

# editorial

## You need a health plan

Health care — do you care?

York students on the main campus will have the opportunity to implement a comprehensive and inexpensive health plan next week from October 30 to November 3.

Currently, unless students are covered by a plan from work or by one held by a parent or spouse, they pay, from their own pockets, for any medical expense not covered by OHIP. This can range from getting a prescription filled to seeing a chiropractor.

The health plan, proposed by CYSF vice-president (internal) Caroline Winship, will be for all York students and their dependants. It will cover 100 per cent of all prescription drug costs as well as providing partial payment for chiropractors, physiotherapists, psychologists, masseurs, speech pathologists, naturopaths, prosthetic appliances, ambulance service and other medical necessities.

And, it will only cost \$52.08 per student for 12 months —providing students vote to implement the plan that includes oral contraceptives.

The CYSF is giving students the option of voting for one of two plans — one with and one without oral contraceptives. The plan without them will cost \$42.72. If students chose the plan with them, the CYSF will distribute condoms for free from its office at 105 Central Square.

Some students have been arguing that men should not have to pay for oral contraceptives, a drug only women take, while the religious beliefs of others prohibit them from condoning the use of birth control.

Even so, we hope York students will choose the plan that includes oral contraceptives.

Although men do not take the Pill, the women they sleep with do. Men should be sharing the financial responsibility for sex along with emotional and physical responsibilities.

Also, students will be paying for many drugs they do not take through the plan. Most people are not diabetic, but insulin will be covered.

And for those who do not condone the use of birth control, many women are on the Pill for other medical reasons. Some take it to regulate their menstrual cycles, and others take it to prevent heavy bleeding that can lead to anemia. Students voting for the plan without contraceptives will be indirectly discriminating against these women.

The Graduate Students Association (GSA) has not given its constituents the option of voting for a plan without oral contraceptives. President of the GSA Lee Wiggins said, "Oral contraceptives are not an issue. Oral contraceptives should be part of the costs, and we didn't want them targeted as special items. That's the basis of social services — paying for something not everyone uses."

We agree.

Also, financially, the plan makes sense. The average cost for a one-month supply of birth control pills is \$16. That's \$192 a year compared the \$52.08 plan which will cover all other drugs on top of these and other medical expenses.

The price of other drugs also makes the plan attractive. A week's supply of amoxicillin to fight a strep throat infection can cost anywhere from \$10 to \$12. If you get sick once and see your chiropractor a few times, the plan will have paid for itself.

Also, students who are worried that they will have to pay for the plan even though they are already covered by another one need not worry. They will be able to opt out. So, even if you are not going to use the plan you should vote.

In order to make the referendum valid 2,500 students must vote next week. This is the highest voter turnout ever required by any referendum or election in the history of this university.

So take your student card and a few friends with you to a voting booth. Winship has arranged a great plan and York students should take advantage of it.

Health care . . . you've got to care.

## EXCALIBUR

**Editor** . . . . . Nancy Phillips  
**Assistant Editor** . . . . . Heather Sangster  
**Production Manager/Art Director** . . . . . Amanda Jane Keenan  
**Cover** . . . . . Julie Lawrence  
**Illustrations** . . . . . Frank W. Cameron, Joseph Greenbaum  
**News Editors** . . . . . Susan Vanstone, Daniel Wolgelerenter  
**Arts Editors** . . . . . Jeannine Amber, Roslyn Angel, Mikel Koven  
**Sports Editors** . . . . . Jacob Katsman, Josh Rubin  
**Features Editor** . . . . . Howard Kaman  
**Photography Editors** . . . . . Jennifer Crane, André Sourojou  
**Production Staff** . . . . . Jane Burkett, Melissa Campeau, Rosa Dragonetti, Michele Green, Linda Lake, Lisa Penn, Bob Shairulla  
**Staff** . . . . . Brian Amuchastegui, Nancy Bevan, Paul Brooks, Trevor Burnett, Rob Cabral, Morley Conn, Alan Cooke, Candice Cooper, Jerry Cowan, Sharon Creelman, Randy Dearlove, Tim Doucette, Paul Ferris, Renato Filice, Paul Gazzola, Andrew Goss, Kristy Gordon, Isabel Granic, Paul Headrick, Tania Hewett, Valerie Hochschild, Jim Hoggett, Zubin Hooshangi, Dave Horton, Pamela Jarvis, Barbara Kaczor, Anton Katz, Shawna Kaufman, Marla Krakower, Julie Lawrence, Dina Lebo, Jessie Lee, Donna Mason, Andy Marshall, Ian McMullen, Stephen Mitchell, Stephen Moses, Mark Moss, Elizabeth Murtha, Ira Nayman, Jessica Rudolph, Sydney St. Nicholas, Riccardo Sala, Jason Schwartz, Pam Serkowney, Cynthia Sharp, Natalia Smith, Anna Spalvieri, Karen Sugar, Randall Terada, Ken Turriff, Enza Vaccher, Tina Wood, Mark Wright  
**Advertising Manager** . . . . . Merle Menzies  
**Advertising Assistants** . . . . . Jeff Kippel, Patty Milton-Rao  
**Advertising Rep** . . . . . Meiyin Yap  
**Typesetter** . . . . . Mary Jankulak  
**Board of Publications Chairperson** . . . . . Kevin Connolly

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

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



## letters

### Reader criticizes pro-choice opinion piece

Dear Editors:

After reading the one-sided article (I like the grey "opinion" behind the huge headline) by Jessica Rudolph, "Right to Life vs. Pro-Choice," I was appalled. I mean, a newspaper should have its own political orientation, but blatantly advertising one's bias by highlighting a piece of political propaganda disguised as an article is a bit much.

