

# COMMENT: There are no cutbacks

As in all cases, there are two sides to every issue. As of late, the C.Y.S.F. has gone to great pains to once again establish the 'CUTBACKS' campaign. In the previous O.F.S. campaigns (which CYSF belongs to), facts were often presented in ways designed to evoke strong emotional responses from student sympathizers. The following contains the inside of the story; the 'real' facts.

While student leaders have been claiming there are some supposed 'cutbacks' the economic statistics state otherwise. During the 1977-78 academic year, when the Hon. Harry Parrott was the Minister of Colleges and Universities; students were loudly proclaiming the \$41 million increase in his budget as a cutback. An increase which is a decrease is somewhat mystifying indeed. As well, students enjoying the benefits of education were paying only 17% of the operating costs. The rest was being handed to the taxpayers to pay. However, the projected figures for the 1978-79 academic year indicate there will be a cutback. Even with the proposed increase for next year, tuition fees will meet only 13.5% of the operating costs.

In their annual ritual, OFS organized another Anti-Cutbacks March in the latter part of last year. As seen by the representation, the silent majority dictated their acceptance of the government's funding of educational institutions. Thus, when the traditional student leaders tried to initiate another assault, they found support to be lacking. The facts, when stated plain and simple, show that students have received both just and fair treatment.

During the present academic year, colleges and universities received a 5.9% increase (that means an increase of \$55.5 million), one of the largest among all ministries. As well, more students received student aid this year than any in Ontario's history. Ontario taxpayers paid \$77.7 million for the Ontario Student Assistance Program (O.S.A.P.), an increase of 96% over 1974-75. Although enrollment has dropped, reducing the need for more money, assistance has indeed increased.

One of the big complaints of the increases is not the cutbacks, but the fact that they do not keep pace with inflation. Government spending accounts for a large share of the economy. If they were to match spending increases to the inflation rate, they would only add to the inflationary pressures. The government has displayed good economic sense, unlike that of many critics. The critics fail to realize that tuition fees have not kept pace with inflation at any time. In the past fifteen years, tuition fees have been raised only twice. If the Consumer Price Index had been applied every year since 1967-68, the general arts fee would now be well over \$1,000. As it stands now, the province by increasing the ministry's budget by almost 90% since 1972-73, has provided at great expense to the taxpayers, an impressive string of universities. Since we benefit the most from our education, we shouldn't complain about having to pay a few dollars.

A great deal of publicity has been given to the fact that tuition fees will be raised next year. This increase is

reported to be 5%. When worked out, this amounts to 20¢ per academic day. This increase is significantly less than the academic year will total \$1,068 million, an increase of \$51 million over this year.

In listing the educational facts of life,

I am not disputing the need for provincial support. However, in attending one of the best systems of universities in Canada, we must bear a considerable amount of the financial burden our presence entails.

Robert Steadman

(This extra-length comment piece was authorized by a vote of the Excalibur staff assembly, but does not necessarily reflect the view of anyone other than the writer. Any member of the York community can appear before the staff and request a comment piece. Letters of response are invited.)

## York Unions



## Graduate assistants want Senate seat

The battle by part-time teaching staff for a seat on the Senate will come to a head Thursday, March 22 in the Senate chambers, as the Senate considers a recommendation by the Committee on the Organisation and Structure of the Senate (COSSU) which effectively denies part-timers any real representation.

Last spring, the Graduate Assistant's Association, which represents the vast majority of part-timers, made a request on behalf of the part-timers for a seat on the Senate, in light of the ongoing reform of the Senate structure. COSSU agreed at that time to recommend that one Senate seat be filled by a representative of the part-timers, to be selected through the GAA.

The Senate, however, questioned

the fact that the GAA represents all part-timers, and the promise of a seat became a promise to encourage Faculty Councils (on which part-timers have no representation) to elect some part-timers, as they see fit, to the Senate.

The GAA in fact represents 350 of the 400 part-timers, the remaining 50 being primarily employed in Law and Business Administration. These part-timers are excluded because they are full-time employees elsewhere, and hence do not share "a community of interests with the other part-timers."

Various suggestions have been put forward by the GAA to try to please the Senate on this question, but the Senate's only response has been a paternalistic pat on the head; that is, "ask your full-time friends to have you one of their seats".

Needless to say, part-timers cannot count on handouts, nor should they.

The GAA has bent over backwards to satisfy the Senate: our present position is that we should administer the election on behalf of all the part-timers. We are in regular contact with almost 90 per cent of all part-timers, and would undertake to contact the rest for the purpose of the election.

