

EDITORIAL

It's time to dismantle daycare co-op system

The time has come for York's co-op daycare to consider another form of management. The 110-child Centre was established in the mid-'70s with all the ideals that a co-op incorporates, but because of reduced parental time commitments and the inability of parents to make long-term financial decisions which are beneficial to the Centre, a new management system is desperately needed.

Currently, the daycare enjoys a landlord-tenant relationship with the university, but in reality the daycare could not exist without ongoing university support.

First, the daycare receives free space from the university plus janitorial service (which has been increased from 28 hours to 40 hours per week). The university has contributed over \$14,000 to the Centre through renovations to the facility in order to provide quality child care. Finally, the university has given the daycare a courtesy account which enables staff to receive cheques issued by York, and gives the daycare up to 60 days to settle all outstanding loans. Unfortunately, the account presently stands at an almost \$70,000 deficit. With the recent strike settlement, which could potentially raise the Centre's expenses by 13%, there is literally no financial relief in sight.

Many things have contributed to this financial dilemma. It started in the early '80s as parents reduced their weekly commitment to help out with the Centre from four hours a week to just an hour, forcing the daycare to hire more staff. Then in 1984, parents decided to cut nine positions from enrolment without raising fees, thus causing the Centre to incur a deficit of \$45,000 in that year alone. This is evidence of how many parents will keep their fees low during their tenure on the co-op, yet they will not make decisions based on long-term financial considerations.

Therefore, the only viable option left for the daycare is to first request that the university either write off its present debt or reduce it as a grant, just as the University of Toronto did with its daycare in 1984. In turn, the university can demand the dismantling of the co-op and the establishment of an independent management board where the university can defend its financial investment and ensure that the daycare does not fall into the same dire straits. While co-op daycare was a nice concept for the '70s, it's simply not a financially viable option for the '80s.

Yap's senseless move

It's amazing how many people have misconstrued *Excalibur's* October 1 editorial entitled "McCreadie must develop more conciliatory attitude." But once an editorial is published it becomes public domain, open to any interpretation. The crux of the argument, however, was that the onus falls on any leader to resolve ongoing disputes within an organization.

CYSF President Drew McCreadie recently attempted to reconcile his conflict with Social and Cultural Affairs Director Meiyin Yap through a coordinated executive effort. McCreadie did his part, as the editorial suggested, by abandoning his confrontational stance and initiating some sort of reconciliation. However, in order for such a process to work, Yap had to be responsive to McCreadie's and other executive members' efforts to include her in the operations of the Council. Instead of choosing to involve herself within the system, Yap resigned. In reality, Yap decided foolishly to set out on a personal vendetta against McCreadie and in the end abandoned her portfolio responsibilities.

What Yap is trying to prove by leaving Council right before the Multicultural Festival is hard to say. Certainly she has bolstered McCreadie's credibility, ruined her own and left the entire executive in a precarious position with the task of organizing the Festival.

After her resignation, Yap claimed, "My efforts for a more effective working relationship have only resulted in immature retorts and insulting memos from Drew." Too bad Yap never really tried to meet the executive's attempts at reconciliation, to end this ridiculous memo ritual, and work out her problems with McCreadie face to face. If she was so committed to her job as she was to her vendetta, perhaps she would have stayed on at least to complete her responsibilities for coordinating the Festival.



"Orientation" is puerile, sexist

Dear Editor,

The article "Bethune Orientation 1987" in the October 7, 1987 issue of *Lexicon* demands comment. The article describes various Orientation activities including a Scavenger Hunt organized by the College. I believe this particular activity to be offensive, and perhaps, indicative of the overall flavour of Orientation in general (i.e. immature).

For example, sending snickering college kids into a gay bar may seem innocent and funny, but it is *not!* Gay bars exist, in part, because lesbians and gay men have been, and continue to be, excluded from society at large. Gay bars developed as places where lesbians and gay men could gather together without the fear of violence. And away from the kinds of heterosexist ridicule (intended or not) that is implicit in this Scavenger Hunt. Homosexual men and women are people deserving of dignity and respect—and should not be the brunt of puerile college humour.

The degree of macho-male, heterosexual sexism evident in this Hunt is appalling, especially when it comes from a (supposedly) intellectual and mature community such as York... such as Bethune. Having to obtain the name and telephone number of the "blonde waitress at Tobys" is strictly harassment. (Were no women involved in this Hunt? Did no one object to this?) Women working in restaurants are poorly-paid—and paid less than men. They are victims of a (male-ordered) system that forces them to "put out" for tips and they rely on tips to make economic ends meet. Restaurant work is hard enough as it is. The last thing someone needs is to have to run interference with "hot to trot" college boys and girls playing games. Work is not a game to these women. And a woman giving out her phone number to strangers leaves herself open to further harassment. I hope this particular waitress had the good sense not to cooperate.

And yet a further example of insensitivity and sexist orientation was the request that the participants find out "the average price of a hooker on Jarvis Street." Obviously the kids (and I use the word "kids" on purpose) have little idea of what goes on in the real world. Men and women in the sex trades industry are not deserving of the kind of humiliation and harassment offered them by York students. They get enough harassment as is from the johns and jocks cat-calling and pleading for discounts. And from the cops and judges hassling them with discriminatory laws and regulations. Men and women in the sex trades have a job to do. Leave them alone. Stop reinforcing the stereotypes about prostitution and the sexist notion that prostitutes are deserving only of scorn and laughter. They are deserving of dignity and respect and have a right to work. Let them get on with it.