Now Rudolph made some good points, the Right to Life (Anti-Choice) movement has basically done some idiotic things. They are desperate and out of control. If they think hanging bloodstained baby-dolls on sticks is going to gain sympathy, they're crazy. I am also disgusted with their use of picketing children. These kids don't understand what they are protesting and shouldn't be forced to one side or the other. Their belief that they have a monopoly on God is ludicrous. Morality is just the majority's belief. If society said it was alright to steal cars, God would think it mighty fine also. Finally, the Anti-Choice movement must maintain legal methods of protesting. Some of our laws are pretty stupid, but that isn't one of them. Chanting and picketing is okay. Barricades and bibles aren't.

Of course the Pro-Choice (Anti-Life) movement isn't without sin itself. An example of "emotional manipulation" is Rudolph's constant use of the phrases "choice" and "women's choice." To be Anti-Choice is to be against all of what democracy is about. Just as being Anti-Life is to be against all of what humanity stands for. Both sides use guilt as a weapon. You're either against choice or against life. They are ploys aimed at the heart, not at the mind.

I am neither Pro-Choice (Anti-Life) nor Pro-Life (AntiChoice). I am Pro-Thought (Anti-Guilt). The whole abortion issue gets down to

whether or not a fetus is a baby, and who really betters from an abortion. On the first point we must decide what truly makes us human. After about six to eight weeks a fetus is just the same as us, a wriggling mass of flesh, using its tiny brain every so often. The only difference is we can't see it and it cannot rationalize. If the former is the reason for abortion, murder while wearing a blindfold should also be legal. If the latter is the reason, then we should be allowed to kill infants. They don't rationalize; they are primal savages with only the potential for coherent and rational thought. Just like a fetus.

Next, I must truly question who betters from an abortion. The whole argument "Make every child a wanted child" holds as much water as a sieve. With the current demands on adoption agencies, an infant will find a good, loving home where he or she will feel wanted. I have known many (no, not all) adopted people. All are stable individuals who feel no anger nor regret for being adopted. Most abortions are done for generally selfish reasons, such as bother and inconvenience. If abortionists feel nine months of childbearing is an inconvenience, well then a lifetime of impoverished-bearing through taxes is a real bitch. Maybe we should stop it too.

Now no one should be forced to keep a pregnancy derived from rape. That would be like being forced to accept your house being burglarized from rape. That would be like being forced to accept your house being burglarized and told that your items were the thief's now. Also, no woman should be forced to give up her physical existence (die) to have a child. With the high possibility of the child dying also, it's not worth the risk.

I would also like to mention that this is not only a women's issue.

No pregnancy could possibly occur without male involvement. If abortion remains legal, the male's rights must also be acknowledged. Both parents must agree for termination, with silence meaning agreement. Therefore, just as a man cannot force a woman to have an abortion, no woman should be allowed to tell a man she is going to kill his future son or daughter. If this were allowed it would destroy the "choice" which Pro-Choice types so high.

In my opinion, no unwanted pregnancy should ever occur. There are 100 per cent methods of birth control (sic), but most choose to ignore them. For the people who want temporary birth control, maybe one is not enough. The construction worker avoids accidents not just by wearing a helmet, but by also wearing gloves, goggles and steel-toed boots. An unwanted child is an accident.

The problem is that many times no birth control is used. Why? We refuse to see sex as anything but something dirty and bad, and condoms or pills as evil or "icky." We must broaden our minds and lift the covers of taboo, to show the world that sex is good and occurs from 13 year olds to 70 year olds. We must make sex education more than "you're body is going through changes." Only if sex is accepted as a part of life, and a good one, will people be able to buy and use contraceptives as easily as they buy and wear underpants.

In conclusion, to be fair to fetus and female alike, do not listen to the rhetoric of the Pro-Choice movement, do not listen to the preaching of the Pro-Life movement, to make the right decision listen inside yourself, not to your heart, but to your mind.

Sincerely,  
 Karl J. Borst

## Excal boost

Dear Editors:

This letter is to commend you all on a job well done. I think that your efforts to put out a paper twice monthly for the summer was especially good. The staff in the Office of Student Programmes-Arts and the students who frequent our office have had a lot of positive comments about the 'New Look.'

Thank you for such great work and keep at it. You have some hardy fans out here in the York Community.

Jane Skinner  
 OSP-Arts

## humourless

Dear Editors:

Why is it that some journalists have no sense of humour? Reviewer Paul Gazzola did not find any laughs in the paper/skit that I recently gave at the recent 15th Annual Conference on Social Theory, Politics and the Arts. Maybe it was too subtle? Maybe it was the delivery? Is this a trend?

With concern,  
 Joseph Kispal-Kovacs



We will publish, space permitting, letters up to 250 words. They must be typed, double spaced, accompanied by the writer's name and phone number. Libellous material will be rejected. Deliver to 111 Central Square during business hours.