It is unlikely that full-time faculty will give up one of their seats to a part-timer. Part-timers are a significant portion of the teaching staff at York, and clearly should have their own representative. Thus we will continue to press for the only sensible solution - a seat for the part-timers, administered by the part-timers, and responsible to the part-timers.

Eric Walberg

## letters

All letters should be addressed to the editor, Excalibur, Room III Central Square. Letters must be typed, triple-spaced, on a 66 stroke line. Letters are limited to 300 words (seven column inches). Name, address, or phone number must be included or the letter will not be published. Excalibur reserves the right to edit for grammar and length.

Deadline Monday 4 pm

### Thanks for Matthews' letter

Thank you for publishing the letter written by Ralph Matthews in Excalibur of March 8, 1979, entitled "Another Side of Gay Rights".

I wholeheartedly agree with Ralph Matthews' viewpoint and appreciate your publishing it, especially in these times.

Sophie Abarbanel.

### Is it fair to tolerate EVERYONE?

Please allow me these brief words about two items in your edition of 15 March.

The first is a page 1 news article about the closing of the tunnel between Vanier College and BSB, caused by "hate slogans" and "intimidation". It seems that when it is "acceptable minorities" that are the target of such threats, the University does not hesitate to take appropriate, positive actions. Yet, I am moved to ask, why is it the case that when the same University is made aware of continuing "hate slogans" and "intimidation" of lesbian women and gay men, its reaction is either defensive rationalizations and deliberate misunderstanding, or absolute silence?

Second, I noticed several letters protesting a very bigoted anti-gay letter that you saw fit to print the week earlier. I do not question the importance of these letters: such attacks born out of ignorance and a deliberate attempt to deny how personal presuppositions colour any interpretation of a historical entity (in this instance, a text) must be answered.

I regret, however, that no one sought to raise the issue of what it meant for you to print both sets of letters. In short: I assume that you believe that such actions are above question, for you printed both sides of a controversial issue. I do not think the issue is this clear-cut. Liberal theories of "balance" and "toleration" are only fair, if ever, if there is an equal power base on both sides of an issue. If there is not, your equal balancing merely perpetuates a basic inequality, oppressive to one side. I believe it is clear that gay men and lesbian women do not have "equal power". Their lives can daily be attacked by their employers, or by bigoted individuals who

the legal system does not feel it is in the position to condemn. Thus, your "liberal toleration" seems to be supporting the existing system which oppresses our human rights. I do not claim that you intend this to be the effect of your actions. I do ask you to think about it on a deeper level than, I fear, you have.

In fact, with this letter, I ask all of us to think about it. I am not sure of the answers, but I know that it is important to take the time to ask the right kinds of questions. I also think that others thing they already know the answer... unfortunately.

Chuch Wheeler, M.A.

### A reply to (several) critics

In reply to half the letters section of Excalibur this week.

● The Bible is still the best seller of all time, including its historic content. Its history has yet to be proven wrong. All others are written by man and subject to prejudice.

● Homosexuality probably has existed as long as man like any other sin. (Murder goes back to Cain and Able.) This does not make it right.

● If you are waiting for California to submerge, don't listen to the cults, look it up in Matthew 24:36.

● Don't know if it's deliberate or not but you misquoted Prov. 26:4-5.

● Some of my first letter had to be shortened by the Editor so it may be that it was not clear that I have no personal beef with gay people. I agree that they are as intelligent as the best of us (check Matt. 5:45; However the "Divine Loving Father" who loves us will punish all sin because he is also a God of judgment. Read the prophecy of Rev. 20:12-15.

● You are right regarding "a free society, independence of conscience and self-determination for all". In fact God gives us an entire lifetime to do as we please. His desire is that we live as he directs but he also reminds us in his word (Gal: 6:7) "We reap what we sow".

● You are quite right to remind us that homosexuality was not Sodom's only sin. But taking other scriptures into context: Jude: 7, Lev. 18:22 Lev. 20:13 and specifically Gen: 19 (there are still others) it becomes clear that homosexuality displeases God. It ought to be made clear too that it is not a sin against fellow human beings for gays to practise their way of life (except when someone is molested - then our laws take over) it was God who said "Thou

shall not lie with mankind as with womankind. It is abomination" - Lev. 18:22.

● The quotation in one letter last week is well taken... To love one another .... if it is kept in context, especially with the previous one from Lev. 18:22.