Perhaps we could organize a Subculture Scavenger Hunt and have lesbians and hustlers, whores, waitresses and gay men come to York and play games during exams. After all, fair's fair.

This Hunt was probably undertaken merely in the guise of "good humour" and "clean fun" but even so, it was undertaken without thinking, and without any awareness for the feelings of, and the consequences for, its victims. To the women and men in the Sex Trades, to women in general, and to lesbians and gay men this Hunt was not "good clean fun." It was another example of stupid, unfeeling, unthinking, bigoted, heterosexism. One can only hope that people who plan future orientation activities do so with some degree of insight and intellect.

—Bruce Eakin

Red Scare article thin on research

To the Editor:
The article entitled "The New Red Scare" touched upon an important topic that deserves more explanation and analysis than you allocated.

The preamble of Graham Thomp-

son's article described the phenomenon of the '60s (and early '70s) as a "liberal era." This is hardly true. During the height of this "liberal era," a then-perceived conservative candidate, Richard M. Nixon, easily won the Presidency (and later won re-election with a similarly huge mandate). The '60s and early '70s were not a "liberal era," but rather a period in American history where the mobilization of a minority radical left dominated the political agenda. Today we have the opposite.

To know American historical, political and social development is to understand that Americans are politically more conservative than Canadians. The left and right (Liberal and Conservative) are equally represented in American politics, whereas the Canadian political spectrum is dominated by parties from the centre to the radical left. Therefore, it is important for the author of the article, and Canadians in general, to realize that what they conceive to be the reactionary right (or New Right) is in the American mind a norm.

The late '70s and '80s has seen a delayed reaction to the radical movement and mobilization of the '60s and '70s. The Heritage Foundation, Accuracy in Media, and the many other organizations that are the topic of Mr. Thompson's article are a reaction to not only the radical left, but also the liberal media and academe that have moved from a conservative stance in the '50s to their present status.

One further fault in Mr. Thompson's article deals with his reliance on wholly unreliable sources. After presenting a strongly negative, and somewhat simplistic review of the New Right, he relies on the *New Republic* to explain this conservative reaction of the last decade. Being the most prominent of left wing literature, the *New Republic* is of course not exactly the most unbiased source. To state that people are attracted to the New Right in order to challenge the "established authority," as did the "student radicals of the 1960s," illustrates a total lack of understanding of the maturing

cont'd on page 5

EXCALIBUR

Editor	James Flagal
Production Manager	Kevin Connolly
Arts Editors	Adam Kardash, Jennifer Parsons
News Editors	David Dollard, Deborah Dundas, Jeff Shinder
Sports Editors	The Jim Hoggett Brothers
Features Editor	Zena McBride
Photo Editor	Babak Amirfeiz
Mascot	Ryan McBride
Staff	David Ackerman, Darren Alexander, Pat Anderson, Dave Baas, Stacey Beauchamp, Sujata Berry, Gary Blakeley, Christine Bouchard (see "Heather Sangster"), Richard Burdett, Lidia Miranda Cabral, Angela Catallo, Michelle Cheung, Len Cler-Cunningham, Paul Conroy, Blair E. Cosgrove, Jennifer Crane, Peter B. Cronsberry, Hasnain Dattu, Ron "Legs" Diamond, Mark Eklove, Dr. Lorne Foster, Anna "M.I.A." Garibotti, Dave Gershkovitch, Karen Golightly (and carry a big stick), Christine Gomes, Karim "Conflict of Interests, what Conflict of Interests?" Hajee, Russ Hoffman, Clark Hoskin, Ron Howe (-erd), Mark Hunter, Pierre Imlay, Congratulations to Mary Jankulak, Farah S. Jamal-Majors, Ken "Kabuki" Keobke, Lorne Manly, Garry H. Marr, John Mazzilli, Amy Menon, Montreal Jubilation Gospel Choir, Lisa Olsen, Joanne Oud, "Tim" O. Riordan, Pete Peng, Lisa Penn, Nancy Phillips, Mario Pietrangelo, Laura Pratt, Michael Redhill, Tracey Reid Irvine, Lisa-Lisa Roosen-Runge, Heather Sangster (see "Christine Bouchard"), Lee Schnaiberg, Lisa Snoddon, Steve "Boys of" Somer, Andrew Sun, Vince Torreiri, Gary Verrinder, Steve Wise, Wynndham Wise, Meiyin Yap, Kaan Yigit
Board of Publications Chairperson	Brigitta Schmid
Advertising Assistant	Patty Milton-Feasby
Johnny Typesetting	Stuart Ross
Typesetting Assistant	Linda Fogazzi
Mr. Distribution	Graham Thompson
Advertising Manager	Merle Menzies

EDITORIAL: 736-5239
TYPESETTING: 736-5240
ADVERTISING: 736-5238

MAILING ADDRESS:
Room 111, Central Square
York University
4700 Keele Street
Downsview M3J 1P3