

President Ross:**Let them in**

Last Wednesday I had the opportunity of meeting with the York University Committee Against the War in Vietnam. The Committee was good enough to discuss with me their objections to the appearance on campus of the representatives of Hawker Siddeley Canada Ltd. to recruit students to work for that company.

While I have sympathy with the objectives of the Committee, I tried to explain to members of the Committee some of the problems involved in their request:

(1) On the invitation of the University, the National Employment Service (N.E.S.) established an office on campus. It is a service for students and indeed, has been used by many students to secure part-time jobs and full-time placement.

(2) If we at York did not wish this service, we could ask the N.E.S. to leave the campus. However, it is my understanding that many students use these services and my impression is that most students want the N.E.S. to continue on campus. They surely have some rights in this respect.

(3) It seems to me the Committee Against the War in Vietnam were asking that the N.E.S. invite on campus only companies 'approved' by the University. I doubt whether any government agency would agree to discriminate against some individual companies in this way. As far as the University is concerned, I doubt if we would want to 'censor'; saying to some 'you are not acceptable' and to others 'we approve of you.' Personally, I would not want to make such a judgment for the whole University, because I know

how difficult it is to differentiate between various commercial enterprises and their manifold activities. Censorship is always dangerous. In this case, it is far better to allow each individual to make his own judgement--to decide if he wishes to meet with certain company officials or not.

(4) Given the fact that most students want the service provided by the N.E.S., and given the fact that the University is not willing to censor by prohibiting entry to the campus of some industries which work with the N.E.S., it is clear that many firms will be on campus, some of which may appear to be objectionable to various members of the faculty and of the student body.

(5) Some students and members of the faculty may wish to protest recruiting by some companies, and I think they have every right to do so. If they do, however, I expect them to respect the rights of others, to protest peacefully, and to do nothing that will interfere with the on-going programme of the University. It is possible to have more than one loyalty and I would hope students and faculty here have sufficient identification with York University that they will make certain that the University's reputation is not damaged in any way. There will be, indeed, there should be, sharp exchanges of views in the University, but all of us have seen that when feelings run high and irresponsibility takes over, great damage can result. I hope all will act responsibly in situations in which there is disagreement. The University should be a place where reason prevails.



A caribou evacuates refugees in Vietnam. The plane is made by de Havilland Aircraft, a subsidiary of Hawker Siddeley.

THE QUESTIONS: Is it true that Hawker Siddeley makes aeroplanes for the Viet war? Should the company be allowed to recruit future employees on campus? Do the Vietniks, who say no, have a legitimate case against the administration, who say yes?

THE ANSWERS: may be found on this page. Keep reading.

COMMENT**Hawker-Siddeley Abused by anti-war group**

by Richard Banigan

An article in last week's (December 1, 1967) Excalibur contains certain allegations by Joe Young, of the Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which are false and unfair.

In the article, Mr. Young mentioned that 'Hawker Siddeley is affiliated with an international company involv-

ed in the supplying of planes for the United States military effort in Vietnam.' The only international company with which Hawker Siddeley of Canada is affiliated is Hawker Siddeley International, of London England, which has at no time supplied aircraft to any of the combatants of the war.

The current organization of Hawker Siddeley International dates back to 1964, when a series of mergers originating in the British aircraft industry created one of the largest industrial complexes in the world.

The threat to boycott Hawker Siddeley recruitment on campus is probably not aimed at Hawker Siddeley of Canada at all, because its primary manufactures are buses and railway equipment.

Rather, the intent is to protest against one of the minor subsidiaries of the company, which is de Havilland Aircraft.

If this is the case, the allegations still do not apply because de Havilland has stopped making aircraft for U.S. forces in 1962, well in advance of any large scale commitment in Vietnam.