The purpose behind writing the first letter was not to generate hatred. Anything short of the command "to love one another" is hypocrisy, another sin. May I humbly say that if I understand anything about gay people, they have a desire for love and to be loved, i.e. pure love, like all of us. Please read the book of John and I Corinthians 13 - see if God is big enough to reveal Himself and His kind of love.

Ralph Matthews

### Pro-life stands for human rights

A few remarks concerning the article of March 8, 1979 about the abortion debate. I was the pro-life speaker at that event. I think it only fair to point out that the CARAL representatives spoke for only one-half hour and after only a few questions, they departed. I began to speak at 3:15 and answered questions until 5:45. Most of that time there was a fairly large audience which engaged in a lively debate - and a civil one for such a controversial topic.

The reporter states that I based my argument on a definition of "personhood". I did not. The CARAL representative granted that the fetus was human, but not yet a person and misled the audience by asserting that legal rights belong only to "persons". I remind her that it is the Bill of Human Rights not Person.Rights. I was surprised to find the CARAL people admitting the humanity of the fetus; just a short while ago they had many convinced that it was just a "Blob of tissue". This drift to denying "personhood" to the fetus suggests that abortionists no longer wish to fly in the face of the scientific fact that the fetus is human - and that from the moment of conception.

It is hard to refute the CARAL argument since no definition of personhood was offered. When, though, we allow criteria other than humanity as the determinate of rights, we certainly open ourselves to all kinds of legal abuses. The example of slavery does serve; blacks were considered property while enslaved; if they were freed they were then "persons".

The abortion issue is not a matter of women's rights vs. fetal rights; it is a

matter of human rights. Women argue that they have been exploited and treated as less than human by men because men had the power to do so - and it was convenient for them to do so. It is disheartening to hear many women argue that because they have the power - and because it is convenient for them to do so - they can treat the fetus as less than human, in fact, as completely negligible. I as a human and as a woman and as a person wish women to have all the rights which are rightfully theirs. I wish no one to have the right to take the life of another.

Janet E. Smith

### The Globe on Sewell: inaccurate

To the editor of the Globe & Mail

I was somewhat mystified by Marina Strauss's report, "Toronto's a bore," on Mayor John Sewell's message to York University students; the article left the impression what York students are only interested in discos and nightclubs. I was in attendance at the meeting which was a 'bearpit' session in which the mayor answered questions from the floor; Ms. Strauss's report seems to bear little resemblance to what actually took place.

There were some very serious questions raised by students concerning T.T.C. fare increases, housing and government cutbacks; Where was Ms. Strauss's report on those statements by the mayor concerning these issues? Instead she chose to stress the social life of students. Many students are concerned about adequate housing and affordable public transit; not every student wants, nor can afford the swinging social life.

In future, I would hope your reporters will provide a more accurate and fuller coverage of such events. Thank you.

Doug Hum Calumet

### China the aggressor in Vietnam

The Chinese invasion of Vietnam, constitutes an act of aggression and a high danger to world peace. This aggressive attempt at overpowering the Vietnamese people has its roots in Peking's reactionary foreign policy. Chinese foreign policy has been

linked to fascist and corrupt governments around the world, for the purposes of its expansionist aims. China has participated in armed conflicts in Africa and Asia supporting reactionaries against revolutionaries. A few examples:

In Africa it backed reactionary groups in the Angola war, as well as in Mozambique, Zaire Ethiopia, etc. In Latin America, China has supported fascist regimes and, along with the USA, was the first country to recognize the fascist military junta of Chile. The Chilean regime has received, since 1973, large amounts of economic aid.

In Asia, China has been at war with many countries. In 1962 it was at war with India. Later, it backed the former government of Pol Pot in overthrowing the old ruling class in Cambodia. People in the country and around the world believe that Mr. Pol Pot was to set up a new society where social democracy and economic prosperity would benefit all the population. What occurred, was a night mare for the masses; hunger, mass extermination and the constant violation of human rights. All the world knew of these atrocities which were repudiated by the UN.

The new revolutionary regime, which has overthrown Pol Pot has been welcomed by most Cambodians, who have received aid and support from the Vietnamese people. The new regime recognizes Vietnam as its principal ally. The Chinese reacted by launching a punitive raid against Vietnam like the USA did before. The Vietnamese people, as when they defeated the French and the United States, are not alone. China is already being condemned for this aggression.

The solidarity of many countries, along with the Vietnamese military experience of the past, has contributed to the expulsion of the aggressor from Vietnamese territory.

Cosme Pima

Get your letters to us - just two issues left