

Proposed draft policy statement avoids bureaucracy

by Larry Englander

I've often wondered why no one has ever written a How-To-Succeed-at-York-University-Without-Really-Trying Manual. And then I realized why: it's too simple. It wouldn't even fill a page. You just get a PhD, say the right things to the right people and before you know it — you're on the Senate! (There's also a harder way: make a few million bucks and get a seat on the Board of Governors.) Just think of all the power you could have, for example, as a Department Chairman: he teaches, he decides what's being taught, and he sits on the Senate without even having to run in an election.

Frankly, when I see one individual wielding so much authority, I become a trifle suspicious. We have various administrators pigeon-holed in their offices, making major

decisions — and we don't even know who they are.

As a trivial example of one we do know: Ed Annis single-handedly controlled the parking policy at York until the YSC executive hauled up the Reserved signs — then he decided that he'd better call a meeting of his committee (which didn't exist at the time).

A Draft Policy Statement was drawn up by Glen Murray and myself, when we were still on YSC, in order to avoid the power-centred bureaucracy. In the statement, we recommended that:

A central legislative body be established, hereafter referred to as the York University Legislature. The members of this body shall be freely elected from among all members of York University (members defined as faculty, students, and salaried staff) and its meetings shall be open. This body is to replace the present York University Senate.

Budget proportion, curriculum determina-

tion and the appointment and removal of the president and major administrative staff would be among its major powers.

All other councils on campus (including YSF) would become ancillary committees of the York University Legislature. The Board of Governors would become a Financial Advisory Committee, responsible to the Legislature.

Simple, yes? Also more democratic. And the colleges could be constituencies from which members of the Legislature would be elected; this would finally make the college system relevant to something more than card games and dances.

Most of us are here at York for an education. Perhaps if we democratized York just a little bit, we as students will be able to play a meaningful role in deciding what form our education takes. And, perhaps, when decisions are made out in the open, we won't get chapels and football teams stuffed down our throats.

This is Page Seven

This page talks of a better college system, by Mac Councillor Bill Moull.

This page talks of what should happen at York when students finally assume their responsibilities, by Larry Englander, ex-YSC commissioner.

This page talks of life at the real bottom of the pile, and how Canada openly twists the laws to illegally deny Americans entry to the country.

We got lots and lots of lyrical letters this week — see page six. Letters to the editor are the best way to make your viewpoint heard. People read them, people can see what other people think, and then more people will write letters. Someday with enough letters we'll understand each other.

This is Page Seven; it is your page to offer opinions and comment. It is your page for cartoons, photos, or long letters.

A case for the college system

by Bill Moull,
Mac Councillor

The necessity of the present college system at York is highly questionable. It is blamed for the prevalence of apathy, the failure of various social and cultural events, the lack of student solidarity in dealing with the faculty and the administration, and for other assorted problems.

But despite what the York Sunday Movement and other sundry individuals maintain, the college system does have a positive value. Moreover, its relevance lies in building something beneficial out of it, not in abandoning it because it is misunderstood.

The main purpose of the col-

lege system is to prevent over-centralization at all levels, and the resulting impersonalization that would soon follow. It attempts to provide small units of government and activity so that students will not feel completely lost in the mass bureaucracy of a multiversity.

At the moment, it is already difficult to imagine what orientation would be without the four colleges. While YSF has its advantages, it is based on the whole university, not the colleges, and provides no decentralization.

The York Sunday Movement has recognized this fact and suggested an alternative to the "irrelevant" college system — course unions. This is an excellent idea, for it would group together people of similar interests and provide for solidarity in academic affairs. But it certainly does not provide all the answers. What of the college courses to be instituted next year, or the system proposed by Professor M. Bakan that would radically re-personalize all academic relationships?

While the YSM may have the solution for academic questions, what of non-academic matters if the college system is abandoned? There are so many activities that YSF, course unions, or any other University-wide organization cannot look after them. Coffee-shops, poetry-readings, dinners, films, speakers — only the colleges can provide the necessary personal contact in these areas.