It is true, however, that de Havilland aeroplanes are flying in Vietnam. Between 1949 and 1962, the company produced some 1200 Beavers, 600 Otters, and 180 Caribou for various American services. During 1963, a number of caribou were also supplied to the Royal Australian Air Force, but also previous to a Vietnam involvement.

All of these aircraft are small, unarmed, piston-engined transports originally designed as bush planes for the Canadian north. They have been found suitable for operation out of short jungle airfields, such as those found in Vietnam, and are used there to resupply forward bases and evacuate casualties.

It has been Canadian go-

vernment policy for several years that de Havilland shall sell no aircraft or parts thereof to any of the combatants of Vietnam. This is the major reason why the company was unable to negotiate its multi-million dollar contract with the Pentagon for the new Buffalo aircraft. This is a 'fait accompli.'

Joe Young has no grounds on which to base his protest. De Havilland has not built an offensive aircraft since the Second World War, and cannot even remotely be referred to as an arms company. So far as I know they have never built a gun, a bomb, or a bullet for anybody.

Because of the lack of spare parts for the Caribou, the U.S. Air Force, which now operates most of the remaining examples of the type, decided last summer to phase out this aircraft. The American aircraft industry has been asked to submit proposals for a replacement.

De Havilland is the largest single employer within Metropolitan Toronto, and has consistently improved Canada's balance of payments picture by exporting millions of dollars worth of products ever year for the past 20 years.

The few U.S. Army Caribou occasionally seen in Downsview are apparently here under the terms of a service contract signed almost a decade ago.

What really concerns me is that the administration may be pressured into extending the supreme insult to a visiting firm, when said firm is quite, quite innocent.

Why should President Ross pay attention to an armistist when others with legitimate causes are left standing at the door?

Mr. Bannigan (F III) spent the past summer as a public relations officer with the de Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited, Downsview.

The Case for the Vietniks

by Joe Young

Representing the Committee to End the War in Vietnam, I attended the last ACSA (Advisory Committee on Student Affairs) meeting, which considered the question of war industries recruiting on campus. Dr. Ross and Mr. Best, chairman of ACSA, posed the question as an all or nothing proposition, either all the companies come on campus or none.

In this way they abdicated from all moral responsibility to do everything possible to stop these companies which are aiding in the slaughter in Vietnam and



Joe Young, speaking for the protesters.

blackmailed the students who require the service in order

to get jobs. First ACSA and the President should decide whether they are in favour of war industries recruiting on campus in principle, then it should be decided how to stop them.

The opinion of ACSA is quite insignificant. Since it is chosen by the President it is inevitable that it should reinforce his decision. It is in no way representative of university opinion. Only eight of the 22 members were present to vote to retain the companies anyway.

One argument raised in favour of these companies recruiting is the right of students to work for whom-ever they please. When you see someone participating in an act which injures another you can applaud, walk by or stop him. The same applies to companies which supply arms to kill the Vietnamese, and to those who would work for them.

It is the responsibility of every individual to do something to stop this crime, as a start by stopping on-campus recruitment. Abstract talk about the right to work for whomever you please ignores the reality of the terrible suffering which these companies are aiding.

We are all responsible and must do whatever we can to end the Vietnam war which threatens to engulf us all in a Third World War.

advanced. While some of the criticisms made above may arise from tribulations in starting up the systems (since the two building referred to have only been open for two years), it is true to say that most of them arise from inherent defects in the design of these systems.

Yours sincerely,
G. Hunter, Chemistry Dept.
and Founders College Don.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Hurrah for Dr. Hunter! It's high time someone spoke up against the inadequacies at York of the basic necessities of living.

letters * from page 4

or carpets, or anything else with which it comes into contact. Such instances of property damage have occurred in the Farquharson building and in the residence. Puddles of water which form make the floor slippery and are a hazard to the people using the building.

In conclusion I would like to say that the above discussion is not intended to be an exhaustive critique of the facilities provided on the York Campus. Rather it is intended to counter the false impression created by the article in the York Communique, that these facilities are technologically