

Amendment should be ratified

The Oregon State Legislature is being asked to ratify the so-called women's rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The amendment was approved last year by the Congress and requires ratification by two thirds of the states before being added to the Constitution. In essence, it prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, and would serve to re-emphasize equal employment and public service laws already on the books.

It is important Oregon ratify the amendment.

Proponents of ratification are willing to admit the amendment is a redundant piece of legislation. It duplicates philosophies outlined in other portions of the Constitution. But they emphasize the need to clearly and unequivocally restate the rights of women in this society.

Unfortunately there are organizations which oppose a restatement of a basic commitment to women. They have attacked the amendment with contradictory and even absurd arguments.

For example opponents argue the amendment would permit the drafting of women into the military and should be rejected for that reason.

Of course making women eligible for the military draft is a move towards equality. And while it may frighten op-

ponents the Emerald sees it as a logical step forward—objections to the draft aside.

More absurd is the insistence that passage would force men and women to share public bathrooms.

Such a conclusion can only be drawn with the widest possible interpretation of the amendment. Sexual equality does not negate constitutional rights to privacy. As long as some men and some women are reluctant to share toilet facilities the Constitution guarantees existence of segregated bathrooms.

But the argument has been effective in scaring women away from an amendment which seeks to guarantee future equality in law, in employment and in family.

Actually action on the part of the Oregon Legislature will probably prove irrelevant. The amendment has gained strong support around the country and will no doubt gain ratification before the year is out.

But a vote against ratification will reflect poorly on the progressive image of Oregon politics.

Where is the faculty

Two years ago the Emerald printed an editorial telling the faculty that their contributions to the commentary and letters columns of the Emerald were most welcome. The response to this was tremendous and up until fall term members of the faculty regularly commented on the events of the day.

But where are they now? Surely teachers and administrators have opinions. Surely teachers and administrators get outraged just like other

people. Where are the Porters, Stephensons and Pallandris, all regular and welcome letter writers?

The Emerald would once again like to formally request letters and columns from the faculty and the administration. They have as much right to have their opinions aired in the Emerald as students do.

Besides, if attendance at faculty meetings is any indication the faculty must have enough time on their hands to write at least an occasional letter.

Letters

In other place

I would like to comment on the commentary by Lee Siegel on the legality of the new section of the Eugene code on Indecent Touching.

Indeed it is sad to see a city pass laws against an individual's rights. However it is much sadder to see these laws enforced because people are unaware or inconsiderate of other peoples rights also.

Public displays of this kind of behavior obviously offended others causing it to be outlawed in the first place. It would be like a person being invited to a friends home, who without regard for the person's property, puts his feet on the table or puts his cigarette out in his dinner plate.

I suggest that if people don't want laws made telling them what they can and can't do they should put themselves in the other person's place.

Katherine Hall
335 1/2 Pearl St.
Eugene

Thanks Senate

At the ASUO Senate meeting on Jan. 18, the senate suspended the rules to consider and then unanimously approved the following resolution:

Whereas, through Congressional and State action the funding for the ASUO Child Care and Development Center is likely to cease before the end of winter term;

Therefore, be it resolved that the ASUO Senate will send a delegation to President Clark and send letters to the members of the Eugene City Council, the Lane County Commissioners, and Governor Tom McCall requesting that the university, the city, the county, and the governor's office, respectively, appropriate funds to the ASUO Child Care and Development Center sufficient to keep it operational through spring term. The senate will also send a letter to the members of the Eugene Budget Committee, urging that it recommend to the City Council that Federal Revenue Sharing Funds be appropriated to the ASUO Child Care and Development Center.

The letters will point out that the ASUO Senate is acting in support of funding requests by the ASUO Child Care and Oregon Daily Emerald

Development Center that are distinct from the requests of the Community Coordinated Child Care Council.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the ASUO Senate for its concern and quick action.

Marva Van Natta
Mary C. Pauli
Kathy Blago
Nancy Beck
Diane Saint
Members of University Feminists

Bio-crud activists

In response to Lee Siegel's commentary on the new Eugene City ordinance titled Indecent Touching, I would like to say his attitude was most flippant and un-called-for. To throw supposedly-humorous abuse at a new section of our proud City Code is to strike at the very stalwart and bastion of Freedom.

Why, just the other day I saw the most lewd display of GROPING and TOUCHING, in front of Woolworth's no less! These Touchers, these Fondlers, these SCUM should be put to hard labor or locked in Dammasch with their own element.

What kind of commie-symp bio-crud activist is this Siegel? And what kind of newspaper is the Emerald to partake in such slanted yellow journalism? This is reading material for pink radicals, faggots, and WORSE. May Freedom be preserved in the name of Moral Sanity.

Jeffrey S. Walker
Music Composition

Sure of victory

Contrary to OSPIRG's hopes, I am still serious. Unfortunately, challenging OSPIRG is a difficult and expensive task. If any delay exists, I suggest they take it up with the State appointed lawyer handling their side of the case. My lawyer is a volunteer and has to serve his paying clients for a living. It should be added that I must pay my own court costs while OSPIRG's tab is picked up by State monies.

The funding of OSPIRG is still illegal—even more so now. The Constitution and By-Laws of OSPIRG insist on a refund procedure and has never been amended by a vote of the students. Come to think of it, OSPIRG's local board members at PSU

and OSU were never elected by students last Spring. Some problem about lack of student interest.

OSPIRG found it convenient to overlook these technical violations of their Constitution in their quest for money and power.

The real losers are the thousands of students who don't want to support CSPIRG and received refunds last year. They are denied the opportunity now because of improper and illegal Board of Higher Education action. You probably remember that OSPIRG's original funding (on the basis of questionable petition support several years ago) demanded a refund procedure as a protection for those

students. This policy, said OSPIRG leaders publicly, would never change, regardless of Board action. Or so they insisted until a better rip-off was found.

Additionally, legislative action in 1971, and already introduced this year, call for an evaluation of incidental fee funding—a direct result of OSPIRG's activities. Mine is not the only action questioning their legality. All interested students are urged to contact me for more information.

As the tortoise indicated to the frivolous hare—I may be slow, but I'm sure of a victory.

Gerald M. Swibies
19611 N.E. Glisan
Portland, Oregon 97230



— IN MEMORY OF BRAD BOSWELL, CPL USMC —