A further misunderstanding has arisen in some quarters concerning distinct college "identities". A distinction must be made between internal and external functions. To the outside society, we are members of York University, not of McLaughlin College, or Winters College, etc. This should be so. There was never any intention on the part of the originators of the College

system to have each college acquire a distinct personality in its relationships with non-York organizations. Even within the University, the development of an identity would be difficult, because of the physical similarities that exist between any two colleges.

The Colleges are important as units of self-government and organization. Their roles will be filled if they can provide the social and cultural aspects of university life; no other system has yet been devised to rid the multiversity of its impersonality.

Advocates of the College system are trying to develop it, not in order to fracture York's identity into college identities, but to ensure that students have a place to participate and become involved in whatever they wish.

In the light of present circumstances, there are several things that can be done to facilitate this. A modified version of the YSM course unions should be instituted under YSF auspices, but with the emphasis placed on rational dialogue, rather than on radical confrontation. (Believe it or not, some faculty members want and like to talk with students). The York Student Federation should develop itself so that it can adequately reflect University-wide opinion on external matters. But, most important, a change of attitudes towards the colleges must take place.

They are the centre of most non-academic activities and soon may develop some measure of academic importance. College organizations should be developed to look after this.

The new YSF president, Paul Koster, should initiate both constitutional and attitudinal reforms to reflect this basic reality of the university. He has the authority to do it—I challenge him to at least attempt it. For the sake of improving the college system, it's worth a try.

A view from the bottom of the pile

by Larry Goldstein

Of Liars and Lying

There are three main conclusions that are immediately evident in the "deserter" story. (see page one) All have to do with lying and liars.

The present Department of Immigration is making a liar out of Mr. John C. Monro, Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. Marchand, for Minister of Manpower and Immigration. On June 12, 1967, in response to a question in the House of Commons, he stated,

"An individual's status with regard to compulsory military service in his own country has no bearing on his admissibility to Canada either as an immigrant or as a visitor; nor is he subject to removal from Canada because of unfulfilled military obligations in his country of citizenship."—Hansard, June 12, 1967.

Four of the five students posing as deserters were turned away solely because the border guards believed they were deserters. As Canadian citizens we have a right to demand an explanation. Has the Monro policy changed? If so, by whom? and why are changes like this made without Parliament's knowledge or consent?

The Immigration act states, — Every person who being an immigration officer, wilfully makes or issues any false . . . declaration (or) statement . . . touching upon any matter connected with his office or duty . . . or otherwise wilfully forsakes his duty . . . is guilty of an offense and is liable . . . (to various penalties up to 5 years' imprisonment) — Revised Statutes of Canada 1952, Chapter 325 c. 51 (1)(a)

At the Rainbow bridge, Immigration Officer Pringle told Chris Wilson that without discharge papers, there was "no way" he could enter Can-

ada. Bob Waller was told at the Windsor crossing that deserters have to apply for landed immigrant status directly to Ottawa from the U.S. Both these statements are untrue and misleading.

The third falsehood has to do with the confidentiality of statements made to a civil servant. The Oath of Office and Secrecy that every civil servant swears to uphold is "I, (A.B.) solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfil the duties that devolve upon me by reason of my employment in the Civil Service and that I will not, without due authority in that behalf, disclose or make known any matter that comes to my knowledge by reason of such employment. So help me God." — Revised Statutes of Canada, Chap 48, Schedule A, 1947, c.53, 59.

In three cases on Saturday Canadian civil servants broke this solemn oath by informing the authorities of a foreign power of a deserter's identity. William A. House told Graham Muir, "I don't like this way of doing things but I have orders." Does that remind you of anything?

When we set out upon this course of action, we had enough evidence to satisfy ourselves that these conditions obtained at the border. Now we know the truth. The Liberal Government and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration are responsible for this state of affairs. I don't need to remind you that Canada has a two-hundred-year-old tradition of being sanctuary for draft evaders and deserters, beginning with the United Empire Loyalists.

It is your responsibility to write to the Minister, the Prime Minister, and your member of Parliament to remind them that even the minister himself must obey the law, and that changes in the law are solely the prerogative of Parliament, not some anonymous bureaucrat.