

viewpoint

Students Doubt Success Of International Woman's Year

After much soul searching and heart to heart discussion we decided a controversial topic which is currently tearing our quiet campus into a raging inferno of heated discussions; namely International Women's Year.

We interviewed ten students and discovered a lot of indifference and ignorance of the total scope of the campaign. The general consensus of the majority was that the ideas are good but the methods are not the best.

Daniel Wylie said he was rather indifferent about the whole campaign but went on to say that he noticed a lack of unity among Island women although he was more familiar with the situation in Montreal where feelings are stronger. He also felt that the entire responsibility for the campaign here has been placed on the university and that it was being mismanaged. He thought that it was a good idea to inform the world about the problems of women. He mentioned that one of the main issues is discriminatory abortion laws in Canada and that although funded by the government there is no bureaucracy in the Why Not campaign.

Pam Stevenson agreed with women's goal for equal pay but didn't think that one year will change anything. She did not think that it has any great effect on her life.

Stephen Fitzpatrick thought that IWY is a good idea because women have been looked down upon and they shouldn't be. They deserve equality in every way. He said that the Why Not campaign is a waste of time & money sponsored by a group of males and it has no real meaning. He is strongly against abortion and can't see what it has to do with female equality anyway.

Karen Lowther is in favor of the Why Not campaign and feels that it will help women gain equal job opportunities and hopes it will put more emphasis on women's sports at the national level. She feels that it should gain recognition in areas where women are put down but is not intended for women's lib which is more soapbox speechmaking than action.

Chuck Gosnell thinks the whole thing is a farce. Women will always be exploited because of a different value scale in our culture which is too big to change. Things should not be that way. They should be equal but women's lib will not bring this equality in the foreseeable future.

Mike Egan has a low opinion of the Why Not campaign. He felt that it is too commercial that women are dehumanizing and trying to sell themselves. He doesn't think it will have any real effect that it is just a passing idea. He thinks that they have valid goals, and complaints the economic and political scene look down upon them but they are going about the solution the wrong way.

Beth Jenkins (the only female who was wearing a Why Not? button) is definitely in agreement with the idea that everyone is not aware of what the women want & that something should be done about it. However she has never really thought about it and has no strong opinions. Joanne MacLean questioned what will actually be accomplished for women by IWY and considers the expensive ad campaign a waste of

money that won't really help women. She thinks that opening up what women want is a good idea but this is not the most productive method. The money should be spent on people instead of ads.

Austin MacDonald thinks that it should be International Peoples Year rather than a Women's year although a special year to bring liases to the fore is a good idea. It is not an answer and it won't change the world, but it will help. The money for the ads should be spent on concrete activities rather than on Stupid buttons.

Jean Chandler feels that it shows a general trend in support of women's goals and if everyone lives up to their promises it will do a lot of good in removing employment prejudice. She thinks that the Why Not campaign is silly. The Royal Commission of the Status of Women is comprehensive enough and moneys spent on further research should be spent on such activities as day-care centers and legal aid for women who have been discriminated against.

Since this is our last in our series of interviews we would like to thank all



CREDIT: CPS

the students who took time out from their homework and bridge games to share their views with the rest of the campus.

John Underhay and Raymond MacDonald

The Late And Great Student Judicial Committee

Ever heard of an organization called the Student Judicial Committee (SJC)? Well apparently, the SJC is a "sub-organization of the Student Union, whose primary function is to deal with disciplinary cases involving students. As this committee is concerned with 'fair-play' both to the students & to the University, it is felt that it is more convenient to handle offences which occur within the University by students of that University (S.J.C.)?"

The procedures for trying cases within the University are: the Security Police must give a charge in writing to the S.J.C. within seven days of the occurrence of the alleged offence, the S.J.C. then orders the student to appear before it to decide on the case. If the SJC is not operative, cases are referred to the Director of Student Services and Academic Deans. The last court of appeal is the Board of Governors.

All offenses should appear before one of these boards.

In September & for most of that semester, Junior McLeod, director of Security, referred all cases to the S.J.C. The SJC, however didn't act on these cases but left many of them pending for weeks and weeks.

Apparently, Junior McLeod became frustrated by this inefficient & non-functioning organization, so graciously called SJC. His frustration was so great, that he decided to take matters into his own hands by side stepping the S.J.C. As a result, the major offences were not handled by our students within our community, but rather by the civil courts downtown. This caused some students to be labelled as criminal and to be black-listed by the society at large.

What I would like to know is why the Vice President of the Student Union didn't look into the operations of the SJC, why the SJC was so useless and neg-

ligent, and why the S.J.C. and Jim Griffith allowed Junior McLeod to take the law into his own hands?

I hope all of you responsible people on the S.J.C. and the Director of Student Services and the Director of Security are aware that you needlessly blacklisted students because some of you were unwilling to assume your responsibilities and others assumed responsibilities that were not yours to assume in the first place. The result, a criminal record, a black mark when job hunting and lots of public embarrassment.

I hope that next years S.J.C. will do its job and keep the offenses of this University within the University as it was intended.

Colleen Warren

"Rumor Has It" that a student not on the student Union voted eleven times on motions at the last Student Union meeting.