

hospitable to them in accordance with an order of priorities, and subject, of course, to experience that would support a refusal to permit any further use of its facilities or premises.

The use of the University name for merely descriptive purposes ought not to be, perhaps cannot be, prohibited. The same is not true with respect to the University's motto or coat of arms. The University may wish to consider carefully whether it will give permission for use by any staff or student association of the University motto or coat of arms. This is not a matter for this Committee's recommendation one way or the other. So far as concerns the descriptive use of the University name, the Committee recommends that the University ask any staff or student organization to notify it of such use. It would be advisable for the University to publish in its calendar a notice that the use of the University name, other than for descriptive purposes, or the use of the motto or coat of arms is forbidden without proper prior approval; and, further, that the descriptive use of the name or any use of the motto or coat of arms carries with it no official University approval or responsibility for the aims or activities of the organizations that so use it.

Where any faculty member or student organization seeks financial assistance from the University for some project or some course of activity, the response must be a matter for the University's discretion. This Committee has no mandate to interfere in such matters by making recommendations thereon.

A different situation exists where the University through its Board of Governors compulsorily taxes students to provide a fund which is remitted to student organizations to enable them to finance their activities. The so-called student fee for extra-curricular programmes is included in the overall cost of enrolling in and attending the University; and in authorizing it the Board of Governors recognizes that this provides for a necessary part of University life, all the more important because it permits an exercise in self-government. The Committee does not believe that it is for it to recommend any particular level of fee for student activities or to recommend how the fee fund should be distributed to student organizations or what should be the eligibility requirements for a claim on the fund. Further, it is of opinion that the University and its Board of Governors need no instruction that the objects of expenditure of the student activity fund are a matter for the students to determine. However, there is a legitimate concern of the University that a proper accounting be given of expenditures. The Committee therefore recommends that in the interests of the student body as well as of the University as a whole, every campus organization which is the beneficiary of money granted by the University, or exacted from students by Board authority and remitted to student organizations by the University, should be required to have its accounts audited annually and the audit made public. The auditing requirements should be worked out with an officer of the University such as the Vice-President (Finance) or someone delegated by him.

Where the University merely deducts monies from the salaries of faculty members or others, as opposed to providing the money, there is no University interest to be served in requiring a proper accounting. The University is providing a service only, acting as a collection agent as a convenience for the benefited organization. Whether and to what extent the University wishes to do this are matters for it alone to determine. The Committee does not see that its mandate requires it to recommend any policy in this connection.

The Committee is aware of the fact that there is presently a regulation in force prohibiting mem-



Excalibur -- Dave Cooper

bership of York University students in fraternities, with an exception having been made in respect to legal fraternities when Osgoode Hall Law School became a faculty of the University. It is unnecessary to examine here either the reasons for the promulgation of the regulation at the inception of York University or the reasons for the exception. The Committee simply underlines the fact that freedom of association, which is an important value of the University community as well as of the wider community, cannot be limited to exclude one type of lawful association while supporting all others. The Committee is not called upon to express its approval or disapproval of fraternities any more than of any other organizations of faculty members

or of students. How far the University wishes to give them support, through permitting use of University premises or otherwise, is a different matter from prohibiting their formation or the association of students with them. Certainly, the University would be wrong to seek to visit any sanction upon faculty members or students who belong to or seek to join a fraternity or sorority.

In so far as fraternities or sororities practise discrimination in membership on grounds condemned by the public policy of Ontario under the Ontario Human Rights Code, the University would be entirely justified in refusing them any assistance or access to University facilities.

## 5. Residence liberties

Another dimension is added to the relations of the University with students where they reside on the campus and are not daily commuters. The University is in this respect a boardinghouse or lodginghouse keeper of a special kind; but what, in the Committee's view, is the dominant feature of the situation is the status of the residents. They are in residence in a College because they have been previously admitted as students. The Committee feels that the *in loco parentis* relationship, which it has rejected for students in general, should not be resurrected for residential students.

The development of residential Colleges has

been a feature of York University from its founding. Although it was realized that it would be impossible for financial reasons, if for no other, to house all York students on the campus or in University-owned or operated premises, it was nonetheless felt that provision of a residential feature for each College would have academic and collegial value for non-resident as well as resident student members of the College. The college is a community within a larger society; and the sense of community is reinforced for those whose home is in the College during the academic year. Moreover, college members participate in the formulation of the rules that govern the day-to-day operation of the

College and for the administration of which there is a College Council and a College Master, a University faculty member. The Senior Tutor and the Dons that staff each College provide academic and social direction to its resident as well as to its non-resident members.

This Committee is not aware of any dissatisfaction with the operation of the Colleges in their residential aspect, and considers therefore

continued next page