

## SRC threatens college system?

Some people at York believe the college system is doomed. They further believe the formation of the SRC now under consideration by the student councils will be a major factor in this downfall.

Who's kidding whom?

We do not deny that the formation of an SRC can pose a threat to the freedom and importance of some of its constituent members -- particularly the undergraduate college councils. But we do say that this danger does not have to exist -- certainly not to the degree imagined by some. Incorporation of the many diverse bodies such as MBA, Atkinson, undergraduate college councils and possibly faculty associations can add strength to, rather than weaken any of the individual members.

But the role an SRC will play at York will be of little consequence to the college system.

The failure of the college system will not originate primarily from the students. It will come from the administration.

The administration will decide, if they have not done so already, the eventual fate of the York experiment. And their hand will be forced by financial and departmental considerations -- not student activities.

One rumour often heard is that the provincial grant to York will be cut. If this is true the college system may prove to be too expensive.

York has also learned that a college is too small a base for an effective academic department.

Students have an exaggerated opinion of their own importance if they think the formation of an SRC will destroy the college system. A centralized clearing-house for student voices is required to deal with a centralized administration.

## SRC constitution undermines college system

The following are Jeff Solway's impressions of the ACSA meeting last Wednesday evening. They are not presented as the official stand of ACSA, nor as the personal opinions of Jeff Solway.

The new SRC constitution, ratified to date, severely undermines the college system at York University. That was the general feeling at the ACSA meeting held last Wednesday.

The constitution was seen as a move toward the centralization characteristic of most North American multi-universities. York, however, was not designed in this way. It was based on a system of individual colleges and its student government should reflect this characteristic.

It would be much easier to run a multi-university as a large homogenous body than as twelve separate colleges, from both the student and administration point of view. The suggested form of SRC is a move in this centralized direction.

The student move may be the first step in a chain reaction of lethal proportions. With a university-wide state of mind, the extra millions of dollars spent to build this institution on a college basis might seem unnecessary. There has not yet been a final decision to go ahead with construction of the next college complex. It is possible that the buildings comprising Founders, Vanier, Winters and McLaughlin Colleges will be some day looked upon as strange anachronisms, vestigial remnants of a forgotten dream.

ACSA felt that administration and faculty will have to make greater efforts to work with students on a college basis, if students are to feel that college-based government is sufficient for most internal matters. This and all the above comments deal primarily with Article Three, section one (a) and section two of the proposed constitution.

Most ACSA members seemed to agree that there is a need for a university-wide organization, but all felt that any tendency to centralization away from the college system should be restricted.

### PROPOSED CONSTITUTION, STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

#### ARTICLE THREE: FUNCTION

##### Section One

The functions of the S.R.C. shall be the following:

a) To represent the interests of its constituent members before the governing bodies, both administrative and academic, of the whole university.

##### Section Two

The S.R.C. shall take precedence over all governing bodies of the constituent members in the five specific areas outlined in this article.

## Excalibur

student weekly of york  
university downsvew, ont.

editor-in-chief  
managing editor  
assistant editor  
news editor  
features editor  
entertainment editor  
sports editor  
photo editor  
layout editor  
circulation  
office manager

fred nix  
dave warga  
ross howard, anita levine  
mike snook  
gary gayda  
don mckay  
frank trotter  
clark hill  
richard levine  
karen junke  
frances de angelis

excalibur is a member of the canadian university press and is published weekly by the students of york university. opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the student councils or the university administration.

offices: room 019A, founders college, york university, downsvew



### DEBATE STILL RAGES

Dear Sirs;

As a rank-and-file member of the York University Debating Society (YUDS) I feel impelled to add my observations to the recent "York Debate Club President Ousted" issue.

First I believe the ouster to be illegal. The charges presented against Mr. Lubek at that meeting were ill-defined and ill-expressed as well as unsubstantiated. The Duties of the president were not then defined and as yet still await definition by the proposed new constitution of the society. A non-confidence vote was illegal procedure-wise. The president can only be removed by impeachment.

