Free Speech

Oil and money

Mr. James Carlisle's comments on Ed Broadbent's recent Petrocan speech (Dead end Socialism, Excalibur, Sept. 13) were predictably facile, and display the total disregard for, or ignorance of, economic and political reality that is so typical of the arch-conservative mentality.

To suggest that a pro-Petrocan stand is not in the best interest of all of Canada is quite incredible, since the alternative is to allow Canada's already minimal control of the energy sector to fall entirely into the hands of foreign multinational corporations. If the government has, indeed, had any power to compel private oil companies to carry out its priorities, such power has never been exercised, and never will be by any rightwing government.

The private, primarily foreign oil companies will not carry out exploration where they cannot make a huge profit; particularly, in the high Arctic and the Atlantic Continental Shelf. Exploration is taking place in these areas only because Petrocan took the risk and initiative by its offers of joint equity participation. Even oil company executives attest to this fact. At a time of impending energy shortage for Canadians, exploration in the high-risk, high-cost areas is vital; the foreign oil giants will not undertake this expensive exploration on their own, contenting themselves with draining our proven and easily recoverable reserves.

Mr. Carlisle's statements to the effect that the Canadian government and Crown Corporations are not answerable to the public, and cannot be counted upon to act in the nation's interest, are tantamount to saying that foreign multinationals are more trustworthy than Canadians. While this erroneous view displays a

touching degree of blind faith in the likes of Imperial Oil, Shell, Texaco, etc., it patently ignores the fact that the principle goal of 'free enterprise' is the quest for private profit. If the profit-takers are foreigners, by definition their interests cannot be the same as those of the Canadian people.

The proposals to sell Petrocan (and other profitable Crown Corporations) are misleading and weak for a number of reasons. 1) Canadians already own Petrocan. 2) The resultant profit from the sale would be relatively small and ephemeral; future Petrocan profits would go into a few hands after the Canadian public took the risk and expense to build Petrocan into a profitable Crown corporation. What is needed now is a Canadian controlled energy company that will assure us of a long term, reliable source of energy. 3) Shares of Petrocan sold to Canadians could, and would, be rapidly bought up by the Americans. Joe Clark has stated that he will not oppose further foreign equity investment and takeovers of Canadian economic interests; he has already expressed his intention to scrap the Foreign Investment Review Agency. This would serve to leave Canada's energy sector almost entirely in the hands of foreign multinationals, who pay allegiance only to their bankers, and whose priorities are determined by their Income Statements.

Canada already has the highest level of foreign ownership of any industrialized country on earth. We are dangerously dependent on, in fact largely dominated by, American corporations. The ailing American economy is damaging our own; our foreign debt is dangerously high; we are being deindustrialized by retrenching foreign corporations, and the free-trade



continentalists are rearing their heads once more.

Most industrialized nations have a national petroleum company, as do many developing nations. The French and British national petroleum companies are in fact more active in Canada's oil fields than even Petrocan.

Raising the spectre of socialism whenever someone speaks up in favour of Canadian economic independence is trite and irrelevant. It has been successive Liberal and Conservative continentalist governments who have sold out our economy, and now seem intent on giving what's left to foreign multinationals, who would readily milk us dry.

Ed Broadbent's 'socialist vision' with regard to Petrocan is a vision of Canadians controlling their own economic lives. In this case, it happens to be a vision that a great majority of Canadians share. Most Members of Parliament want to keep Petrocan; most of Joe Clark's Cabinet want to keep it. Even oil company executives want to keep it. But, most importantly, the Canadian people want to keep Petrocan.

Duane V.J. Muyres

Student Federation Notes

For all those who have had the displeasure of standing in long lineups at the TD Bank, don't feel you are alone. The decision to close permanently the Founders sub-branch has rendered the situation at the main branch intolerable. In talking with both the manager and the district supervisor, they seem extremely reluctant to improve the quality of service presently offered. President Macdonald has been asked to intervene personally, and meetings between the administration and the bank are taking place. If you have any comments, drop into the office and sign one of the many petitions going around.

The Student Federation is considering participation in an Education Rally at Queen's Park on October 23. To discuss possible means of participation (Cutbacks Hurt Ontario's Children), there wil be an open meeting on Tueday, October 9 at noon in the Federation Office Room 105 Central Square.

Next week's Homecoming should provide the opportunity for both alumni and students to watch the Yeomen overpower the Waterloo contingent. After the game on Saturday, we are sponsoring York Fest in the Bethune Dining Hall from 4 pm to 7 pm. An oom-pah-pah band will provide entertainment.

