

Oregon Daily Emerald

Tuesday, October 21, 1986

Eugene, Oregon

Volume 88, Number 34

Affirmative action office faces policy complaints

By Michael Rivers
Of the Emerald

Barbara Pope, director of the women's studies department, has asked the University administration to appoint an independent committee to look into the University's policies and procedures on sexual harassment because of complaints by some women who say current policies are ineffective.

But Bean Comrada, director of the University Office of Affirmative Action, said she "would hope people would complain if they felt that way."

"If people feel their grievances have not been treated appropriately for whatever reason, then they need to make that known," Comrada said.

A number of women — faculty, staff and students — expressed an interest in forming a committee last week after the Oregon Daily Emerald's Oct. 13 story which contained allegations of sexual harassment against former University professor Stephen Reynolds. The allegations, made by former students of Reynolds, claimed Reynolds purportedly had a long history of sexually harassing his female students.

Reynolds was convicted this past summer of the first-degree rape and first-degree sexual abuse of a five-year-old girl.

Alison Baker, executive assistant to the president, said that rather than appoint a new committee, she prefers that

the women go through regular channels. She suggested that Pope and other interested women go to the University Committee on the Status of Women with their concerns.

The committee was established by faculty legislation to advise the president on the status of women on campus, Baker said.

"If you appoint an independent committee, there's going to be as much controversy about who's going to be on the committee as well as about the issue," she said.

Besides, no women have expressed such an interest to the president, Baker said.

"I am sort of ignorant about exactly what the problem is," she said. "I have a problem defining the problem."

Baker isn't sure whether women are concerned because they are unaware of what the University policy is regarding sexual harassment, because they find the policy inadequate or because they believe the policy is inadequately administered, she said.

Connie Scolla, a University student and library aide at the Main Library, believes the policy is both inadequate and inadequately carried out.

Scolla went to the OAA in the spring of 1985 on the advice of her supervisor to report that she was being harassed by Reynolds.

Scolla talked to Comrada, who gave



Bean Comrada

her literature to read and told her of the options available to her, she said. According to Scolla, Comrada asked her to return after she had decided how she wanted to deal with the situation.

After perusing the material, Scolla decided she wanted to file a formal complaint against Reynolds, she said. She also decided to send him a registered letter telling him how she felt about the situation and asking him to discontinue his attentions, she said.

When Scolla told Comrada of her

decision, Comrada said that her proposed line of action was inappropriate for the given circumstances, and that it would be more effective just to write a letter and hand it to him, Scolla said.

But Scolla wanted to pursue a formal complaint, she said, because her understanding was that, by doing so, the incident would be investigated, the department head would be notified and the complaint would be noted in Reynolds' personal file.

"I wanted him to have some kind of recorded history in his personal file and in the Office of Affirmative Action," Scolla said. "I wanted to send him a registered letter so I could avoid another personal encounter with him."

But because Comrada was an authority figure, Scolla said, she figured Comrada was "the person to listen to and followed her recommendation."

Comrada helped her start the letter, Scolla said, but it took her three days to build up the courage to give it to Reynolds. After she gave him the letter, the harassment did stop, she said.

Even so, Scolla does not believe the problem was resolved as easily as it might have been.

"Affirmative action is not working," she said. "Something needs to be done so that things like this don't go as far as they have done."

Continued on Page 4

Many still unaware of alcohol's dangers

By Sarah Kitchen
Of the Emerald

According to a report published by the Will Rodgers Institute, many people need to know the facts, not the myths about alcohol.

In observation of the third National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week, the institute published tips on alcohol consumption. Tips include advising people who are going to drink to eat food high in fat before and during drinking, to space their drinks, and not to drive, even after just one drink.

The institute believes if more people are aware of the effects alcohol has on the body, and the amount of alcohol the body can tolerate within a certain amount of time, traffic fatalities may be reduced. As it stands now, one American dies in an alcohol-related traffic accident every 35 minutes.

Karen White, administrative assistant for Alcohol Counseling and Education Services at 1461 Hilyard St., said she doesn't believe many people are aware of the driving-while-intoxicated rules.

"Not many people realize that the alcohol blood level limit of .08 is not a minimum; a person can be arrested for having even less alcohol in his bloodstream," White said.

White said for a 150-pound male, .08 is equal to two drinks in a two-hour period.

"Also, not many people know that if someone is stopped for driving under the influence and refuses to take a breathalyzer test, his or her license will be automatically suspended for one year," White said.

"If a person fails the breathalyzer test, his or her license may be suspended for three months, during which time an occupational license may be issued," White added.

The Will Rodgers Institute also reports that there are certain myths about alcohol many people still believe, or do not understand. A stimulant such as caffeine will not reduce the amount of alcohol in the blood, a cold shower will not do any good either.

According to Maureen Jenne, a counselor at Drinking Decisions, 1188 Olive St., social drinkers should learn to space their drinks, keeping the consumption of alcohol to one drink per hour. Staying occupied while drinking also will

Continued from Page 1

Marijuana legislative issue raises heated discussion

By X. Kang Xie
Of the Emerald

For the second event of the University's Alcohol Drug Awareness Week, the Associated Students of the University of Oregon sponsored a panel discussion on the Oregon Marijuana Initiative, Ballot Measure Five.

Lane County District Attorney Doug Harclerod debated with John Sajoe and Sandee Burbank, two drug law reform activists before approximately 60 people who attended the event.

"Everyone agrees that our society has a problem with drug abuse, the real hard question is what we're going to do about it," Sajoe said.

"As far as marijuana goes, we've tried marijuana prohibition. We've tried it for 50 years. But what have we accomplished?" he said.

In 1935, when marijuana was made illegal for the first time, over 100,000 people tried it, Sajoe said. By 1986, 70 million people have tried the drug, he said. Looking at these statistics, Sajoe believes that marijuana prohibition has failed.

"Now we should try a different approach," Sajoe said.

The measure will allow adults to grow and possess marijuana in private for their personal consumption. Using



Photo by Shu-Shing Chen

John Sajoe, left, Doug Harclerod, center, and Sandee Burbank discuss issues surrounding Ballot Measure Five

the drug in public, and use by minors would remain illegal.

"I think when we're considering Ballot Measure Five people need to remember that we're not voting on marijuana... we're voting whether or not adults should be arrested and go to jail for their choice on using marijuana."

Burbank, director of the Yes on 5 Tour, believes the law is good because of its stipulation that the drug will be for private use only.

District Attorney Harclerod disagrees. If the ballot measure is passed, people will think it is

now legal to privately consume and cultivate marijuana, he said.

"That is 100 percent wrong," he said. "It is still a violation of federal law."

The federal law will still be in effect, he said, so even if the law passes it will still be illegal under federal law and there will not be sufficient power to prosecute all of the cases, Harclerod said.

The law is ambiguous, and leaves interpretation between public and private use, and selling and cultivating of the drug, he said.