Secondly I believe the ouster of President Lubek to be immoral. If I find as a member, that usually only six to eight people show up at any given Debating Society meeting. At the "ouster" meeting over 20 people were present including many unfamiliar or long-forgotten faces. I have no need to play dumb. I know what they were there for. Larry Rappoport had told me the day before the meeting.

Conversation subsequent to that infamous meeting proved rather interesting. Mr. Richard Bannigan (F III), Chairman YUDS revealed that he knew Larry had intended to impeach Lubek, adding that he "could not deny the truth" and typifying Mr. Rappoport's actions as "vengeance, pure vengeance". (This quote used with the very reluctant permission of R.B.)

From Richard Sands (VII) member Vanier College Council and as he now describes himself, ex-member York Debating Society, I learned that Mr. Rappoport had urged his attendance at this Debating Society meeting and had revealed his intentions to him. Mr. Sands told me "everyone present know the intentions of the meeting" adding that he felt "the meeting was not spontaneous."

The conclusion I draw from these statements is that opinion had led and shaped, and Mr. Rappoport did the leading and shaping.

### letters to us

I am aware of different executive positions being proposed to various people prior to the meeting. I am also aware of people being exhorted to come to an anti-Lubek meeting. On the day before the meeting Mr. Larry Rappoport said to me "Come tomorrow, we're going to get Lubek." However in my own case I feel he must have mistook me for an anti-Lubek man for when I took exception to this remark he did not press the point very hard.

Whatever the exact words, shades of meaning, etc. offered to the others is slightly irrelevant. What is important is that the Debating Society meeting was "packed" or again, in the quaint words of Mr. Sands "not spontaneous". All the foregoing indicates to me that "something is rotten in the state of Denmark."

Steward Ross V II

### NON-RATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Dear Sir,

Your lead article in the November 10, 1967 edition of your publication has come to my attention.

I note that your editorial supports the view that part-time degree students who are members of York University should not be afforded the opportunity to stand for election to the office of president and vice-president of the university-wide student government which is proposed. You might wish to consider whether or not deciding that part-time degree students should not be eligible for election to those offices involves discrimination.

It is my hope as indeed it was the hope of those who proposed that Atkinson College be established that members of this College would not become "second class citizens" in the York University community. The original proposal by York University to the Atkinson Charitable Foundation which led to the establishment of Atkinson College stated in part "surely these students (part-time degree students) whose sacrifice to continue their education is considerable and whose potential is often very great, deserve every possible opportunity

for development."

In your editorial you refer to "the more conservative views of an equal Atkinson student vote." In addition you state that "the university is the prime concern of a full-time student. It is only a secondary concern of Atkinson students." These are interesting statements. I would be interested to know what bases exist in fact for such statements.

The reference to 'The life-blood of the university' is also of interest. Are you intending to suggest that part-time students to say nothing of the faculty are not part of 'the life-blood' of the university? On the basis of what evidence have you decided that an Atkinson student vote would be more conservative? How do you know that 'the university' is the prime concern of full-time students and 'only a secondary concern of Atkinson students'?

There are in my view two types of communications: rational communications and non-rational communications. Rational communications are in the long term interest of all concerned. Non-rational communications are not in the long term interests of those who make them or those to whom they are addressed. Editors of newspapers have a responsibility to communicate rationally. They do a disservice to themselves, their readers, their communities, the free press and freedom generally when they communicate otherwise.

It is my hope that all of us working together will be able to build a community of learning in York University. If such a community is to emerge all who are granted membership in York University must be treated as far as possible on a basis of equality as individuals who seek and wish to learn whether or not they are here for longer or shorter periods. For York University to develop on any other basis would result in the perpetuation of unnecessary antagonism and senseless rivalries which in their many varieties have impeded human development throughout history.

D. McCormack Smyth, Dean  
Atkinson College