Tonight is also the first night for Student Security on campus. They will be identified by their red jackets and will patrol from 9 pm to 1 am.

As well, buses for the York—U of T football game will leave the Ross Building ramp at 6 pm. Tickets for both the game and the bus are available in the office.

Yesterday afternoon I met with Dr. Bette Stephenson, Minister of Colleges and Universities. A full report of the proposed new tuition policy will be carried in next week's paper.

Keith Smockum

Correspondence

The Rill Thing

Re: article "Rill roasted by hungry students". Any man that is here at York to sell food at such ridiculous prices should have his noodle examined. But what is more outrageous is that this man, Rill, takes us for granted. He states: "I'm not here for any reason at all which is financial." What are you here for then Rill—to make a fool of us? Come on Rill, get off the pot. We already know you are a capitalist.

Dirk Heinze

I Told You So

With regard to your editorial of September 27, 1979, I refer you to the minutes of just one of the many meetings that Excalibur has had with the Board of Publications over the past four years and on which the executives of CYSF were always present.

This meeting was held on February 2, 1978, at which then CYSF President Paul Hayden was present as well as future president, David Chodikoff.

According to the minutes, "The Business Manager pointed out that at the rate that CYSF were cutting their grant to the paper, Excalibur was not being given

the chance to survive. She pointed out that there was a definite recession in the market which was affecting everyone and that trends pointed to it getting worse before getting better, and recommended that Excalibur seek independent financing as the paper was being enjoyed by everyone in the community and only being financed by CYSF, who themselves were being subjected to cutbacks. The business manager warned that Excalibur should not depend solely on advertising revenue to fund its paper and that a reasonable amount should be paid by each individual in the community for the convenience of obtaining concise news and also for the practical training which Excalibur provides...

"The business manager also pointed out that a commercial rate would have to be established and the ratio of advertising be raised if the paper is to survive on its advertising revenue alone, or on the existing small grant..."

"The business manager placed on record that she is not to be held responsible for the consequences if the paper does not establish the correct ratio since no proper funding is established for the paper. She reported that the paper is going

into a deficit and the end result could be bankruptcy for the paper if the Board does not get reasonable financing for the paper whether independently or otherwise."

Additionally, Excalibur's financial statements are not only circulated to CYSF, the members of the Board and indeed the university, but are published each year in the paper itself.

Two years ago, even the janitor who read Excalibur made the remark: "I see Excalibur is in trouble like everybody else."

Olga Graham Business Manager Excalibur Publications

Fiscal-Woahs

Last week's Excalibur editorial reflects the fact that you have still yet to comprehend the source of the paper's financial problems. There can be little argument with the reality of the CYSF's cutback of funding to the paper. But, the CYSF cuts are an insufficient explanation for a \$34,000 deficit.

The real source of the problem that you failed to fully outline is that the paper's own management did not monitor the expenses and losses of the paper over the last several years.

Furthermore, I suggest that these employee(s) did not make the Board of Publications (the body which governs the finances of Excalibur) aware of the paper's financial problems. At the same time, the CYSF did not know the seriousness of Excalibur's financial situation. The conclusion I draw is quite apparent. In the short term, Excalibur should consider a radical overhaul of the management staff and system. In the long term, Excalibur should first prove with several years of financial consistency that they will not waste students' money before seeking independent funding. Let us face reality, would you want your money to go to a financially incompetent organization?

David W. Chodikoff Donald M. Sugg

Narrow Critics

Shortly after reading Ronald Ramage and Andrew C. Rowsome's reviews of Eraserhead, I went to attend a screening of the film. I was outraged by Ramage and Rowsome's pretentious and clearly one dimensional comments; and that from two gentlemen who like to

think of themselves as film students. I, of course, thought the film was wonderful. It is an audio and visual representation of everyone's wildest fantasies and deepest emotions.

Lit, much in the highly expressionistic style of the film noir of the German thirties and American forties, sketched with grossly satirical caricatures of everything that "America stands for", and scored with a brilliantly stomach turning, soul wrenching, obnoxious soundtrack, Eraserhead takes an honest and uncensored look at love, sex, the family, child rearing, conformity, repression, death and the marriage bed.

Anyone who finds the film gross or disgusting *is clearly missing the point. It is not meant to represent reality. It is, obviously, satire. The images are symbols used to illustrate the underlying themes, much like a descriptive poem which metaphorically rather than literally, tells its story.

Eraserhead is a courageous and powerful film, though one must wear one's "thinking cap" to perceive it as such, and should not be missed by anyone who dares to refer to themselves as intelligent, educated or trendy.

Karen Tully