

Excalibur



editor
 managing editor
 news editor
 assistant news editor
 features editor
 business manager
 entertainment editor
 photo editor
 sports editor
 lay out

ron graham
 mannie zeller
 fred nix
 frances de angelis
 gary gada
 henry gertner
 don mckay
 clark hill
 jim richardson
 ross howard
 roly stroeter
 rosamund dunkley
 heather anderson
 rich levine
 sam stern

circulation manager
 excalibur is published weekly by students
 of york university on york campus. opinions
 expressed do not necessarily represent those
 of the student council or the university
 administration. phone-635-2300
 Associate member--Canadian University Press

Editorial This Dangerous Proposal

Almost unanimously the presidents of Ontario's Universities have criticized the recommendation by the Spinks Commission to amalgamate 14 universities into one super 'University of Ontario' directly responsible to the Ontario Government Department of University affairs. So they should!

The Spinks proposal has many defects and dangers.

First and foremost, it directly threatens the autonomy of the universities. By placing in government hands directly responsibility for seeing that there is little duplication in university curriculum, it is conceivable that there could come a day when universities would be little more than glorified high schools with a standard curriculum designed to meet the 'needs' of the economy as the government sees them. What then of York's unique general education courses? What then of academic freedom?

On a practical basis, the implementation of Spinks recommen-

dation would probably impose a burdensome mountain of bureaucratic red tape on Ontario Universities by placing power in one central authority.

In California, where the University of California with its numerous campuses services the entire state, a smaller portion of government revenue is spent of university education than in Ontario. It is not unlikely that the percentage of expenditure on post-secondary education in Ontario would decline given a government's natural inclination to cut financial corners for political reasons. Moreover, as President Murray Ross has put it, 'what we fear most is the California system with complete domination from the top.'

Dr. J.A. Corrv. principal of Queen's University said, 'I don't think the report has the active support of one of the 14 presidents.' We hope their active opposition in the weeks ahead will kill this dangerous proposal.

Letters

Dear Sir:

I wish to comment upon the statements of Mr. Scott, Chairman of the Board of Governors, as reported in your last issue.

Oust, Oust

Mr. Scott is much dismayed
 To find a Glendon Protest made.
 Free speech is never quite polite
 And free assembly not a right
 Of students, who should mind
 their letters
 And learn to imitate their betters,
 Who swear and sex and drink discreetly,
 Dress nicely and speak always
 sweetly,
 And never, never will disgrace
 Themselves, by telling Lester to
 his face,
 Illiberal thoughts that they may
 find
 Quite accidentally in their mind.

Mr. Scott is much dismayed,

But Lester did not seem afraid
 Of those few critics and their
 noise.

Perhaps he thought, boys will be
 boys,

Or maybe, as a teacher should,
 Allowed dissent is something
 good.

To talk with those who don't
 agree,
 Is the aim of university,
 And even done in Ottawa,
 Where others help Liberals make
 the law.

I, too, am very much dismayed,
 That Mr. Scott would have York
 made

A private club with public money,
 Where criticism is not funny,
 Out of which he quickly pitches
 Thos who aren't proper sons-of-
 riches.

Sincerely,
 Gordon McClure
 Graduate,
 Psychology.

Russian Gymnastic Team

All those interested in ushering or those who have already signed up for ushering, there will be an organizational meeting Monday, December 12 at 5:30 p.m. in the Physical Education building,--third floor.

Support! CUSandFreeTuition

by Malcolm Jackson

C.U.S. in principal deserves your support. Whether it deserves as much financial support as its student members give it is another question. In principal it is made up of the president of the University Student Council of each member University campus, and a certain number of delegates appointed by each Student Council (that number based on the number of member students per campus); plus, and most important, the C.U.S. Executive which is elected at the annual C.U.S. Congress. In theory the Congress decides general policy and priorities for the coming year and the executive carries them out to the best of its ability throughout the year.

