the OCSA movie 'Return of the Dragon'." This motion was also defeated partly by abstentions. A vote on this motion for a role-call vote was also defeated.

The meeting then recessed for five minutes to, as one councillor said, "get our shit together".

After the recess the council passed a resolution "to grant a forgivable loan to OCSA for the movie 'Return of the Dragon'." This meant if the movie made a profit the loan would be paid back, and if not then it would be forgiven. Councillors Alan Hildebrand and Allan Patrick requested to be recorded as opposed.

Councillor Bill Sanderson said, when approached afterwards, "There were a lot of side issues thrown in." He said "We should have stayed away from the educational or cultural aspect. When we gave them \$600 it was just for 'films'."

He also said, "I was really angry at the result of the role-call vote motion. I feel that as a

representative you should not be afraid to have your vote recorded as yours."

Councillor Steve Whelan, sponsor of the original motion against the movie, said he was opposed to the film "because we don't fund private entertainment. The OCSA members got in free and the SRC doesn't fund that."

He said he was "happy about the second motion failing. We used abstentions to our benefit just like the other side."

He said, about the role-call motion, "I would be very scared that people might try to make it look like it was prejudice against Chinese students and it wasn't. It was just a straight entertainment policy. We're not saying they can't raise money, just that they can't use SRC funds for entertainment."

Councillor Steve Berube said "I put the first motion on the floor. It was a negative motion and the abstentions defeated it and Alan Hildebrand put forth the second motion and he used the rule to his full advantage."

Berube added, "Role-call votes should only be used on issues that have a great effect on the union not on petty issues. Otherwise they're a waste of time. Councillors can be recorded as 'for' or 'against' if they want."

The chairperson of the Monday meeting declined comment on the affair.

## United Way driving hard

By ANNE MARCEAU

The UP The Hill United Way Campaign winds up Nov. 12 and campus organizers are driving for that extra bit to put them up and over their goal of \$19,500.

UNB president John Anderson and student union president Jim Smith agreed to be thrown into the Sir Max Aitken swimming pool if the quota were met.

The appeal, aimed at UNB's 1240 permanent faculty and staff members, has raised \$13,819 to date from 210 donors. "If only half of the 1000 who have not yet contributed pledged \$1.00 per month or \$12.00 per year, our goal would be reached," quoted Professor Eric Garland from a United Way press release.

Contributions range from \$1.00 to \$300.00 with an average of \$67.00 per donor, down from \$77.00 last year.

"Every little bit helps us contribute our share to the total 'United Way campaign'," he said.

Though not appealing directly to the students for financial contributions, Garland is hoping for student participation in "volunteer work and promotion of the campaign."

The engineers will be taking up a collection this Friday during the Great Canadian Coaster Derby. "It may be nickels and dimes," Garland said, "but it's a gesture on the students' part."

In reply to whether he thought it wise not to lock his door after this incident, Smith indicated there was nothing of value in the office "but two cans of dog food and a pair of \$30 pants."

Students might also help with the Fredericton door-to-door canvass. Mrs. Pam Fuller heads this area of the campaign and is canvassing routes mapped out. She can be reached at 455-3346.

Money collected during the United Way Campaign is distributed among 21 service agencies in the Fredericton area.

## Letters con't

for any groups of students who wanted to submit a team (not a residence or faculty team). After a year and a half they have won and Steve Gilliland, Eric Semple and the others deserve a vote of thanks. This is not really a victory for the off-campus student, but at least we are now noticed, and can have our own teams.

CHSR is not available to the off-campus student. Due to my affiliation with the station, I have been concerned for a long time with the off-campus students who pay their share to keep us on the air and receive far less benefit from our services than the residence students.

I see only one solution to these beefs of the off-campus student. Any business is run on the premise that you pay for what you get or the services you receive. For the off-campus student this is not the case, and they have every right to bitch, complain and push this issue until an equitable solution is found.

Allan Patrick

## Missing: dictaphone

By ANNE MARCEAU

The SRC dictaphone is missing from student union president Jim Smith's office. "I just don't know what happened to it!" was Smith's response.

Last seen two months ago, this famous dictaphone caused some controversy when purchased by Peter Galoska during his term as president.

Deeming it "a waste of money from the start" Smith emphasized that he prefers not to use it but has always made it available to student leaders.

As no check was kept of who borrowed the dictaphone, the last user is not known. A "certain individual" thought to have had it in his possession, as well as other SRC property, claims he returned it to Smith's desk.

When in the building, the president leaves his office open, claiming "student's property should be available to them."

In reply to whether he thought it wise not to lock his door after this incident, Smith indicated there was nothing of value in the office "but two cans of dog food and a pair of \$30 pants."

cheap filler sww