

Barn committee passes new admission policy

By
CRYSTAL DAWN CROSSAN

On March 10, 1997, the Barn committee passed a new rule stating that any underage individuals who wished to attend Barn events must be post-secondary students and be able to provide identification proving so. This same rule also allows for anyone 19 or older to attend Barn events whether or not they are post-secondary students. This new rule has caused considerable amounts of heated discussions on campus and amongst non post-secondary students. The "17+ Rule" raises a number of issues pertinent to both non post-secondary students and post-secondary students alike.

The actual rule was made by a Barn committee which is active throughout the year, according to Panther Lounge manager Cara Hedefine. This committee makes decisions on pricing, admission and other lounge issues. The Student Union's spokesperson Chris Gray was unavailable for an interview, however UPEI security and students were, and they were more than willing to discuss this issue.

The decision to make this rule has seemingly sprung from several security incidents which occurred at the I Mother Earth concert. During this concert, four arrests were made. Of these arrests, one individual (who was not from UPEI) was 19 and the others were 17 and 18 year old high school students. According to UPEI security, there was alcohol involved in each case. It is understandable that the 19 year old could be served alcohol at the concert. The main issue, however, lies in the three underage cases. A number of individuals seemed to be under the impression that the students had been issued "wet" tickets and were served alcohol at the Barn. This, however, was not the case. Security

stated that the students arrived at the Barn intoxicated.

Does the fact that three underage students arrived at the Barn intoxicated and caused trouble give just cause for the "17+ Rule"? Some UPEI students do not think so. The general consensus was that if the people arrived drunk, they should not have been admitted into the concert; after all, their ticket and identification would show them to be underage. The other question raised by UPEI students concerned the other underage attendees: how many underage people went to the concert that did not cause trouble; were the three troublemakers enough in number in comparison to the others to merit the "17+ Rule"?

Other student comments seemed to support a different side of the argument altogether. One student believes that a university event is not the place for high school students to begin with, while another student thought that if Barn events are going to be limited to one side of the post-secondary line, it should also be limited to the other side. In other words, if Barn events are not going to be open to underage non post-secondary students, these events should also be closed to non post-secondary individuals who are of age.

UPEI Security believes that the "17+ Rule" should cut down on the number of security incidents at Barn events; however, Security also believes that there are other possible alternatives to the "17+ Rule." The most plausible alternative would be to have a strictly enforced sign-in policy. This would involve a UPEI student signing in guests aged 17+ as well as 19+ non-UPEI students. The guests would be required to leave a piece of photo ID which would be returned upon being signed out by the UPEI student. The UPEI student signing in guests

would assume full responsibility for his/her guests. Having to accept full responsibility for guests would encourage UPEI students to be cautious about who they sign in and would

also encourage them to "keep an eye" on their guests.

Although Security believes there are other alternatives to the "17+ Rule", Director of Security John McEntee

supports the Barn committee's decision to make a change which will prevent more security incidents.



Smoking on campus *gone in a puff*

By **JULIE CLOW**

On March 11, 1997 a memo was sent out to faculty, staff and students. This memo contained information about the new smoking policy. The new policy says that "Beginning April 1, 1997 smoking will no longer be permitted in any campus buildings apart from the dorm and residences." This means that faculty, in any building on campus, will now have to go outside to light up.

In 1987, the decision was made to make UPEI a non-smoking campus. In 1995, the administration declared The Pit and all other areas of the library smoke-free. "The decision was long overdue" says President Epperly. She claims that this will have a positive effect on campus life. Students and faculty alike have been coming to her with requests to get rid of smokers inside the buildings. "It has been making people ill," Epperly explains.

The reaction from faculty was mixed. Professor Blouin plans on making this the excuse to kick the habit. Professor Benardinelli has not decided how she feels about the new policy. "I am not opposed to the new smoking policy, what I am opposed to is the fact that they are taking away all the rights of smokers. In the classroom we should not smoke, if there are people around in the offices we should not smoke, but there should definitely be somewhere that we (the faculty and students) should be allowed to smoke."

Many faculty members plan on ignoring this new policy. One secretary, who is opposed to the new policy on no smoking, says "You can buy liquor on campus, you can buy condoms on campus, you can have sex on campus... but, you can not smoke on campus?" The decision on how to monitor the new policy has not been reached. They hope that other faculty members will report if people smoke in a campus building. Letters will be sent to enforce the new rule. Epperly hopes to keep it as an internal matter. "The offices are not the faculty's home. It is not like they rent it."

The memo says that we all know the effects of second hand smoke. Administration has asked to keep it in mind that smoking with non-smokers around is simply irresponsible, as it affects the quality of air that we all must breathe. Epperly also wants "everyone to keep in mind that the tone of the new policy is a good one. This campus encourages critical thinking, so it would be helpful to keep an open mind about the new policy."