C.U.S. is a voice of Canadian Students. It can claim a hand in pressuring the Federal Government to increase its aid to higher education, pressure which has resulted in part in the Canada Student Loan Plan (which the Ontario Government has 'red-taped' beyond recognition). The student means test done two years ago was a major credit to C.U.S. and the results were accepted by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

The S.G.R.S. is a student information service which gives valuable assistance to students and student councils on a vast number of subjects. C.U.S. has in the past attempted to participate in many causes to student benefit, e.g. student housing, student orientation programs; discussion to determine the role of the student in university government. It offers an insurance plan; charter flights to Europe; and now reduced accomodation at Expo. It has submitted clarifying comment on the various reports of government and non-government commissions on higher education, (e.g. re the Duff Commission) In other words it has tried to represent the interests of Canadian students.

Yet people have begun to question the value of C.U.S. We should

too. All this questioning appeared to begin with the formation of U.G.E.Q. (Union General des Etudiants de Quebec) and the secession of the French members of C.U.S. It was symbolic of the separatiste designs of the French Canadian youth. It may as Doug Ward, President of C.U.S., claims, have been a create step on the part of the French speaking members. Nevertheless, English speaking members began to question the value of C.U.S., especially since it no longer could claim to speak for all 200,00 Canadian university students.

Like others, I can find fault with the present C.U.S. Firstly I would suggest that C.U.S. concentrate on her programme at home. Of \$20,000 (approx) spent directly on the core program in 1965-66 (i.e. not including operating expenses which ran to \$46,000), approximately \$5000, (i.e. one quarter of the budget went to the International Program. I feel that until C.U.S. is back on her feet solidly, this money should be spent at home. (The fact that on a priority list at the most recent Congress the International Affairs program was twentieth shows I hope, a changing trend).

Secondly C.U.S. should investigate means of revenue to supplement the per capita levies which in 1965-66 accounted for approximately 95% of the \$86,000 Revenue. There are many other suggestions in policy that could be made if the program were carefully studied.

As students you should demand first that your council investigate the policy of C.U.S. and try to change it before deserting a 'sinking ship'. Let York go on record as trying to shape policy rather than merely running from it. C.U.S. has had its very good days. Now she may appear to be in a slump. To abandon all that was worked for because of one or two rough years would be wrong and would show weakness on our part.

To the editor:

Mr. Graham suggests that 'Mr. Young is a captive of the old myth that the proletariat is necessarily a force for liberty and social progress'. Then he hastily plods onward without explaining how he arrived at that politically scientific (I presume) conclusion about the 'myth'. Where were the sociological and political references for that conclusion?

What was the Chartist Movement all about Mr. Graham? Was that mythical? By the way there is a grade twelve history book (elementary no doubt, but I doubt inaccurate) called the Modern Age and it contains a section entitled 'The Growth of Democracy in Great Britain' and I recommend it to you. What was the Populist movement all about Mr. Graham? Do you consider the Labour Party in Great Britain, which has represented the proletariat from the early 1900's, and I assume, received its support from the proletariat, authoritarian or democratic? What class supported the C.C.F. in Canada, and was the platform and philosophy of that party, authoritarian or democratic? From what class does the N.D.P. get its support and do you consider it authoritarian? My impression is that the democracy I live in today is the result of victories of a politically conscious proletariat that struggled

for the realization of democratic rights for everyone in this country!

Yours democratically,

Carmin Victor Priolo
 member of the York U. Committee to end the war in Vietnam.

Dear Sir:

On the front page of last week's issue there was a report that Mr. Scott, Chairman of York's Board of Governors, expressed the feelings that the 'students involved in the demonstration' on the occasion of Prime Minister Pearson's visit to Glendon, 'should have been expelled and/or otherwise disciplined.' If this report is true, let me say:

(FIRST) Such sentiments represent a dangerous attitude towards our freedoms of speech and assembly. The exercise of these and other freedoms should be encouraged not suppressed. That possibility that these freedoms may be misused is the risk that comes with them.

(SECOND) The Prime Minister is part of a system of responsible, representative government which demands communication between the men at the top and the people. This is often difficult. Traditionally a demonstration has often been the best way to voice people's sentiments. The demonstration in question was just such a form of direct communication,